United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2014 No. 23

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 6, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOC HASTINGS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen Rossetti, St. Luke Institute, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, you are the Lord of Heaven and Earth, yet You are humble and it is Your delight to serve us, Your beloved children. We pray that we too might have that same spirit of humility and a deep desire to serve.

May we be especially mindful of those who are struggling, those who are suffering, and those who are poor. You have a special love for them; may we have that same love.

We thank You for being the humble, loving God that You are. May we become more like You: loving, humble, serving. We pray this in Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NEAL 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

DRUG POLICIES—BE HONEST AND DIRECT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, in a congressional hearing, under oath, Michael Botticelli, the Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, could not answer my direct questions: What is more dangerous, methamphetamine or marijuana? How many people died from marijuana last year? He complained that people think marijuana is benign.

Well, I don't think marijuana is benign, but I can understand how people can get confused when so-called ''experts'' cannot give straight answers. Federal law says that marijuana is more dangerous than cocaine and methamphetamine, which everybody knows is a lie.

Unlike marijuana, tobacco use is falling. Unlike marijuana, we don't arrest millions of people for using tobacco. Tobacco use has been cut almost two-thirds because we have been honest about the facts.

Maybe there's a lesson for our drug policy officials: if you want to discourage marijuana use, be honest and be direct.

INVEST IN U.S. ACT OF 2014

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a piece of legislation that I have introduced to boost our economy, invest in our crumbling infrastructure, and create jobs.

The economy is in need of a jolt, a proverbial shot in the arm to get it moving again. The need for this legislation is clear. Our unemployment rate is too high, the number of jobs created too low, and income inequality has made our recovery uneven, at best.

Eight million jobs were wiped out during the recession. We have to get them back. I have introduced the Invest in U.S. Act. My legislation will go a long way toward helping the economy take off again.

It makes strategic investments in infrastructure, bond measures, wildly successful Build America Bonds programs. It makes the R&D tax credit permanent, and many other tax credit initiatives.

Printed on recycled paper.

The Invest in U.S. Act also takes full aim at rising income inequality. It increases the minimum wage. It provides tax relief for small businesses who hire new employees and those that buy new equipment.

The American people want one thing: an improved economy and more jobs. Join me in supporting this legislation that will finance critical infrastructure investment, fight income inequality, and grow our economy. The argument is about jobs.

REFOCUSING ON THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, climate change, offshore drilling, wildfires, scarcity—these concerns are expressed over and over again from my constituents in my district.

People are anxious that the world that they are handing down to their children is not as pristine as the one they inherited. They plead with us to protect the environment. Yet time and time again, the House majority votes to undercut clean air and water laws, while blocking efforts to protect public lands. What a travesty when an allegiance to industry takes precedence over maintaining a healthy environment.

This week, we wasted precious floor time with needless bills, like the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act, which made a mockery of the serious drought in California. The House needs to stop bringing irresponsible bills to the floor, giving away our cherished lands, stripping away environmental protections, and doing nothing to solve real problems like the drought in California.

We have heard their excuses. They say environmental regulations slow the economy, but let's be honest: putting the interest of appropriations above our environment is a dangerously expensive notion.

Let's stop being reactionary and get ahead of these real problems facing our planet.

JOBS BILL

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, long-term unemployment has not been this high in this great country since World War II.

It is time to look back in our history and see what the leaders did then. We can always learn from the past. In 1944, the President was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His vision was to expand economic opportunity, jobs. To build the middle class, we must rebuild, and help them thrive, and fight inequality.

Mr. Speaker, how about beginning with women? Today, we have more than 50 million people—13 million of them are children—living below poverty in this country. We have the greatest economy in the world. This is absolutely shameful.

We must adopt and be committed to the concept of full employment. Take up the President's American Jobs Act of 2013. Rebuild this country's infrastructure, invest in education, in our first responders, and in medical researchers. It is time to put America first and Make It In America.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2954.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 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. 2954.

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

□ 0913

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. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, with Mr. DENHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, H.R. 2954, is a bipartisan package of 10 bills to protect and promote public access to lands; to improve opportunities by removing red tape that stands in the way of responsible, local economic development and jobs; and to encourage transparent community center land management.

This small grouping of bills will advance important local projects that will have a direct impact on jobs and on economic growth in communities throughout the country.

□ 0915

The package includes several commonsense land conveyance bills to remove unnecessary bureaucratic strings attached to how land is used and how it is managed. It recognizes that locally elected leaders, not Federal bureaucrats, know how to best manage certain lands.

There are measures to prevent unreasonable Federal regulations or actions from destroying a historic lookout tower in my home State of Washington, blocking unreasonable public recreation access to the Cape Hatteras seashore in North Carolina, and preventing the use of hand-powered boats, such as kayaks, in several national parks in the West.

This bill will help family businesses and ranchers by implementing commonsense reforms to the process of renewing livestock grazing permits. Livestock grazing on Federal lands is an important part of the American ranching tradition. This bill will help our Nation's ranchers operate more efficiently and with greater certainty.

The package, Mr. Chairman, also includes legislation sponsored by the Public Lands Subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, requiring the BLM to establish an Internet database for all BLM lands that are available for sale to the public.

In the year 2014, if I may be parochial, when a Seahawks fan can purchase a championship hat on the Internet just moments after the Superbowl ends, the Federal Government can certainly get its act together and post its lands that are available for sale online.

This bill will expedite the planning and implementation of emergency salvage timber sales for Federal lands in California that were ravaged by the Rim Fire last summer. Without prompt emergency action, the impacts of this devastating wildfire could become even worse. Fire-damaged trees invite disease. They invite insect infestations. They increase the risk of future wildfires, and they are a threat to visitor safety. Emergency salvage and forest restoration efforts should not be delayed due to bureaucratic hurdles and lawsuits.

Finally, the bill provides for transparency and accountability in how Federal funds are spent in protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

This small package of bills is reasonable, responsible, and it reflects the will of local communities and their elected leaders. It deserves support, I believe, from my Democrat and Republican colleagues.

Before concluding my remarks on this piece of legislation and listening to the statement of the gentleman from Arizona, I would like to briefly address the legislative work of this committee as a whole. The committee, of course, I speak of is the Natural Resources Committee.

Just this week, the House will have considered three measures from the House Natural Resources Committee.

Two of these packages were individual bills, which means a total of 18 different bills from this committee will have effectively been considered and debated and voted upon by the House this week.

Prior to this week, over the first 13 months of this Congress, the Natural Resources Committee has advanced nearly 60 individual bills through the House. Nearly 50 of those bills have passed on a broad bipartisan basis under the expedited suspension process. Ten bills under the jurisdiction of the committee, both Republican and Democrat, have been signed by the President, which represents a noticeable percentage of the public laws that have been enacted by this Congress. These totals do not include individual bills included in other measures, such as bills that were included in the Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Chairman, this statement is not made as a pat on the back, but to make clear that the intent of this committee is to dutifully work and act on priorities for our Nation. They may be narrow bills to resolve a parochial problem or broad measures affecting the country as a whole. Of course, the nature of our committee is to deal with, in many cases, bills that deal on very parochial issues. That is one of the reasons why there are so many bills that come out of our committee.

In matters of broad policy, some are of great urgency, such as the importance of restoring responsible, active forest management to both support economically struggling rural communities and to improve the health of Federal forests. We passed that bill earlier this year. Just yesterday, the House moved swiftly to provide a solution to the devastating drought in California.

We have also acted on multiple bipartisan measures to streamline red tape and boost America's ability to safely harness our vast energy resources to create jobs—because we know that energy jobs are good-paying jobs—to lower prices, and to strengthen our national security by reducing dependence on foreign energy from hostile nations.

On each of these measures, it is time for the Senate to act and to pass their own proposals so that we can then work to reach an agreement. Obviously, there will be differences between both Houses, but they need to pass their legislation so we can work on the differences so that these measures can become law. We have differences, but we have a responsibility to represent those we are elected to serve and put forward real solutions for the challenges facing the American people.

There are dozens of bills solving local problems, implementing locally supported solutions, and establishing protections for historic and special places that can be acted on by both the House and the Senate. I believe that this is possible on matters under the jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, that we can find common ground with the Senate. Why do I say that? Because we have successfully done so repeatedly over this last year. That is why there are a noticeable number of public laws from our committees that have been acted on by the House and have gone to the President.

But, as always, this will require a willingness to recognize and respect differences in philosophy and procedure in both the House and in the Senate. It must be a two-way street where each Chamber acts on the other's priorities, but, again, has successfully been done in the past, and I know it can be done in the future. The Republican majority in the House has demonstrated our willingness to do so while maintaining our fundamental views on Federal land management, the importance of multiple use of public lands, and the ability of local communities to make better decisions for themselves than Federal bureaucracies.

So as we conclude this week's full slate of action on House Natural Resources Committee bills, I pledge to continue working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol to make progress in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

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

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

Let me congratulate the chairman on the Seahawks, and also remind him that there was a long 16-game season. They won their division. They played San Francisco three times, two out of three, and then after that they went into the playoffs. Then after the playoffs, they went to the championship game and, finally, to the Superbowl, which they won. Congratulations. So it is great that you got that cap 1 minute after the game was over. I am pointing out that there was a long, deliberate process with rules, games to be won, that encompassed the whole season. Sometimes us rushing legislation is cutting corners that great championship teams like the Seahawks never do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), my colleague.

I will have more to say on the specifics of this legislation later.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2954, the mistitled Public Access and Lands Improvement Act. Rather than improving our Nation's lands, this bill negatively affects our land management decisions. It conveys or disposes of Federal lands improperly. It rewrites grazing policy, and it waives numerous environmental laws like the Natural Environmental Policy Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Overall, H.R. 2954 contains a number of provisions that would undermine the responsible balance of interests and considerations in the stewardship of our Nation's lands and our Nation's resources.

Included in the myriad of poor land management provisions that this bill cobbles together is language that gives away thousands of acres of Federal land in Florida, Alaska, and Nevada, valued at millions of dollars, without a transparent public planning process. When the Federal Government gives away land, we do so with certain understandings of how it will be used. It is just wrong to change the rules without due consideration and without any compensation for the Federal Government—the taxpayers of this Nation—if others will now profit from this land.

Yet another ill-advised land management provision, H.R. 2954 also prevents the Bureau of Land Management from carrying out its mission to manage public lands for multiple use. Specifically, this bill requires that until the agency creates a public database of all lands identified for disposal, BLM would be barred from all land acquisitions. This is couched as a transparency measure when, in reality, it is nothing more than an attempt to prevent and delay BLM from doing its all-important work.

Further, provisions of the bill would disregard or reduce public engagement on a range of community interests, including natural resource protections. In fact, H.R. 2954 would overturn a multiyear National Park Service process that has resulted in balanced provisions that protect threatened shorebirds and endangered nesting sea turtles while preserving the economic health of the community at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The National Park Service should be allowed to continue their balanced and successful management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore in order to ensure these critical protections remain in place.

Along with these poor land management decisions and irresponsible consideration of our Nation's lands and natural resources, H.R. 2954 would eliminate or delay timely reviews of grazing leases necessary to ensure sound conservation principles.

In addition, H.R. 2954 includes a bill to expedite salvaged logging on the Rim Fire area of northern California, overriding NEPA and administrative and judicial review.

The end result after piecing together all these provisions is a piece of legislation that waives Federal law, including laws that require consultation with Federal, State, local, or tribal governments or with local residents in order, among other things, to expedite timber harvest on certain Federal lands in California; reverse course on the science-based National Park Service plan that provides an appropriate balance of off-road vehicle access and protection of sensitive seashore areas in North Carolina; and waive NEPA in multiple scenarios, weakening important public involvement and planning provisions.

Mr. Chairman, our public lands and natural resources would simply be mismanaged, unprotected, and undervalued as a result of this bill. I believe we have to put partisan politics aside and work together to protect and responsibly manage America's natural resources and to support and ensure that the Nation's spectacular landscapes, unique natural life, and cultural resources and icons endure for future generations. This bill is just a giant step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues here in the House to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2954.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who is the author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and particularly want to thank him for his work on the Natural Resources Committee and for his invaluable assistance on this bill.

This summer, the biggest fire in the history of the Sierra Nevada mountains burned 400 square miles of forestland. The fire left behind an unprecedented swath of environmental devastation that threatens the loss not only of the affected forestland for generations to come, but sets events in motion that could destroy the surrounding forest for many years to come.

The fire also left behind hundreds of millions of board feet of dead timber that is on Federal land that could be sold to raise millions of dollars, money that could then be used to replant and reforest our devastated lands. In addition, processing that timber would help to revive the economy of a stricken region.

But time is already running out. Within a year, the value of the timber declines rapidly as the wood is devoured by insects and rot. That is the problem. Cumbersome environmental reviews and litigation that inevitably follow will run up the clock of this valuable asset until it becomes absolutely worthless.

□ 0930

Indeed, it becomes worse than worthless—it becomes hazardous. Bark and wood-boring beetles are already moving in to feast on the dead and dying timber, and a population explosion of pestilence can be expected if those dead trees remain. The beetles won't confine themselves to the fire areas, posing a mortal threat to the adjacent forests.

By the time the normal bureaucratic reviews and lawsuits have run their course, what was once forestland will have already begun converting to brushland, and by the following year, reforestation will have become infinitely more difficult and expensive. Within just a few years, several feet of dry brush will have built up, and the smaller trees will have begun toppling on this tinder. It is not possible to build a more perfect fire stack than that. That means that intense second-generation fires will take advantage of this fuel, sterilizing the soil, eroding the landscape, fouling the watersheds, and jeopardizing surrounding forests.

Without timely salvage and reforestation, we know the fate of the Sierras because we have seen the result of neglect after previous fires. The trees don't come back for many, many generations. Instead, thick brush takes over the land that was once shaded by towering forests. It quickly overwhelms any seedlings struggling to make a start. It replaces the diverse ecosystems supported by the forests with scrub brush.

For this reason, I introduced H.R. 3188, which waives the time-consuming environmental review process and prevents the endless litigation that always follows. It authorizes Federal forest managers, following well-established environmental protocols for salvage, to sell the dead timber and to supervise its careful removal while there is still time. The millions of dollars raised can then be directed toward replanting the region before layers of brush choke off any chance of forest regrowth in the foreseeable future.

It was modeled on legislation authored by Democratic Senator Tom Daschle for salvaging dead and dying trees in the Black Hills National Forest, a measure credited with speeding the preservation and recovery of that forest. Unfortunately, the bill spawned lurid tales from the activist left of uncontrolled logging in the Sierras. Nothing could be further from the truth. The legislation vests full control of the salvage plans with Federal forest managers, not the logging companies. It leaves Federal foresters in charge of enforcing salvage plans that fully protect the environment.

Because of the opposition—and we heard a little bit of it just a moment ago—in a few minutes, I will offer an amendment that was worked out in consultation with the U.S. Forest Service and with several Democratic offices, and I hope it will receive bipartisan support. It preserves the EIS process and the environmental and judicial reviews, but it expedites them and assures that salvage under the direction of the Forest Service can begin this spring.

There is plenty of room for compromise, but there is absolutely no excuse for inaction. The left wants a policy of benign neglect—to let a quarter of a million acres of destroyed timber rot in place, to surrender the ravaged land to beetles and to watch contentedly as the forest ecosystem is replaced by scrub brush. It is true that without human intervention the forests will eventually return in about a century from now but certainly not in the lifetimes of ourselves, of our children or of our children's children. If we want to stop the loss of this forestland and if we want to control the beetle infestation before it explodes out of control, the dead timber has to come out soon.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. If we take it up now, we can generate the funds necessary to suppress brush buildup, to plant new seedlings and to restore these forests for the use and enjoyment of our children. If we wait for the normal bureaucratic reviews and litigation and delays, we will have lost these forests for the next several generations.

The irony is that 16,000 acres of that same forest were destroyed but were on private land. The owner, Sierra Pacific Industries, is in the process of salvaging the timber on their lands. They will be done by this summer, and then they will begin reforesting from a portion of those proceeds. Meanwhile, the public lands lay unattended. Let me tell you something. Within a couple of years, the difference is going to be dramatic. We will have fully salvaged and reforested private lands next to neglected, overgrown public lands that are dry with scrub brush and just waiting for the next fire.

The public management of our lands will be judged in comparison with the management of the private lands, and if we maintain current law, we will have been held in the balance and found wonting.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with great frustration, and must oppose the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act in its current form.

This bill is a merger of 10 public lands and natural resource bills, all of which are unrelated to each other and many of which would ignore the best available science, would compromise the stewardship of our public lands and would completely disregard the bedrock environmental laws that have served to protect our environment and cherished open space for decades.

That being said, there is one part of this bill that I do support. Buried in title VI of this bill is the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act, which I introduced with Congressman LARSEN and Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL.

Green Mountain Lookout, located in the Glacier Peak Wilderness, was built in 1933 as a Civilian Conservation Corps project to detect fires and spot enemy aircraft during World War II. The lookout is an important, historic and unique part of the Pacific Northwest. It is a popular destination for hikers, and it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Unfortunately, severe weather caused the Green Mountain Lookout to fall into disrepair in 2001, and the U.S. Forest Service began taking steps to preserve the historic

structure for future generations. However, an out-of-State group filed a lawsuit against the Forest Service for using machinery to conduct these repairs, and a U.S. District Court ordered the Forest Service to remove the lookout.

My bill would allow critical and routine maintenance while keeping this iconic structure where it is meant to be—in its original home. Local governments in the area, my constituents, as well as a number of environmental and historic preservation groups support my bill to keep the Green Mountain Lookout where it is. The Natural Resources Committee agrees. They passed this bill unanimously last year, and why wouldn't they? This bill is common sense. It saves us money because it would actually cost more to remove the lookout than to keep it where it is.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that, if this bill had been brought up on its own, by its own merits, it would have passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. Unfortunately, that is not what is happening here today. Instead, this bill has gotten wrapped up in a series of very controversial and divisive bills. The Green Mountain Lookout represents a significant piece of the Pacific Northwest's history, and it deserves to be protected for outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy for years to come. It does not deserve to be wrapped up in a package of bills that we all know will be dead on arrival in the Senate. The administration has also voiced its support for keeping the Green Mountain Lookout where it is while strongly opposing the rest of this bill.

Green Mountain deserves a vote on its own, and I am extremely disappointed that my amendment to separate my bill from the rest of this package was denied a chance to be considered today. The way this piece of legislation was handled is emblematic of the dysfunction that is so prevalent and so unnecessary in Congress today. The people of Washington State expect Congress to make progress, and they expect compromise, not partisan exercises that won't make it to the President's desk or achieve a meaningful result. I am deeply disappointed that that is where this bill is today, and I know that many of my constituents are as well.

It is my hope that I will be able to work with my colleagues from across the aisle to consider the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act before it is too late. The need for immediate action is great because, if the lookout is moved once, there is no moving it back.

It is simple. Taking care of our environment is critical to protecting the quality of life we cherish. I cannot in good conscience support this overall bill due to the many other harmful measures that are included in this package.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), who is an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of title VIII of H.R. 2954, which I originally introduced as H.R. 657, the Grazing Improvement Act. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for recognizing the importance of this issue and for including it in H.R. 2954 for consideration today.

Livestock grazing is an important part of the rich ranching tradition in Idaho and the United States. My home State of Idaho produces some of the world's finest lamb and beef. Food production is a major part of Idaho's history, and it is an integral part of our cultural fabric and our economic security. These traditions are under attack, and we must preserve them for future generations.

The financial security of ranchers depends upon their responsible stewardship of the land. Unfortunately, the Federal process to review the permits which allows them to produce food has become severely backlogged due to lawsuits aimed at eliminating livestock from public lands. The local Federal land-managing offices cannot keep up with the pace of litigation and the endless environmental analysis. This diverts the already limited resources from these offices and leaves ranchers at risk of losing their grazing permits and jeopardizing their livelihoods.

Agriculture is a challenging way to make a living, but producers choose this path because it is their passion, and it is their way of life. Several ranchers in my State of Idaho have said, if they were to lose their grazing permits, they would have to subdivide their land and further reduce their grazing areas. My bill, the Grazing Improvement Act, would provide relief to these ranchers and to ranchers throughout the country.

It would, number one, extend livestock grazing permits from 10 to 20 years in order to give producers adequate longevity and production stability. It would codify existing appropriation language to put into statute annual riders. It would also encourage the respective Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to utilize categorical exclusions to expedite permit processing.

I believe that protecting our environment can be done in a manner that does not impede our economic growth. It is time that we improve our regulatory structure so that we continue to prosper as a Nation. We can no longer allow the Federal Government to maintain an enormous backlog in processing grazing permits.

I thank the cosponsors of this legislation, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2954 is another attempt to weaken landmark environmental protections, to dictate land management decisions, to convey and dispose of Federal land, and to rewrite grazing policy.

This Chamber, once again, will spend a day debating bad policy put forth by the majority, which seems to work tirelessly to undermine the progress of the last century Americans have made in land conservation and environmental protection, undeterred by reality or a desire by the American people for bipartisan legislation and compromise. Furthermore, Republicans have long criticized omnibus bills as an affront to regular order, but they now attempt to force this bill of bad policy proposals through the House, which has no chance of passing in the Senate.

Let me quote a statement from the White House, which strongly opposes the bill. It reads:

> Overall, H.R. 2954 contains a number of provisions that would undermine the responsible balance of interests and considerations and stewardship of the Nation's lands and natural resources . . . Provisions of the bill would disregard or reduce public engagement on a range of community interests, including natural resource protections, and would preclude agencies from considering less detrimental environmental alternatives . . . Provisions of the bill would waive all Federal laws and consultation requirements that would now initiate a timber sale without those, that would eliminate the balanced limitation on off-road vehicle use within the Cape Hatteras recreation area and that would waive environmental review requirements for grazing activities on Federal lands.

The White House said it could support provisions that would restore the Green Mountain Lookout in Washington State and that would modify conservation programs at the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Overall, this legislation is going nowhere. It has no chance of ever becoming law, but here we are. Furthermore, even though we could be working together on a variety of public land issues that need to be addressed, like the reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we are, instead, debating a package of bills that fails to address significant issues that have bipartisan solutions. In fact, we can work together on some of the individual titles in this bill as standalones. We are not legislating. We are wasting valuable time. It is clear why the American people have such a negative view of Congress. Let me review quickly the substance of the package.

□ 0945

Title I would extinguish the reversionary clause covering property on Santa Rosa Island in Florida. The reversionary clause requires that the property in question is used for public purposes, since Federal land is for the American public in its entirety.

What is the reason for rescinding the clause? So that the county of Escambia can dredge and build a harbor that would cut off access to the rest of the island, most of which is managed as part of the Gulf islands National Seashore, a unit of the National Park Service.

Titles II and III are much of the same, Federal land grabs to be used for

windfall profits at the expense of the American people. Title III goes further by waiving a number of laws, including the Endangered Species Act; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; the National Historic Preservation Act; and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Title IV would prevent the BLM from carrying out its mission to manage public lands for multiple use until the agency creates a public database of all lands identified for disposal. BLM would be barred from all land acquisitions until such database is created.

BLM currently uses a public process developed and implemented locally through Resource Management Plans, and approved by Congress, to identify parcels for acquisition or disposal. This measure would just add another extreme layer of bureaucracy.

Title V would threaten endangered nesting shorebirds and sea turtles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore recreational area. In 2007, the National Park Service placed modest limits on the use of off-highway vehicles on the beaches in order to limit the impacts on these species. The National Park Service was sued, and a judge determined the limits were inadequate protection for the endangered species.

In arbitration, the parties, including all stakeholders, agreed on a new plan that provided adequate protection for endangered species while allowing managed off-highway vehicle access. This measure would require the seashore be managed under the first rule rather than the agreed upon settlement.

Title VIII would change grazing tenure from 10 to 20 years and provide environmental waivers for grazing permit renewals, reissuance, or transfers. If we are going to reform grazing permit tenure, we should also talk about those ranchers who would like to get out of the business and retire their permits.

Also, we should address the low cost of grazing on Federal lands. Grazing fees have not changed since 1996 and are significantly lower than in the past, while State and private landowners generally seek market value for grazing. This measure is completely unbalanced and fails to address significant grazing issues.

Title IX, like many other natural resource measures proposed by the Republicans, waives NEPA, judicial review, and administrative review, completely disregarding the input of critical stakeholders such as the general public.

In conclusion, this so-called lands package should be called the ''Federal Lands Giveaway, Destruction of Protected Species, and Lack of Accountability Act.'' This package undermines the management of our public lands, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering this morning includes a provision that would repeal excessive restrictions on public access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Even though the seashore is paid for by tax dollars, current regulations have restricted access to the recreational area that is owned by the taxpayer. The elected officials of Dare County have verified that the regulations have damaged the economy in the area, which relies heavily on tourism. The last thing that we need in eastern North Carolina—and across the country—is governmental regulations stifling job creation and economic growth.

This bill would overturn the current rule, while restricting access to the seashore, and reinstitute the National Park Service's 2007 Interim Management Strategy to govern visitor access and species protection at Cape Hatteras. The Interim Management Strategy was backed by a 113-page Biological Opinion issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which found that it would not jeopardize piping plover, sea turtles, or other species of concerns.

Please support this legislation. Let's protect the species that need to be protected, but let's also protect the rights of the taxpayer. This bill finds the balance between the two.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chair, I do want to say that this is a simple solution to a very important property rights issue in northwest Florida.

Pursuant to a 1947 Federal deed, Escambia County, Florida, was given authority to transfer property on Santa Rosa Island but could not issue title to that land. Instead, the county began leasing the property to individuals who would pay a lease fee instead of being charged a property tax.

In the years since 1947, Pensacola Beach and Navarre Beach have grown into bustling communities and fine tourist destinations.

Additionally, numerous pending cases in the judicial system seek to allow local authorities to levy taxes now on those properties that currently are being leased. As a result of these developments, local stakeholders, including the boards of commissioners of both Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties, asked me to introduce this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a fairness issue. It will allow leaseholders the option of attaining fee simple title to their property while also protecting current agreements governing conservation, public access, and recreation. Additionally, the bill would help ease management of the island by allowing conveyance of certain land currently owned by Escambia County to Santa Rosa County.

It is important to note that the bill does not address the issue of property taxes on those properties. It simply seeks to permit leaseholders the option to attain title to their property so that leaseholders and local governments can jointly address any local tax issues that may arise in the future.

Contrary to a statement released by the White House yesterday, this bill does not remove any protections from Santa Rosa Island. Rather, it restates those protections that are currently in place with Santa Rosa County and Escambia County that are critical to this barrier island.

I also want to take note that this bill in no way affects the right to public beach access, nor does it change the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, nor does it impact the mission of the National Park Service. And contrary to what the ranking member said, Escambia County has absolutely no intention of dredging a bay. This is not going to happen.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Escambia County is protected on both sides of the land that they have currently now under lease by the National Park Service, the Gulf Islands National Seashore, so I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

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

It should be noted for the record that the National Park Service provided a series of recommendations to make this portion of the legislation workable, and those were not considered during the process.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. If the National Park Service said Escambia County was doing this because they had an intent of doing some type of dredging project, they are absolutely incorrect.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Reclaiming my time, this land was to be used for public purposes. This is public land, not land to give away and, as stated before, over and over again, be dredged and used for a harbor for potential windfall profit. Not only that, this action completely disregards the conservation goals of the adjacent national seashore by hindering access. On one hand, we talk about limited access to public lands; on the other, we hinder access to those places we see fit.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), subcommittee chairman and also an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by talking about some things that have been overstated on parts, especially the one that is my title.

My title does not stop the BLM or anybody in the Interior Department from doing multiple use on land. It has nothing to do with management. It simply says they can buy no new land until they first become transparent and provide a database that anyone can easily accomplish.

As with some of the other statements that have been made on the floor, some of them are somewhat exaggerated from what this bill intends to do.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk about this bill as an entity. There is a common thread that runs through this bill that deals with public lands and people from Florida to Alaska and all stations in between. What we simply have found is the Federal Government has large, centralized bureaucracies that do our land management process that no longer meet the needs of people, but, rather, they hide behind rules and policies and regulations which make them safe for them. But they don't actually help people, which requires sometimes people to be flexible and think outside the proverbial box.

The island in Florida that Mr. MILLER was just referring to was given by Florida to the government, and the government gave it back to Florida before I was born—and that has been a while. But the concept here is that the government does not own this land. They don't need it, they don't use it, but they still wish to control it—it doesn't matter why; they still do—and there is no purpose for that.

It is ludicrous that the Congressman from Alaska must come down here and write a law to transfer 3 acres of land in Anchorage back to the city of Anchorage so it can be used to benefit the people of Anchorage. Again, land the Federal Government does not own, they don't need, they don't use, but they still wish in some way to control it.

The grazers in Idaho who produce the stuff from which Big Macs and Whoppers are made—and I know that from personal experience, obviously—only wanted to be treated fairly and consistently and with consideration for the needs so they can be successful in their trade.

Kayakers in Wyoming simply want the ability to recreate on an area that was designed for recreation without being specifically prohibited by rules and regulations that were to insist and support a policy that we have found no longer is necessary and does not work.

If these 10 bills were to pass, unfortunately it doesn't solve all our problems. Because all these 10 bills do is show a tip of the proverbial iceberg of the problems that we face in dealing with land management when it comes from a large, centralized bureaucracy and we no longer put our primary interest in helping people meet their needs.

Mr. Chairman, when the Berlin Wall fell down, the entire world realized that large, centralized bureaucracies of the communist world failed.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Eastern Europe learned that, entrepreneurs learned that. They found that lean, aggressive companies simply take market share from the lumbering corporate products of the past.

Everyone realized that a large, centralized bureaucratic program is ineffective, except here in Washington, D.C., where we still address every problem with an effort to try and build something that is going to be controlled here in the center of all wisdom that is large, that is centralized, and that is bureaucratic. It is mind-boggling that the Nation who defeated the Soviet Union with creativity and freedom still decides to solve all problems and all management issues by going back to a Soviet-styled agency program and concept.

This bill is needed because it affects people throughout the length and breadth of this country, and it is only the beginning of what we need to do to set it right and make sure that our highest priority is people, not rules and regulations.

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

We have heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle make fun of the fact that the United States Congress has to be involved in such unimportant matters as the conveyance of Federal land, this great Nation defeated that the Soviet Union, and we allude to the fact that we have a Soviet-style centralized government with regard to land management in this country. I think that my colleagues need to take that up with the Framers of the Constitution.

Article IV of that document states:

> The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

So I am sorry if the majority finds this burdensome, but the Framers apparently felt that Federal property was valuable and that Congress should play a role in determining what to do with it.

□ 1000

Let's be clear: we are talking here about Federal property, that is, property owned by all Americans. The land in question in Escambia County, Florida; Anchorage, Alaska; Fernley, Nevada; Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; Yellowstone and Grand Teton and the land on which Federal grazing occurs, the land impacted by this package is Federal land, owned by each and every American taxpayer.

In the case of these land transfers, the Federal Government gave the land, gave it to a local community as a means of Federal support, and the only requirement, in most cases, was that the land always be used for public purposes. As long as it is a park or a school or a fire station, it is yours, for free.

What these bills do is end those public purpose requirements. The communities want to use these lands for private profit. They want to close them to the public, in many cases.

This is not a land grab by Uncle Sam. This is not some silly scheme by the Feds to harm local communities and to use their power to hold down the taxpayers and keep the public out. This is a community asking to make money off land that was owned by all Americans, and it is the job of Congress to decide if that is a good idea or not.

Let's put one other misleading claim to rest. While Republicans claim the Federal Government owns too much land, the historic trend has been one of divestiture and fragmentation.

As recently as the late 1860s, the Federal Government owned 1.8 billion of the 2.3 billion acres in the contiguous United States. Grants to States, homesteaders, land-grant colleges, railroads and others settling in the Alaska and the West have reduced Federal land ownership by roughly 640 million acres to date.

We have been giving land away for centuries, not buying it up. Today we have a whole series of bills seeking more Federal land, and we owe it to the American people—the American people require that we consider this carefully, and the Constitution requires that Congress be empowered to consider these carefully.

These mischaracterizations are not helpful in the discussions. These bills are not in the best interest of the American people, on the merits alone, and using misinformation to claim otherwise is wrong.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time is on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will advise my friend that, at this point, I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I want to respect the chairman. The chairman is correct. The Natural Resources Committee, of which I am a proud member, appears to be very busy passing bills.

But let's be clear: the Republican majority, time and time again, acts unilaterally, alone, without meaningful cooperation with the minority in this legislation, in the House, and with the Senate and with the administration.

On suspensions, the majority insists on ridiculous limitations that prevent consideration of many measures designed to conserve lands, and, of course, they insist on a more than 3:1 ratio of their legislation to the minority's legislation, to ours. No wonder the number of suspensions is lagging behind what we have done in the past.

As to the bills we have considered under a rule, most of them are almost identical repeats of the bills that were passed in the House last Congress, but because they were opposed by the Senate and the administration, they went nowhere.

To keep passing the same, dead-on-arrival bills over and over again to make the committee look busy should not be mistaken for legislating. The idea is to work on legislation that can bring bills of a bipartisan nature, that the Senate will deal with and, more importantly, that the administration will sign.

That is the legislation my side of the aisle looks forward to working on and, in a very serious manner, improving the operation of Interior, improving the operation of our public lands, and creating transparency at all levels.

We want to do that, and we look forward to working with the majority and with our esteemed chairman in that direction.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased when I heard my good friend from Arizona congratulate the work of the committee until I heard his explanation of what the committee did, and then I had to have a bit of a caution there.

I just want to point out that when the gentleman complains about the ratio of majority and minority, we are following precisely the same example when roles were reversed. In other words, when the Democrats were in the majority, when we were in the minority, we had the same ratio. So we are following that pretty much to the same, and that has been the tradition in this House for a long period of time.

The difference, however, I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that the committee has been much more productive when we have been in control, meaning that there has been more legislation moving that the Democrats would like.

I want to make this point also. There are Democrat and Republican suspension bills that are both sitting in the Senate that haven't been acted on, and I think that the Senate needs to act on those pieces of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important piece of legislation. All of these titles have passed out of the committee and were amalgamated here, but they had all been acted on. They all had input in subcommittee in some way or the other within the committee.

So I wanted to make that point. This is not legislation that was pulled out of the air. It was legislation that was deliberated upon within the committee.

I also want to mention, even though the Statement of Administration Policy was negative in some parts of the bill, there is no veto threat by the administration on this piece of legislation. They expressed concerns, as is understandable, on certain parts of it. I understand that, but there is no veto threat at all whatsoever in what the administration has said.

Finally, let me make this observation, and we hear this over and over and over, especially as it relates to the NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act.

Now, I am going to acknowledge that NEPA certainly has its place within our statutes and how we conduct policy, particularly on public land, but here is where we part company, Mr. Chairman.

We part company because my friends on the other side of the aisle always advocate that, even before Congress acts, NEPA should be the judge of whatever that action is.

Now, I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I think that is contrary to what our role is here. Congress created NEPA, meaning that Congress is the one who decides what the law of the land is. Within these bills, we are deciding what the law of the land is, and NEPA should not get in front of our actions.

To hear my friends on the other side of the aisle argue, they are saying over and over and over again that NEPA should be between Congress acting on a law.

Wait a minute. We are putting regulations before Congress should be doing their constitutional duty and enacting statutes?

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; I part company with that philosophy, yet that is exactly what we hear over and over and over from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We are the ones that are given authority by the Constitution to make statutes. We believe that that should be the law, and then regulations follow, not the other way around. But that is what we hear over and over and over again.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. As I mentioned, it addresses areas that are certain parochial and certain parts of the country, as my colleague from Utah said, all the way from Florida to Alaska.

I think it is responsible legislation, and I think it deserves our support.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–35. 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. 2954

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 ''Public Access and Lands Improvement Act''.

TITLE I—SANTA ROSA ISLAND TITLE FAIRNESS AND LAND PRESERVATION ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Santa Rosa Island Title Fairness and Land Preservation Act''.

SEC. 102. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.

(a) CONVEYANCE FREE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Notwithstanding the restrictions on conveyance of property located on Santa Rosa Island, Florida, contained in the Act of July 30, 1946 (chapter 699; 70 Stat. 712), and the deed to the property from the United States to Escambia County, Florida, dated January 15, 1947, Escambia County may, at its discretion, convey or otherwise dispose of all of its right, title, and interest (in whole or in part), in and to any portion of the property that was conveyed to it pursuant to that Act and deed, to any person or entity, free from any restriction on conveyance or reconveyance imposed by the United States in that Act or deed. Any conveyance under this subsection shall be subject to the conditions set forth in subsection (c).

(b) LEASEHOLD INTERESTS.—No person or entity holding a leasehold interest in the property as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be required to involuntarily accept a fee interest in lieu of their leasehold interest in the property.

(c) CONDITIONS.—Any conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than two calendar years after the date of the enactment of this Act, Escambia County shall convey to Santa Rosa County all right, title, and interest held in and to any portion of the property that was conveyed to Escambia County under the Act and deed that fall in the jurisdictional boundaries of Santa Rosa County, Florida. The conveyance by Escambia County to Santa Rosa County shall be absolute and shall terminate any subjugation of Santa Rosa County to Escambia County or any regulation of Santa Rosa County by Escambia County. Santa Rosa County shall not be required to pay any sum for the subject property other than actual costs associated with the conveyance.

(2) Santa Rosa County or any other person to which property is conveyed under this title may reconvey property, or any portion of property, conveyed to it under this section.

(3) For all properties defined under subsection (a) the leaseholders, or owners are free to pursue incorporation, annexation, or any other governmental status so long as all other legal conditions required for doing so are followed.

(4) Each property defined under subsection (a) is under the jurisdiction of the county and any other local government entity in which the property is located.

(5) Any proceeds from the conveyance of any property defined under subsection (a) by Escambia County or Santa Rosa County, other than direct and incidental costs associated with such conveyance, shall be considered windfall profits and shall revert to the United States.

(6) Escambia County and Santa Rosa County shall in perpetuity preserve those areas on Santa Rosa Island currently dedicated to conservation, preservation, public, recreation, access and public parking in accordance with resolutions heretofore adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of each respective county.

(d) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—Escambia County and Santa Rosa County shall have no deadline or requirement to make any conveyance or reconveyance of any property defined under subsection (a) other than the conveyance required under subsection (c)(1). Each county may establish terms for conveyance or reconveyance, subject to the conditions set forth in this title and applicable State law.

TITLE II—ANCHORAGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Anchorage Land Conveyance Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Anchorage, Alaska.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means certain parcels of land located in the City and owned by the City, which are more particularly described as follows:

(A) Block 42, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 1.93 acres, commonly known as the Egan Center, Petrovich Park, and Old City Hall.

(B) Lots 9, 10, and 11, Block 66, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.48 acres, commonly known as the parking lot at 7th Avenue and I Street.

(C) Lot 13, Block 15, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.24 acres, an unimproved vacant lot located at H Street and Christensen Drive.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 203. CONVEYANCE OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to the non-Federal land for the purpose of unencumbering the title to the non-Federal land to enable economic development of the non-Federal land.

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact legal descriptions of the non-Federal land shall be determined in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions to the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) COSTS.—The City shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a), including the costs of any surveys, recording costs, and other reasonable costs.

TITLE III—FERNLEY ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the City of Fernley, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 9,407 acres of land located in the City of Fernley, Nevada, that is identified by the Secretary and the City for conveyance under this title.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Fernley, Nevada, Land Sales'' and dated January 25, 2013.

SEC. 302. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF FERNLEY, NEVADA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to valid existing rights and not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives an offer from the City to purchase the Federal land depicted on the map, the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, shall convey, notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), to the City in exchange for consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such Federal land.

(b) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(1) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The City and the Bureau of Reclamation may retain easements or rights-of-way on the Federal land to be conveyed, including easements or rights-of-way the Bureau of Reclamation determines are necessary to carry out—

(1) the operation and maintenance of the Truckee Canal; or

(2) the Newlands Project.

(e) COSTS.—The City shall, at closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (a), pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(f) CONVEYANCE NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—A conveyance or a combination of conveyances made under this section shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

SEC. 303. RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 302, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

SEC. 304. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land to be conveyed under section 302 of this title shall be withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

TITLE IV—LAND DISPOSAL TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY ACT

SEC. 401. PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Land Disposal Transparency and Efficiency Act''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.—No land or interests in land may be added by acquisition, donation, transfer of administrative jurisdiction, or otherwise to the inventory of land and interests in land administered by the Bureau of Land Management until a centralized database of all lands identified as suitable for disposal by Resource Management Plans for lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau is easily accessible to the public on a website of the Bureau. The database required under this subsection shall be updated and maintained to reflect changes in the status of lands identified for disposal under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate a report detailing the status and timing for completion of the database required by subsection (b).

TITLE V—PRESERVING ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Preserving Access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Act''.

SEC. 502. REINSTATEMENT OF INTERIM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area shall be managed in accordance with the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy/Environmental Assessment issued by the National Park Service on June 13, 2007, for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, North Carolina, unless the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this title referred to as the ''Secretary'') issues a new final rule that meets the requirements set forth in section 503.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary shall not impose any additional restrictions on pedestrian or motorized vehicular access to any portion of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for species protection beyond those in the Interim Management Strategy, other than as specifically authorized pursuant to section 503 of this title.

SEC. 503. ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA FOR SPECIES PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, based on peer-reviewed science and after public comment, the Secretary determines that additional restrictions on access to a portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are necessary to protect species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Secretary may only restrict, by limitation, closure, buffer, or otherwise, pedestrian and motorized vehicular access for recreational activities for the shortest possible time and on the smallest possible portions of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

(b) LIMITATION ON RESTRICTIONS.—Restrictions imposed under this section for protection of species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall not be greater than the restrictions in effect for that species at any other National Seashore.

(c) CORRIDORS AROUND CLOSURES.—To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary shall designate pedestrian and vehicular corridors of minimal distance on the beach or interdunal

area around closures implemented under this section to allow access to areas not closed.

SEC. 504. INAPPLICABILITY OF FINAL RULE AND CONSENT DEGREE.

(a) FINAL RULE.—The final rule titled ''Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management'' (77 Fed. Reg. 3123–3144) shall have no force or effect after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSENT DECREE.—The April 30, 2008, consent decree filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina regarding off-road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina shall not apply after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act''.

SEC. 602. CLARIFICATION OF LEGAL AUTHORITY OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT.

(a) LEGAL AUTHORITY OF LOOKOUT.—Section 4(b) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–339; 98 Stat. 300; 16 U.S.C. 1131 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', and except that with respect to the lands described in section 3(5), the designation of such lands as a wilderness area shall not preclude the operation and maintenance of Green Mountain Lookout.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984.

SEC. 603. PRESERVATION OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT LOCATION.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may not move Green Mountain Lookout from its current location on Green Mountain in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest unless the Secretary determines that moving Green Mountain Lookout is necessary to preserve the Lookout or to ensure the safety of individuals on or around Green Mountain. If the Secretary makes such a determination, the Secretary shall move the Green Mountain Lookout to a location outside of the lands described in section 3(5) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 and designated as a wilderness area in section 4(b) of such Act.

TITLE VII—RIVER PADDLING PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''River Paddling Protection Act''.

SEC. 702. REGULATIONS SUPERSEDED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The rivers and streams of Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park shall be open to hand-propelled vessels as determined by the director of the National Park Service within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act. Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the following regulations shall have no the force or effect regarding closing rivers and streams of Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park to hand-propelled vessels:

(1) Section 7.13(d)(4)(ii) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding vessels on streams and rivers in Yellowstone National Park.

(2) Section 7.22(e)(3) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding vessels on lakes and rivers in Grand Teton National Park.

(b) COORDINATION OF RECREATIONAL USE.—The Fish and Wildlife Service shall coordinate any recreational use of hand-propelled vessels on the Gros Ventre River within the National Elk Refuge with Grand Teton National Park to ensure such use is consistent with the requirements of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

TITLE VIII—GRAZING IMPROVEMENT ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Grazing Improvement Act''.

SEC. 802. TERMS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1752) is amended—

(1) by striking ''ten years'' each place it appears and inserting ''20 years'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of each of paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the initial environmental analysis under National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) regarding a grazing allotment, permit, or lease has not been completed.''; and

(3) after subsection (h), insert the following new subsection:

''(i) Only applicants, permittees and lessees whose interest in grazing livestock is directly affected by a final grazing decision may appeal the decision to an administrative law judge.''.

SEC. 803. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title IV of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 405. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CURRENT GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—The term 'current grazing management' means grazing in accordance with the terms and conditions of an existing permit or lease and includes any modifications that are consistent with an applicable Department of Interior resource management plan or Department of Agriculture land use plan.

''(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term 'Secretary concerned' means—

''(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

''(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

''(b) RENEWAL, TRANSFER, REISSUANCE, AND PENDING PROCESSING.—A grazing permit or lease issued by the Secretary of the Interior, or a grazing permit issued by the Secretary of Agriculture regarding National Forest System land, that expires, is transferred, or is waived shall be renewed or reissued under, as appropriate—

''(1) section 402;

''(2) section 19 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (commonly known as the 'Granger-Thye Act'; 16 U.S.C. 580l);

''(3) title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.); or

''(4) section 510 the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 410aaa–50).

''(c) TERMS; CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions (except the termination date) contained in an expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease described in subsection (b) shall continue in effect under a renewed or reissued permit or lease until the date on which the Secretary concerned completes the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, in compliance with each applicable law.

''(d) CANCELLATION; SUSPENSION; MODIFICATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), a permit or lease described in subsection (b) may be cancelled, suspended, or modified in accordance with applicable law.

''(e) RENEWAL TRANSFER REISSUANCE AFTER PROCESSING.—When the Secretary concerned has completed the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, the Secretary concerned shall renew or reissue the permit or lease for a term of 20 years after completion of processing.

''(f) COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—The renewal, reissuance, or transfer of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned shall be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement if—

''(1) the decision continues to renew, reissue, or transfer the current grazing management of the allotment;

''(2) monitoring of the allotment has indicated that the current grazing management has met, or has satisfactorily progressed towards meeting, objectives contained in the land use and resource management plan of the allotment, as determined by the Secretary concerned; or

''(3) the decision is consistent with the policy of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, as appropriate, regarding extraordinary circumstances.

''(g) PRIORITY AND TIMING FOR COMPLETING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES.—The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental analysis regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of the allotment, permit, or lease and available funding for that purpose.

''(h) NEPA EXEMPTIONS.—The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to the following:

''(1) Crossing and trailing authorizations of domestic livestock.

''(2) Transfer of grazing preference.

''(3) Range improvements as defined under 43 U.S.C. 315c and 16 U.S.C. 580h.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 is amended by adding after the item for section 404, the following:

''Sec. 405. Renewal, transfer, and reissuance of grazing permits and leases.''.

TITLE IX—RIM FIRE EMERGENCY SALVAGE ACT

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act''.

SEC. 902. EXPEDITED SALVAGE TIMBER SALES IN RESPONSE TO THE CALIFORNIA RIM FIRE.

(a) SALVAGE TIMBER SALES REQUIRED.—As part of the restoration and rehabilitation activities undertaken on the lands within the Stanislaus National Forest and the Bureau of Land Management lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California, the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to affected Stanislaus National Forest lands, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to affected Bureau of Land Management lands, shall promptly plan and implement salvage timber sales of dead, damaged, or downed timber resulting from that wildfire.

(b) EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.—Due to the extraordinary severity of the Rim Fire occurring on the Federal lands described in subsection (a), salvage timber sales conducted under such subsection shall proceed immediately and to completion notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (a) shall not be subject to—

(A) administrative review, including, in the case of the Forest Service, the notice, comment,

and appeal requirements of section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note); or

(B) judicial review in any court of the United States.

TITLE X—CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014''.

SEC. 1002. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) CROSSCUT BUDGET.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year; and

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C);

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by all Federal agencies for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds which were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including the—

(A) project description;

(B) current status of the project;

(C) Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, programs, or responsible agencies;

(D) authorization level for appropriations;

(E) project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) adaptive management actions or framework;

(I) coordinating entities;

(J) funding history;

(K) cost sharing; and

(L) alignment with existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement and Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities.

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—The Director shall only describe restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a) that—

(1) for Federal restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(2) for State restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $50,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the submission by the President of the President's annual budget to Congress.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the financial report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act for which the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 1003. RESTORATION THROUGH ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal and State agencies, and with the participation of stakeholders, shall develop a plan to provide technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States to employ adaptive management in carrying out restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(b) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—The plan referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) specific and measurable objectives to improve water quality, habitat, and fisheries identified by Chesapeake Bay States;

(2) a process for stakeholder participation;

(3) monitoring, modeling, experimentation, and other research and evaluation technical assistance requested by Chesapeake Bay States;

(4) identification of State restoration activities planned by Chesapeake Bay States to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(5) identification of Federal restoration activities that could help a Chesapeake Bay State to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(6) recommendations for a process for modification of State and Federal restoration activities that have not attained or will not attain the specific and measurable objectives set forth under paragraph (1); and

(7) recommendations for a process for integrating and prioritizing State and Federal restoration activities and programs to which adaptive management can be applied.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In addition to carrying out Federal restoration activities under existing authorities and funding, the Administrator shall implement the plan developed under subsection (a) by providing technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States using resources available for such purposes that are identified by the Director under section 1002.

(d) UPDATES.—The Administrator shall update the plan developed under subsection (a) every 2 years.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the plan required under this section for such fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information about the application of adaptive management to restoration activities and programs, including level changes implemented through the process of adaptive management.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INCLUSION OF PLAN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Annual Action Plan and Annual Progress Report required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 includes the adaptive management plan outlined in subsection (a).

SEC. 1004. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in restoration activities, including on such related topics as are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may submit to the Administrator 4 nominees for appointment to any vacancy in the office of the Independent Evaluator.

(c) REPORTS.—The Independent Evaluator shall submit a report to the Congress every 2 years in the findings and recommendations of reviews under this section.

(d) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''Chesapeake Executive Council'' has the meaning given that term by section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 15 U.S.C. 1511d).

SEC. 1005. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.—The term ''adaptive management'' means a type of natural resource management in which project and program decisions are made as part of an ongoing science-based process. Adaptive management involves testing, monitoring, and evaluating applied strategies and incorporating new knowledge into programs and restoration activities that are based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify management policy, strategies, practices, programs, and restoration activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay State'' or ''State'' means the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay watershed'' means the Chesapeake Bay and the geographic area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, consisting of 36 tributary basins, within the Chesapeake Bay States, through which precipitation drains into the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term ''chief executive'' means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of each such State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''State restoration activities'' means any State programs or projects carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.

(B) Planning.

(C) Feasibility studies.

(D) Scientific research.

(E) Monitoring.

(F) Education.

(G) Infrastructure development.

(8) FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''Federal restoration activities'' means any Federal programs or projects carried out under existing Federal authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.
(B) Planning.
(C) Feasibility studies.
(D) Scientific research.
(E) Monitoring.
(F) Education.
(G) Infrastructure development.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–340. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It strikes title IV of the bill. Title IV is the text of H.R. 2095, introduced by my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), chairman of the Public Land Subcommittee.

The title would prohibit BLM from acquiring additional land until the agency creates a publicly accessible database that inventories current landholdings and identifies land suitable for disposal.

Much of the bill we are considering today seeks to undermine the public planning process and give away Federal land free of charge. This land belongs to the American people, and if we are going to be in the business of giving it away, we should at least not hinder our ability to acquire more land when it makes sense to do so.

Let me see if I understand this. I do not oppose the idea of creating a database that catalogs Federal landholdings. I do not oppose the idea of transparency at BLM, or any other government agency for that matter, but putting an arbitrary condition on land acquisition authority is just bad policy.

The true intent of the title is not to create a database. The intent is to limit land acquisition.

The majority has been clear about their agenda to limit expansion of the Federal estate, and the bill we are considering today is just another attempt to advance that priority. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Through the public land use planning process, BLM keeps an inventory of its land. Land managers, from the folks down the street in the Department of the Interior building to the field staff all over the country, know how much land the Federal Government owns.

In fact, the Federal Land and Policy Management Act, also known as the BLM's Organic Act, provides clear direction and authority for cataloging and the inventory of Federal lands. FLPMA also provides the agency with authority to dispose of lands deemed worthy for disposal through the public planning process.

Like I mentioned before, I don't see a problem with creating a database of information available in BLM's Resource Management Plans. The problem is with limiting authority for land acquisition.

Land acquisition authority makes the management of Federal lands more efficient. It is not the bogeyman that the sponsors of the bill claim. Federal land managers acquire land in order to clean up the checkerboard pattern of ownership, consolidating Federal holdings and making them easier to manage.

Limiting this authority will have the consequence of making the management of Federal lands more difficult and less efficient.

Land is also acquired when it makes sense for conservation and resource management purposes. The Federal Government is the steward of some of our Nation's most pristine and treasured resources. There are times when it makes sense to add to national parks or national monuments to make sure that they have the resources and the protection that they merit.

Popular programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund have helped conserve millions of acres that provide all of our constituents with opportunities to hike, hunt, fish, and pursue other recreational activities.

If we want to ensure that efficient management of Federal land, limiting land acquisition authority is a step in the wrong direction. My amendment makes sure that this important tool is not jeopardized, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

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

□ 1015

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Arizona. I do enjoy working with him on the subcommittee. And I have to admit, at this stage of the game, I am a little bit perplexed about the amendment.

The gentleman purports that the idea of transparency and keeping a database is not a bad idea. He just objects to the enforcement mechanism we put in there. If that were the case, I would wonder why he didn't just strike the enforcement mechanism out or come up with a substitute enforcement mechanism. I am not bound to this particular one. Had there been a date certain or some other ideas, I may even have accepted that as a friendly approach to try to help this particular title. But, instead, the amendment strikes everything. It strikes the very essence of forcing them to actually come up with a database that is there.

During the Clinton administration—and that has been a while ago—the Interior Department did come up with a database of lands that were available for disposal, that were needless, that were useless for the government. We have the data. The only problem is it is almost impossible to get to the data. The data is found in books in over 150 different local offices. It would take a huge road trip to try to come up with just the information.

This is now 2014. The idea that the BLM cannot actually put this data on a Web site that is available to everybody is, quite frankly, not acceptable. That they are too busy to do this is simply not acceptable.

All this says is the data is there. Put the data on a Web site so it is transparent and it is viewable for everybody to see.

And then we said, since there has been a whole lot of dragging their feet since the Clinton administration in trying to do this, we will give you some incentive. You can't buy new land until you put on this Web site so people can see what land is available for disposal. It does not stop them from managing the land for multiple use or for nonmultiple use or any other reason. It simply gives them an incentive to go ahead and do it.

Like I said, if your goal was to change the incentive, I would have been amenable to discussions on that. I will still be amenable to discussions on that. But this amendment strikes the entire thing, not just the enforcement provision. For that reason, I would oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in my amendment, we are also talking about the Federal Government having the authority to buy land from willing sellers. And when you bar the Federal Government from trying to buy land, then what happens? The seller still wants to sell. So who steps up? Developers, other high-intensity uses around areas that should be protected.

When you look at Uncle Sam as a buyer for political purposes, you empower developers and others that want the land for completely different uses; and before you know it, an area that you wanted to conserve and preserve is gone. This is bad policy. And to remove the authority from the Federal Government of being able to purchase land from willing sellers I think is a step too far.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) to show how this amendment would impact the Chesapeake Bay area.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to speak in support of H.R. 2954, the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act.

I wish to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Washington, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, for his leadership in bringing this important package of bills from the Natural Resources Committee to the House floor.

Today, I want to highlight how this legislation will aid in the cleanup of one of our prized historic resources, the Chesapeake Bay. This body of water provides habitat for plants and animals, resources that drive local economies, recreation, and a way of life for many that live on and around its shores.

I am the proud author of title X of this bill, the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act. These provisions would implement and strengthen management techniques like crosscut budgeting and adaptive management to ensure we get more bang for our buck and continue to make progress in Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts.

These techniques will ensure that we are coordinating how restoration dollars are spent and making sure that everyone understands how individual projects fit into the bigger picture. That way, we are not duplicating efforts, spending money we don't need to, or worse, working at cross-purposes.

During the 112th Congress, the House passed similar legislation as part of H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act. More recently, identical language was adopted by voice vote and included in the House version of the farm bill. These provisions would implement and strengthen management techniques to ensure, again, we get more bang for our buck and progress in the Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts continue and are measurable. Crosscut budgeting and adaptive management and an independent evaluator should be key components for the complex restoration efforts for our Chesapeake Bay.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me and support H.R. 2954.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike lines 3 through 12.

Page 17, line 13, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(2)''.

Page 17, line 14, strike ''subsection'' and insert ''subsections''.

Page 17, line 17, after ''decision'' insert ''concerning renewal, transfer or reissuance of a grazing permit or lease''.

Page 17, line 18, before the first period insert ''or appeal officer as applicable''.

Page 18, strike lines 7 through 10 and insert ''existing permit or lease.''.

Page 20, line 15, after ''the'' insert ''applicable''.

Page 20, line 15, strike ''and'' and insert ''or''.

Page 20, strike line 22 through page 21, line 4, and insert the following:

''(g) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

''(1) The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing required environmental reviews regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of the allotment, permit, or lease and available funding for that purpose.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall seek to conduct environmental reviews on an allotment or multiple allotment basis, to the extent practicable, for purposes of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

Page 21, line 12, after the first period, insert the following

''(i) TEMPORARY TRAILING AND CROSSING.—

''(1) Any application for temporary trailing or crossing that has been submitted in a timely manner or not less than 30 days prior to the anticipated trailing or crossing shall be granted, modified or denied not less than fifteen days prior to the date of requested crossing or trailing. The minimum times specified in this subsection shall not preclude the approval of an application in a shorter time where an immediate need exists.

''(2) Temporary trailing or crossing authorizations across lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service system of lands shall not be subject to protest or appeal except by the applicant or an affected permittee or lessee.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

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

I am offering this amendment with Representative LABRADOR after discussions with our local agriculture producers and the Public Lands Council on some needed adjustments to the underlying bill.

This amendment includes some conforming language to the Senate version of the Grazing Improvement Act that was marked up in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee last November. This includes allowing the Secretary to consolidate environmental reviews of allotments in order to reduce the backlog on permit and lease renewals.

The amendment clarifies the definition of current grazing management to the common sense wording of ''the terms and conditions of an existing permit or lease.'' It also clarifies that only those directly affected by the renewal, transfer, or reissuance of a permit or lease may appeal a final grazing decision.

Lastly, this amendment addresses some concerns with how the Federal land agencies treat temporary crossings and trailing. While the underlying bill exempts all crossing and trailing of domestic livestock from the National Environmental Policy Act, this amendment clarifies that temporary applications and those where an immediate need exists will receive a timely response from the agency. It also states that these authorizations are not subject to protest or appeal, except by affected parties.

Our producers' normal business operations require the ability to cross and trail livestock. It is often necessary to remain in compliance with their grazing permits. Temporary trailing has a de minimis impact on the range, and approval should be an administrative action with a quick turnaround time.

Weather, changes in grazing patterns, and even requests by Federal land agencies can all require trailing unexpectedly. For example, a hailstorm could wipe out a stand of grass in an hour. A devastating grasshopper infestation can change the grazing conditions on the ground. Those kinds of things require quick response to get cattle or sheep to a different pasture to keep that grass stand healthy. We need to provide the flexibility for our Federal land agencies to approve temporary requests.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Lummis-Labrador amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This amendment attempts to conform with the Senate language related to the Grazing Improvement Act, but two wrongs don't necessarily make a right. The language is still problematic.

I thank the sponsors for this amendment and for this opportunity to talk a little bit more about public land grazing.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, title VIII attempts to address one issue related to public lands grazing, the backlog of permit renewals, but it fails to take on the larger issue of below-market grazing fees.

The Federal Government charges $1.35 per month per animal unit on Federal lands. If we are going to consider legislation that waives NEPA and extends the tenure of grazing permits, almost doubles the number of years, we also have to review the formula for grazing fees.

The State of Idaho charges $12 to $14 per month to graze on State lands. In

Arizona, we charge $8 to $9 per month. Washington State charges $12 per month; Nevada, $12.50 per month; California, over $16 per month.

We often hear from the majority that the States do a better job of managing their lands. In this case, I would agree. The States do a better job of making sure their taxpayers get a fair return on the use of their State lands, while Federal taxpayers are stuck subsidizing the practice of grazing on public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I support this amendment. I think the brief part of this debate here points out the importance of having flexibility on the local level rather than having a one-size-fits-all; because there are conditions that can come up in grazing in various States, and those managers need that flexibility, which is, I think, a common thread that we talk about all the time when we talk about Federal land management. So I think this amendment adds very much to the Labrador title of the bill, and I intend to support it.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to point out something about the difference between State lands and Federal lands. I ran my State's Office of State Lands and Investments for a time, and the rights that are conveyed by States on lands to use their lands are very different than the rights that are conveyed by the Federal Government to users of Federal lands.

In the case of State lands, frequently, they have many more rights, including, in some States, the right to exclude others. They have the right to make improvements on the ground. They have the right to acquire water permits. They have no NEPA requirements that are specific to the State land and other opportunities to, in fact, even sublease their lands. And those vary from State to State. States that grant more rights can acquire more revenue because it gives more flexibility to the person who is grazing.

In the case of the Federal Government, there are burdensome regulations. There are third-party challenges. There are compliance issues. It is more of a command-and-control structure, so it is just not worth as much financially because of the tremendous paperwork and burden involved. Therefore, there are reasons for those differences.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments we are proposing have nothing to do with that but offer commonsense solutions to the very important grazing issues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LABRADOR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. LABRADOR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, line 18, after the first period, insert the following:

''(j) LEGAL FEES.—

''(1) Any person, other than a directly affected party, challenging an action of the Secretary concerned regarding a final grazing decision in Federal court who is not a prevailing party shall pay to the prevailing parties (including a directly affected party who intervenes in such suit) fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with the challenge unless the Court finds that the position of the person was substantially justified.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term ''directly affected party'' means any applicant, permittee, or lessee (or any organization representing applicants, permittees or lessees) whose interest in grazing livestock is directly affected by the final grazing decision.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment of title VIII of H.R. 2954, which I originally introduced as H.R. 657, the Grazing Improvement Act.

My amendment is a commonsense reform to require groups who are not substantially justified or directly affected by final Federal grazing decisions to pay for the legal expenses of the other party when they lose in court.

□ 1030

In short, this is a ''loser pays'' system to discourage frivolous legal challenges to Federal land management grazing decisions.

Current law gives grazing permittees the right to a hearing in connection with grazing decisions and gives the ''interested public'' the opportunity to participate in the way Federal land is managed. However, it is doubtful that Congress ever intended to elevate the ''interested public'' to a level of equal standing to that of grazing permittees.

In 1995, the Bureau of Land Management established grazing regulations that far surpassed the intent of Congress. Some were given the ability to participate in the administrative appeals process allowing them to sue if the nonpermittees disagreed with a final grazing decision. Since then, environmental groups have been increasingly effective at abusing the current appeals process, not to promote environmental health, but for the sole reason of removing livestock from Federal lands. Each year, hundreds of appeals are filed on grazing decisions by groups. The cost to ranchers can hardly be measured. In a recent case in Wyoming, for example, an appeal cost a small group of ranchers over $125,000 in administrative appeal and attorneys' fees alone.

My amendment simply addresses this growing problem by clarifying the intent of Congress on who may appeal and litigate a final agency decision on a final grazing decision. It is time we ease the burden that environmental groups have placed on our ranchers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LABRADOR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think that the gentleman's amendment to this piece of legislation is an important policy step. In fact, I think in many cases a ''loser pay'' ought to apply to a much larger area.

I know that the gentleman's amendment only deals with grazing, but he cited an example in Wyoming where it cost somebody $125,000, and with the volatility of the market, that is a big expense on individuals. I think this will help curb that in the future.

So I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment, and I intend to support it.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, very simply, seeks to limit, if not eliminate, judicial review on those who have an interest in grazing on our public lands. This amendment attempts to, with incentives—negative incentives to the public—limit the public from challenging Federal action on grazing decisions by making them pay the prevailing party's legal fees.

Like I have mentioned before, all Federal taxpayers are on the hook for subsidizing grazing on Federal lands; therefore, all citizens of this country should have the opportunity to challenge the decisions made that have an effect on their public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I agree that everyone should have a right to sue, but if you lose, I think you should pay. This amendment will allow Federal land managers to get back to managing lands, create greater certainty in the ranching community, and help strengthen rural economies in the West. This minor reform will save taxpayer dollars and countless hours and dollars spent by ranchers who are forced to defend against these nuisance suits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, grazing has impacts on public lands like no other use, and it is important that we

consider these impacts through the NEPA process and through judicial review, both that are being struck from that process today. Steamrolling and eliminating judicial review and the public process, as in a reference to East Germany, centralized government and thought control, once we begin to limit the public's and the individual's access to redress through the courts by action of this Congress, it is a dangerous not only precedent and a dangerous step in public transparency, but more importantly, in the public's right to know.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title IX and insert the following new title:

TITLE IX—RIM FIRE EMERGENCY SALVAGE ACT

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act''.

SEC. 902. EXPEDITED FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALVAGE AND RESTORATION PILOT PROJECTS IN RESPONSE TO THE CALIFORNIA RIM FIRE.

(a) PILOT PROJECTS REQUIRED.—As part of the restoration and rehabilitation activities undertaken on the lands within the Stanislaus National Forest adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a timber salvage and restoration pilot project on burned National Forest System land within the Rim Fire perimeter.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) USE OF EIS PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the pilot project required by subsection (a) in the manner provided in the proposed alternative contained in the draft environmental impact statement noticed in the Federal Register on December 6, 2013, for Rim Fire recovery.

(2) MODIFICATION.—During the course of the pilot project, the Secretary may adopt such modifications to the management plan as the Secretary considers appropriate in response to public comment and consultation with interested Federal, State, and tribal agencies.

(c) LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.—The pilot project required by subsection (a), and activities conducted under the pilot project, are deemed to be in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ACTION.—The pilot project required by subsection (a), and activities conducted under the pilot project, are not subject to—

(1) administrative review;

(2) judicial review by any court of the United States; or

(3) a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction based on environmental impacts in a case for which a final decision has not been issued.

SEC. 903. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING USE OF FUNDS GENERATED FROM SALVAGE SALES CONDUCTED AFTER CATASTROPHIC WILD FIRES ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND OR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LANDS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Bureau of Land Management land, should use existing authorities available to the Secretary to retain revenues (other than revenues required to be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury) generated by salvage sales conducted in response to catastrophic wild fires on such land to cover the cost of restoration projects on such land.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, last August, the Rim Fire destroyed 400 square miles of timber in the Sierra Nevada. It left behind hundreds of millions of board feet of dead timber that can still be salvaged, but, as I pointed out earlier, time is of the essence. Within a year, the fire-killed timber loses much of its value. Yet the current environmental review process takes a year to complete, and then litigation starts and runs out the clock on what remains of that perishable resource.

Sixteen thousand acres of the destroyed timber is on private land owned by Sierra Pacific Industries. It does not face the bureaucratic obstacles that we face on the public land. SPI is already halfway through its salvage. It will be completed by summer. They will use a portion of those proceeds to replant their devastated acreage.

Meanwhile, the timber on the public land continues to rot and decay. The earliest the Forest Service can conclude its environmental review is August, and then the litigation process will start, and then it will be too late. The cost will be hundreds of jobs, millions of dollars of lost economic activity, and millions of dollars of lost salvage revenues that could otherwise have been used by the Federal Government for reforestation of the public lands.

Now, title IX of the bill in its current form was based on bipartisan language introduced by Senator Tom Daschle to expedite salvage in the Black Hills National Forest, but these provisions were opposed from the other side of the aisle. So I sat down with the Forest Service and opposition offices to work out a process that will assure that salvage can begin by spring, while maintaining both environmental and judicial review. And I particularly want to thank Chief Tom Tidwell for his technical assistance and that of his office. This amendment is the product of these talks.

It authorizes the Forest Service to select acreage for salvage where there is no wilderness, ESA, historic, or other legal restrictions. It authorizes them to implement the draft EIS that is expected to be completed by April and deems the draft is compliant with all applicable environmental reviews. This will allow salvage to begin under their direction in April.

It authorizes the Forest Service to modify the draft EIS in response to public comment and allows for judicial review of the final EIS based on ecological impacts. It merely bars litigation based on process, and it bars temporary restraining orders. This will allow the timely salvage of a portion of the public lands destroyed by the fire while the final EIS is prepared and while any judicial review proceeds. Finally, it authorizes the Forest Service to use the millions of dollars raised by the salvage for forest restoration in the devastated Sierra.

This compromise language assures compliance with all environmental laws and maintains judicial review while assuring that salvage can begin this spring. It is also important to the economy of the region that has been devastated by the fire and by increasingly stringent Federal restrictions and land acquisitions that have ravaged the timber, livestock, mineral, and tourist industries upon which these mountain communities depend. It means jobs for hundreds of lumberjacks, mill workers, truckers, and all those who support them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to say that I think this amendment adds to what he is attempting to do because the issue of salvage and the timeliness of that is something that is lost on a lot of people. So I congratulate the gentleman for not only the title in the bill but for the amendment. I intend to support it.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, since the Rim Fire burned over 200,000 acres in California's Sierra Nevada Mountains in August of last year, Mr. MCCLINTOCK has expressed an interest in expediting salvage logging operations in the burned area. The language he has offered to achieve this

goal keeps evolving, and, in my opinion, it keeps getting better. Unfortunately, I still cannot support this amendment, the latest version of H.R. 3188.

Since the fire, the Forest Service has engaged in an extensive planning effort that includes salvage operations where they are deemed appropriate. The planning effort is ongoing, and the amendment seeks to force a decision before it is complete. The amendment references a proposed action that predates the issuance of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The draft EIS is due out in April. Until then, we should allow the public process to end before backing the Forest Service into a corner with a mandated decision. Otherwise, we take away the opportunity for public input and the ability for the Forest Service to examine the economic feasibility of salvage operations, potential damage to wildlife, and other consequences.

CEQ has already approved an expedited process for the EIS that includes a shortened timeline for the comment period and eliminates notification requirements. The Forest Service is committed to this expedited process and working diligently to advance appropriate restoration.

The amendment still mandates salvage logging in areas where it might not be appropriate while waiving Federal environmental standards. Taking NEPA out of the picture will not end up in more logging or less lawsuits. Supporters of this amendment understand that this is the case. That is why the amendment waives a bevy of other environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act.

The forests of Sierra Nevada provide Californians with clean water, fish, and wildlife habitat and recreation. Indiscriminate salvage logging threatens these treasured forests.

Additionally, the amendment limits judicial and administrative review. This is still a huge sticking point. Salvage logging is extremely controversial, and we shouldn't take away any tools available for the public to be able to weigh in on these critical decisions. Supporters of this amendment argue that the objection process is overused and abused, but it is there to make sure that everybody has a voice in the process.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose its adoption. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the opposition prevails, the Sierra, 400 square miles of it anyway, will be consigned to scrub brush and disease for generations to come. We have bent over backwards with the opposition to work out this compromise, and their continued opposition is quite disappointing.

I repeat that time is of the essence. I beg the Senate and the Democrats to take up these provisions without further delay. These provisions were developed with the full input of the administration and Democratic offices. But if they are still not acceptable, then tell us what is, but please don't just sit there and do nothing.

The Forest Service estimates that 2.2 million board feet can be processed per day. That means every day we dither and delay, $250 million of Federal revenue is lost. That is enough to reforest more than 1,000 every day. But every day we delay, we lose that revenue, we lose those jobs, the salvage value deteriorates with the wood, and that window will start to close even before the litigation begins under current law.

The private lands destroyed by the fire will have been fully salvaged and replanted a few years from now. They are going to host a thriving, young forest. If we don't change current law now, the public lands will remain unsalvaged and the millions of dollars we could have raised for reforestation will have been forfeited. Dry brush and dead trees will be the legacy of the Sierra that we leave our children.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Forest Service, as we speak, is preparing to authorize salvage operations on 30,000 of the 154,000 burned acres, and a decision is due as early as August. As I said earlier, salvage logging is not without controversy, and the decisions to authorize these activities need to be fully analyzed and fully transparent. Many ecologists believe that post-fire landscapes are an essential component of forest lifecycles that provide critical habitat for wildlife and other essential ecological services. Rushing to allow indiscriminate salvage operations, as this bill intends, threatens the overall health of the forest. The planning process is ongoing under expedited emergency provisions set out by CEQ.

Our national forests are more than timber factories, and we have a public planning process that ensures all uses and benefits are considered. This bill ignores that process, and that is why I repeat opposition to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1045

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE XI—ALASKA NATIVE VETERAN ALLOTMENT

SEC. 1101. ALASKA NATIVE VETERAN ALLOTMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means the Alaska Native Veteran Allotment application numbered AA-084021-B.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the 80 acres of Federal land that is—

(A) described in the application; and

(B) depicted as Lot 2 in U.S. Survey No. 13957, Alaska, that was officially filed on October 9, 2009.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ISSUANCE OF PATENT.—Notwithstanding section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g) and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

(1) approve the application; and

(2) issue a patent for the Federal land to the person that submitted the application.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The patent issued under subsection (b) shall—

(A) only be for the surface rights to the Federal land; and

(B) be subject to the terms and conditions of any certificate issued under section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g), including terms and conditions providing that—

(i) the patent is subject to valid existing rights, including any right of the United States to income derived, directly or indirectly, from a lease, license, permit, right-of-way, or easement on the Federal land; and

(ii) the United States shall reserve an interest in deposits of oil, gas, and coal on the Federal land, including the right to explore, mine, and remove the minerals on portions of the Federal land that the Secretary determines to be prospectively valuable for development.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions for the issuance of the patent under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the Alaska Native Allotment Act allowed Alaska Natives to acquire up to 160 acres of Federal land. Approximately 2,800 Alaska Natives served in the military during the Vietnam War, and because of their absence, they did not have an opportunity to apply for their Native allotment.

In 1998, Congress passed a law that provided certain Alaska Native Vietnam veterans an opportunity to obtain an allotment.

One of my constituents, Mr. William Alstrom, applied for an allotment in accordance with this law. During the war, he served honorably in the Air Force. Mr. Alstrom is a lifelong resident of St. Mary's, Alaska, a village of roughly 550 mostly Yup'ik Eskimo residents located on the Lower Yukon River in southwestern Alaska. His family has a long history in the region, helping to settle the area and operating the first general store. During World War II, Mr. Alstrom's father, Fred, was a member of the Alaska Territorial Guard, or the Eskimo Scouts, a military reserve component of the U.S. Army organized in 1942.

Following a TB outbreak in 1954, Mr. Alstrom was sent to a boarding school in southeast Alaska with many other children from Alaska villages. As the Vietnam War was escalating, he graduated from one of these boarding schools and promptly enlisted in the U.S. Air Force, serving his country. Soon thereafter, he left his wife and two children stateside and headed to southeast Asia. During the war, the newly minted Sergeant Alstrom served in Thailand, preparing aircraft on their way to strike North Vietnam.

On completion of his service, William and his family returned home to St. Mary's, where he invested himself in his village and continued to grow and raise his family. Today, William continues to serve—this time as mayor of his community and president of his village corporation.

In 2002, William applied for the Alaska Native veteran's allotment he was entitled to by law. Following an extensive application and vetting process, in 2009, the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, deeded him two 80-acre parcels located in the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

With his deed in hand, William transported lumber and other supplies to one of his parcels on his skiff, spent countless hours clearing trees and brush, and finally built a small cabin and fish camp for him and his family to enjoy.

Out of the blue a few years later, the Fish and Wildlife Service realized that errors had been made by the Fish and Wildlife Service and BLM personnel, both in the surveying and application approval process. Instead of being located on general refuge lands, the two allotment parcels were located within the congressionally designated Andreafsky Wilderness Area. Conveying allotments in wilderness areas is prohibited by law. Similarly, making improvements to the land, such as constructing a cabin, cutting trees, or clearing bush, is also prohibited. As a result, the BLM canceled the deed to the two parcels, plunging this Alaska Native veteran and the status of his allotment and cabin into a state of limbo.

After this decision, William contacted me for assistance. To their credit, the BLM quickly admitted that both they and the Fish and Wildlife Service screwed up. Though, after looking into their options, they also admitted that they couldn't fix their mistakes administratively. In an attempt to resolve the issue, the BLM offered William two parcels of equal size elsewhere in the region. While he agreed to accept one of the replacement parcels, the second proposed parcel excluded his cabin.

My amendment today would approve his application for the second original parcel, subsequently saving his cabin and fish camp from demolition.

Though two Federal agencies are at fault, my Alaska Native constituent is the one being forced to bear the full cost of their errors. The purpose of my amendment is simply to allow a veteran to retain the 80-acre parcel with the cabin on it, at no cost to the taxpayer.

An identical version of this amendment was adopted by voice vote when the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held their markup of the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act, of which the House version is included in today's package.

As you well know, I am no proponent of the fact that the Federal Government is the landlord of well over 60 percent of my State. Think about this: 60 percent. I generally oppose wilderness areas. I have often had an adversarial relationship with Federal land management agencies. All of that aside, this amendment is not meant to make a statement for or against wilderness designations, but rather to fix a unique issue for a truly deserving Vietnam veteran. At its core, fixing issues like this is what we do well when we are sent to Washington. Mr. Alstrom, like his father before him, served this country with honor and dignity, and he deserves similar treatment from this government in return.

I hope you will join me today in fixing this unfortunate mistake and allow this gentleman and his family to move on with their lives by supporting this simple amendment to H.R. 2954.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. If no Member is seeking recognition in opposition, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Alaska) having assumed the chair, Mr. DENHAM, 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. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 11:15 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1115

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 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. 2954.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1116

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. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, with Mr. HOLDING (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, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–340, offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113–340 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. LABRADOR of Idaho.

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. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 190, noes 224, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—190

Andrews	Becerra	Bonamici
Barber	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Bass	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)

Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—224

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

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cook
Culberson
Doyle
Fattah
Gardner
Kelly (PA)
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Miller, Gary
Pitts
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rush
Schwartz

□ 1142

Messrs. BUCHANAN, CONAWAY, TERRY, HALL, and JORDAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DINGELL, HIGGINS, and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 51, the Grijalva Amendment No. 1, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LABRADOR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) 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 218, noes 198, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
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
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
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
King (NY)
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
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cook
Culberson
Doyle
Fattah
Gardner
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Miller, Gary
Pitts
Ross
Rush
Schwartz

□ 1149

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

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 (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, 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. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, and, pursuant to House Resolution 472, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2954 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

TITLE XI—PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 1101. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

For fiscal years 2015 through 2020, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payments to counties and other eligible units of government pursuant to section 6906 of Title 31, United States Code, also known as the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program.

TITLE XII—PROTECTING COMMUNITIES FROM WILDFIRE

SEC. 1201. PROTECTING COMMUNITIES FROM WILDFIRE.

In addition to amounts previously made available, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(1) $50,000,000 to the FLAME Fund established under section 502(b) of the Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748(b)) for wildfire suppression on public lands; and

(2) $50,000,000 for hazardous fuels reduction on public lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. 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.

As my colleagues in this Chamber know well, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program, or PILT, is a source of revenue for counties across our country, especially in rural areas of the United States like Cochise County in southern Arizona, that have large areas of Federal land within their boundaries.

Without the PILT program, many counties would be forced to cut services, delay infrastructure maintenance and improvement, and local jobs would be lost.

While I joined many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support reauthorizing PILT for 1 year in the farm bill, this is but a short-term solution. My amendment would reauthorize the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program for 5 years.

By committing to reauthorize the program for 5 years today, we can give our communities who depend on these funds the long-term certainty they need. In fact, we should really be thinking about acting to authorize this fund as a mandatory fund.

In 2013, PILT meant $5 million in funds for my southern Arizona district, in both Pima and Cochise Counties.

The Sierra Vista Herald in Cochise County reported on the critical need for PILT in my home district, calling the potential loss of $1.98 million in PILT that the county received in 2013 ''a significant blow to the county.''

This is an important issue to all of us, particularly those in rural parts of our country, and I appreciate your attention to the matter.

''A lack of PILT funding,'' the County Board of Supervisors in Cochise County said, ''places the large and unsustainable burden of providing services on Federal lands squarely on the backs of Cochise County taxpayers, while the presence of that land creates a barrier to economic opportunities.''

''Failure,'' the Board said, ''to provide PILT funding to Arizona counties in a timely manner will critically impact on the budget process and structural solvency of Cochise County, and substantially compromise the County's ability to provide these essential services.''

Cochise County and counties like it all across this country are required to provide law enforcement, search-and-rescue missions, emergency services, road building and maintenance, and other community services on or associated with tax-exempt Federal land.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this amendment so we can say to Cochise County, in my district, and the people I represent in southern Arizona, and so that you can say to the people of your State, particularly those in rural counties, that we won't make them wait and worry about whether or not they will have the resources to provide these critical services in the future.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment also goes on to provide much-needed funding to fight wildfires across this Nation. Arizonans know all too well the terrific and horrific effects wildfires have on our communities.

□ 1200

Last summer, our State was devastated by the Yarnell Hill Fire. My colleagues, our State experienced a great loss when last year, a fire swept across 8,400 acres of land in 15 days, killing 19 brave firefighters from the Granite Mountain Hotshots, all of whom died in the line of duty.

These tragic fires are not unique to our beautiful State of Arizona. Every year, communities across our Nation face wildfires that destroy their land, their homes, and their livelihoods. And given the worst drought in California history just 1 month into this year, I know that this is an issue on the minds

of all of my colleagues in the California delegation as well.

Two summers ago, my district in southeastern Arizona endured the Horseshoe Two Fire. On May 8, 2011, the Horseshoe Two Fire started on the east side of Chiricahua Mountains near the community of Portal. The fire continued to burn steadily, heading to the northwest, and on June 8, the fire reached Chiricahua National Monument, burning into the southeast corner of the park. In late June, the fire was finally extinguished and contained. By then, 223,000 acres were burned. We were lucky that summer in southeastern Arizona that there was no loss of life.

This amendment would authorize $50 million to the Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement Act for wildfire suppression on our public lands and $50 million for hazardous fuels reduction. This funding is key to fighting catastrophic fires, wildland fires, and for successful fire management strategies across our Nation.

I ask my colleagues again, on both sides of the aisle, to join with me in supporting both PILT and these critical wildfire programs for our local communities and the people we represent by passing this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation on the point of order and rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I have to wonder when I hear these motions to recommit what exactly my friends on the other side of the aisle are thinking. The first part of this motion to recommit talks about payment in lieu of taxes, or PILT. Those of us in the western part of the United States especially understand that.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we funded PILT in the farm bill. Where was everybody? I voted for it. Where was everybody? That was funded.

The second point, PILT is permanently authorized—permanently authorized. All we have to do now is to get the appropriators to fund it, and they will go through the deliberations. There is no reason for this motion to recommit, as it relates to PILT.

Also, with regards to fighting fires, if I remember correctly, last year, we passed the healthy forests bill, but a majority of the people on the other side of the aisle voted ''no.'' Now we come down here with crocodile tears, saying we have to pass funding to fight forest fires. If they had voted for healthy forests in the first place, they would have solved the problem.

This MTR is not worthy of passage. Vote ''no'' on the MTR and ''yes'' on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 222, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
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.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
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
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—222

Aderholt
Amash
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
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
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
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei
Camp
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cook
Culberson
Doyle
Fattah
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Miller, Gary
Pitts
Ross
Rush
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1211

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. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—220

Aderholt
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
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
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
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)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
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
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
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
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Bachmann
Camp
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cook
Culberson
Doyle
Fattah
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Miller, Gary
Petri
Pitts
Ross
Rush
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1217

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. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call vote 54, on the vote on Passage of H.R. 2954—The Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, I was away from the House floor and intended to vote "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2954, THE PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2954, the Clerk may make technical and conforming changes, and that the amendment to page 17, line 17 refer to the first usage of "decision" on that line.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader, for the recitation of the schedule.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic Whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than noon to accommodate the Democrat Members' issues retreat. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 3193, the Consumer Financial Protection and Soundness Improvement Act, authored by Representative SEAN DUFFY. This bill reforms the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to make the Bureau accountable to hardworking American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the debt limit borrowing authority runs out as early as the end of this month; therefore, I expect action to avoid default as soon as possible.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman ends with the observation that you expect action to avoid default as soon as possible. As you know, Mr. Leader, very well—as we all know—beginning tomorrow, the Treasury Department will have to start using extraordinary measures because

the authorization for the debt limit to be extended will end on the 7th. Secretary Lew has written to all of us and warned us that, on Monday, stating that:

> Time is short. Inaction could cause harm to our economy, rattle financial markets, and hurt taxpayers.

I know that my friend has made similar comments, as I have made similar comments. We agree on this proposition. But I am concerned that we only have 7 legislative days scheduled for the rest of the month.

Does the gentleman expect that we will take an up-or-down vote on a clean debt limit extension next week or before the end of this month?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks just prior, I would say to the gentleman that I am confident that the United States is not going to default on its debt and that we will resolve the need to increase the borrowing authority of this country prior to any deadline that the Treasury issues.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that information. I want to say that the debt limit extension will have—Mr. Leader, I want to give you the information—in my view, well over 180 votes on our side of the aisle if that is a clean debt limit so that America can pay its bills and default is not a risk. As the gentleman indicates, we don't want it to be.

The Speaker has indicated that it would be solved long before we would come to any deadline precipitating another crisis and undermining confidence.

□ 1230

I want to tell the gentleman, the majority leader, that I will assure him that if we get a clean debt limit extension on the floor, that Democrats will work with him and his party to pass that in a way that we have a significant majority for that bill.

Mr. Leader, I was encouraged to see last week at your retreat that the House Republicans put forward a set of principles for immigration reform and have now expressed a readiness to discuss how to fix our broken immigration system. I am sure you have seen the response from my side of the aisle, not only from the President, but myself and Leader PELOSI, has been positive. We see the steps that have been taken as positive steps. We do look forward to working together on these principles.

We were just somewhat disappointed, however, that one of your Members, RAÚL LABRADOR of Idaho, was quoted yesterday as saying there was:

> Overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year. It is a mistake to have an internal battle this year about immigration.

I would hope that Mr. LABRADOR's remarks do not lead us to a place where we will either not proceed or to pass immigration reform on this floor.

The majority leader has indicated in some of our colloquies that he believes the immigration system is broken. Again, we share that view, and I think almost all Members share the view that the immigration system is not working as intended. There have been four bills passed out of Judiciary and another out of Homeland Security. Homeland Security was essentially unanimous in terms of dealing with security. We have introduced, as the majority leader knows, H.R. 15, which is a compilation of the bipartisanly passed Senate provisions, dropping the border security provision and inserting the border security passed out of the Republican-led Homeland Security Committee, I think by unanimous vote, but maybe it was by voice vote.

I would hope that we could, therefore, move forward and that Mr. LABRADOR's observation that there was ''overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year'' would not be the prevalent view. We will again be ready to discuss this, and I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of my party, as I think the gentleman knows, would vote for the Senate bill. We don't think that the Senate bill is perfect. We would like to see a House bill. We have introduced a House bill, and we would like to consider it on the floor.

I will close with this observation with reference to immigration. I am sure the gentleman read the comments of former Speaker Dennis Hastert:

> The House will act in its own way, as it should; but it should act soon. Immigration reform is necessary for our economic recovery.

Again, this is former Speaker Dennis Hastert of Illinois. He goes on to say:

> First, securing our borders, so we know who is entering our country and for what purpose.

I think there is unanimous consensus that needs to be addressed.

He continues:

> Second, a legalization of those folks who are already here.

Again, I think there is consensus on that.

He goes on to say we should provide them with:

> A path to citizenship, much like any other immigrant would have.

Apparently, there is not necessarily consensus on that, but we do have consensus on the first proposition. He goes on to say:

> These two things being satisfied, I believe immigration reform can move forward. It will make us economically stronger. It is politically smart, and morally right.

That was quoted in Politico on February 2. Those are words of former Speaker Hastert. I would hope and I know the gentleman has been very constructive in his comments that we can move forward together in reaching some agreement so we can see comprehensive immigration legislation on the floor consistent with the principles of both parties, and we can come together and pass some legislation.

I yield to the gentleman as to the prospects of doing so.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows, we have been on this floor before and I have said that we believe in the majority that the immigration system in this country is broken. There needs to be reform. I think I have also said to the gentleman, as I have said publicly this week, we have to go about a rebuilding of the trust here. I think the fundamental issue right now is there is doubt cast on this White House, this President, this administration's willingness to implement the laws given the track record that we have seen on laws like ObamaCare and others.

I have said to the gentleman I believe that reform is badly needed. I believe that we have got a situation at the border and the interior that needs to be fixed. The gentleman knows I have been very outspoken on the issue of kids and the fact that so many are here, unbeknownst to themselves, brought here, and know no other place as home and then are stuck without any sense of the fact that they will be accepted in the country that they know.

But before we can even get there, there needs to be some trust. There needs to be some trust built by this President with this Congress because it seems that the track record is full of examples of the White House and the administration picking and choosing in terms of the regulations, the laws, and the provisions that it wants to implement. If it doesn't like to implement one, then it will just seemingly ignore that.

I don't think that the gentleman agrees that that is the way this system was designed or our Framers had in mind in terms of equal branches of power, one that makes the laws and one that fully and faithfully executes the law, and obviously a judiciary that provides that extra check and balance.

So again I would say to the gentleman, I would ask, if he is talking with the White House, please ask them to begin to work with us on any number of things to demonstrate that they are willing to actually drive toward the same result and not just work around us in terms of a unilateral result that they may seek.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LABRADOR, and I will quote again, said there was:

> Overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year.

Now in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the observation is that the system is broken, and in light of Speaker Hastert's observation that it is morally the right thing to do, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't place much stock in this what I would call a rationalization of trust.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind this House that George Bush, President George Bush, couldn't get the support of his party for immigration reform. His party rejected President Bush on this issue, this issue of trust. There are less illegal immigrants having come

over the border in the last 5 years than there were during the Bush administration. There have been more people deported, in many cases with tragic results of separating families, over the last 5 years than there were in the Bush administration.

This is a question of what is morally right to do.

This is a question of what is morally right to do, to fix a broken system that is breaking apart families, undermining our economy, and abandoning what so many say is the right thing to do.

So with all due respect to, frankly, trying to distract us on this trust issue, this is not a trust issue. This is an issue of law and the administration's performance both on border security and enforcing the law in this respect, a bad law and a law that ought to be changed, a law that is causing families to be torn apart.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood on this floor as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe with my colleague, FRANK WOLF, and I believe Mr. CANTOR, perhaps, has been in some of these discussions himself when we have been dealing with the Soviet Union about keeping families together. So I will tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of trust. This is a matter of whether the House of Representatives is going to do what Speaker Hastert has urged us to do, what President Bush urged us to do, and for which I think there are the votes to do on this floor if a bill is brought to the floor that accomplishes the principles that both parties have articulated.

Are there differences? There are some. Do we need to resolve them? We do. But we need to act. I say with all due respect to my friend, the majority leader, that I hope that those principles do not fall by the wayside as Mr. LABRADOR projects there is a consensus in your party to allow to happen.

So I would urge us to move and urge us to work together on the principles that Mr. BOEHNER and yourself have put forward and which we have responded to in a positive way.

Mr. Leader, there is also other business that needs to be done. We continue to be concerned, we were concerned when there were 1.2 million people who had fallen through the cracks and had no help. Now there are 1.7 million Americans who have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since December 28. An additional 72,000 will lose their insurance next week. We believe that needs to be addressed and reinstated, as we have done every time that we were in a similar place as we are today in terms of the availability of jobs and the seekers of jobs.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader if he can give us some view of the sustainable growth rate reimbursement for doctors who give our senior citizens medical care? That was extended with a temporary patch to March 31, Mr. Speaker, and that needs to be addressed permanently. There is a consensus, I understand, among the committees for a fix on that, but there is no pay-for on that. That is always the problem. It is easy to say we are going to fix; it is very difficult to pay for those fixes. On both of those issues, I would ask the gentleman on unemployment insurance and the SGR, whether the gentleman has any view on either one of those coming to the floor any time soon?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, on both of those issues, there is a lot of work. On the SGR, he is exactly right; it is always the pay-for. We saw the struggle that surrounded the recent budget agreement, and coming up with $23 billion in cost reductions and savings over 10 years was very difficult. It is hard for folks outside of Washington to imagine why that is the case when you are dealing with trillions of dollars being spent.

I share the gentleman's frustration. I would like to see, as well as, I think, the seniors of this country would like to see, an end to a formula that doesn't work in terms of reimbursements to providers, and one that will allow for a better way and a more quality health care future for our seniors.

So I do share the goal that we should replace the SGR and at the same time ensure that seniors are not going to see a diminution in the quality of their care. The gentleman knows that these discussions are ongoing in committee as we speak.

As far as the UI situation, as the gentleman knows, there are currently 6 months of unemployment benefits available to folks who have, unfortunately, found themselves out of work. We care about those folks and want to do all we can to do what they really want, which is to get back to work. This goes back towards the administration's willingness to work with us.

Our leadership, Mr. Speaker, sent a letter to the President last week outlining four things, just four of the many things he spoke about in the State of the Union address, where there is pretty much agreement on what we need to do together. We have not heard back from the administration. One of those things was the SKILLS Act. If we don't want to accept the new norm of chronic unemployment, we ought to be going full-time overspeed to try to grow the economy, to increase the competitiveness of the American economy so people can get back to work, and so they can take care of their families. We know that the chronically unemployed have a real problem because if they are without either a high school diploma or a college degree, they are at a great disadvantage for today's job opportunities.

□ 1245

The SKILLS Act can address that. All we have heard is the President wants to, once again, create another commission to review all the studies that have been combed through before and that have resulted in our bill, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina's bill, the SKILLS Act.

Again, if the administration is so concerned about trying to addresses the plight of the chronically unemployed, let's go for jobs, not just accepting the new norm.

So again, discussions, building trust with one another, driving towards resolve could actually help the situation so that we can address this serious problem that plagues the communities of this country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I might say the SKILLS Act, of course, was considered on this floor. We could have had a bipartisan bill, and I would like to see a bipartisan bill.

As the majority leader knows, I have been a strong proponent of an agenda that we call Make It In America, which wants to expand manufacturing in America. We believe that when we expand manufacturing, grow jobs in America, Americans are going to be more likely to Make It In America, succeed, get a job, be able to support their families.

So there is, I think, not disagreement on that. There was disagreement on the SKILLS Act. We believe the SKILLS Act essentially retreated in investments with skills.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will certainly yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, my point is that the President, rather than going and acting unilaterally and appointing another commission, could easily have picked up the phone and said, ''Hey, I want to come up there,'' or, ''You all come here, and let's talk about getting the job done,'' rather than doing what is always done, which is kicking the can and creating another commission to go over the studies and outcomes of other commissions. That is my point.

If you have differences with the SKILLS Act, if the gentleman doesn't speak, we understand that. But the bottom line is we both agree we have to improve the outlook for skills for the chronically unemployed.

Why aren't we doing something on that? Why isn't there any response from the White House? That is my point. We could do this. We could work together and achieve results. And so again, I understand the gentleman's disagreement with the SKILLS Act, but let's work through it. The White House doesn't seem to want to do any of that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in America believes the White House doesn't want to do something about that. The President of the United States has talked about it. In every one of his State of the Unions he talked about it. In this State of the Union, he talked about expanding manufacturing and training. So the President has talked about it, all the time

about wanting to invest in giving the skills to American workers that they need to either stay employed or get the kind of skilled jobs that are available in our economy, that pay well.

There are a number of bills, I will tell the majority leader, in the Make It In America agenda that I would love to work with the majority leader on that deal exactly with that. I have a bill myself—actually, I think somebody else introduced it—called the Jobs bill, which is job opportunities between our shores, which is exactly on point of dealing with advanced manufacturers, community colleges, and other organizations in cooperation with work investment boards to identify what skills are needed, to invest in training.

The gentleman is correct, we all want to do that, and we certainly ought to be able to work towards that. He is incorrect in that the President has not only not focused on that, he has worked on that. The Secretary of Labor, Tom Perez, has worked on it; Penny Pritzker, the Secretary of Commerce, is very committed to that end; as is Arne Duncan, the Secretary of Education, and they have all talked about that. So let us work on it.

What the gentleman talked about, he cares a lot about, and I think he does. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely take him at his word. He cares about those people who have—through no fault of their own—lost their job, work wasn't available, they downsized, whatever, they lost their job.

He said he is concerned about those people, as he should be, as I am, as we all are. But one of the real tragedies is, particularly with those folks who are 45 or 50 and above, once they have lost a job, they have a terrible time in this economy finding a job. There are three people looking for every one job that is available. And a lot of those people, as the gentleman has observed, don't have the skills.

So the issue is not just about giving them skills; it is, in the interim, do we let them and their families fall through the cracks, fall through a safety net, fall out of the insurance that they paid into, their employer paid into, in the event they lost their job they would not lose the ability to support themselves to put some food on their table? That is why we are so adamant that unemployment insurance be extended.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, it has been extended under every administration when the facts were as they are today—Republican administration, Democratic administration—for the reasons that the majority leader pointed out. We care about those people. We are worried about those people. So I would hope that that would be on the floor.

On the SGR, let me close by suggesting that there is, as the gentleman knows, an Overseas Contingency Operations account. The CBO scores that significantly.

The good news is that we are not spending as much money as we were. We spent over a trillion dollars in the last decade in Afghanistan and Iraq. Better to spend that money in this instance here at home. I would suggest, respectfully, that that is one alternative to doing what the gentleman says we all want to do, and that is fix the sustainable growth rate on a permanent basis so that doctors and Medicare patients are not worried about whether their medical services are going to be available to them. I would hope we would look at that alternative, and I would be glad to discuss with the majority leader other alternatives as well.

Unless the majority leader has anything further to say, thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2014, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 years, the Obama administration has played politics with the Keystone XL pipeline, a project that is essential to reducing our dependence on foreign oil and creating jobs.

Progress has been blocked at every turn by the President more concerned with his popularity with environmental extremists than supplying our Nation with OPEC-free energy.

House Republicans have joined with members of the labor movement to move this project forward. Just last year, I worked through my committee to advance H.R. 3 to approve the Keystone pipeline with Congressman LEE TERRY. The House passed the bill back in May of 2003, but once again we were ignored by the Senate and the President.

The State Department just released its final Environmental Impact Statement, which estimates that Keystone XL will produce 42,000 jobs and will be safe.

President Obama often talks about wanting to create jobs, improving our economy, and strengthening our energy independence. He claims to support an all-of-the-above energy strategy. But with his stopping the Keystone pipeline and his war on coal, we are losing jobs, we are not strengthening the economy, and we are decreasing our ability to become energy independent.

Mr. President, stop dragging your feet and approve the Keystone pipeline.

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

SERGEANT BRIAN LALOU

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the family of Sergeant Brian LaLou from Chester County, Pennsylvania. Tragically, in the summer of 2012, Sergeant LaLou took his own life while he was at his duty station at the U.S. Embassy in Greece. What happened next was unconscionable.

During the course of an autopsy performed by Greek authorities, his heart was removed and not returned to his body before it was sent home to his family for a proper burial. When the Greek Government finally sent the family a heart, it was not their son's. The DNA testing revealed that it belonged to someone else.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Commandant of the Marine Corps in December seeking answers for this young man's family. The response from the Pentagon so far has been silence.

The LaLou family deserves answers. They deserve peace of mind. It is time for the Greek authorities and the Pentagon to tell Sergeant LaLou's parents what happened to their son's heart, because we know what happened to his family's.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, if I told you we could create tens of thousands of truly shovel-ready jobs, increase the prospects of American energy independence, and avoid undue environmental harm, how long would it take you to sign on the dotted line? For the President, it would take over 5 years. That is how long the application for the Keystone XL pipeline has been languishing on his desk.

In his State of the Union address, the President talked about the need to grow jobs and pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy, yet he has failed to take action on a project that does just that. Even after the release of a report from his own State Department last week clearly stating there would be little to no negative effect environmentally, the President still will not take the lead.

This project has support from Members of both parties, as well as the support of both business groups and labor groups.

The President said he has a pen. Now is the time to use it. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline, get Americans to work, and truly support a plan for an all-of-the-above energy strategy that sends a message to the rest of the world.

TRIBUTE TO THE BENEDICTINE SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH MONASTERY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the Benedictine Sisters of St. Joseph Monastery in St. Marys, which is located in Elk County, Pennsylvania, and is the oldest Benedictine convent in the United States.

The Benedictine Sisters, in concert with their federation, will close St. Joseph Monastery with the remaining 17 sisters moving on in the coming year.

For more than a century and a half, the monastery has grown and flourished. Through roles as teachers and school administrators, religious education teachers, hospital administrators, nurses, technicians, and dietitians, instructors and promoters of the arts, spiritual providers, citizens, and friends, the sisters have greatly impacted the community of St. Marys.

On February 23, 2014, St. Marys is hosting a communitywide celebration to honor and thank the Benedictine Sisters—both living and deceased—for nearly 162 years of service to the community and the region.

Today, I join with the community of St. Marys as we celebrate Honoring the Benedictine Sisters of St. Joseph Monastery Day, and offer thanks and appreciation to the sisters for their faithful and dedicated service to the Lord.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of account of illness.

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until, Monday, February 10, 2014, at noon 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:

4699. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Limitation on Use of Cost-reimbursement Line Items (DFARS Case 2013-D016) (RIN: 0750-AI16) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2013 Revisions to the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule and Final Confidentiality Determinations for New or Substantially Revised Data Elements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0028; FRL-9905-71-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR52) received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Non-interference Demonstration for Removal of Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement for the Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0562; FRL-9905-70-Region-4] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4702. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Annual Emissions Fee and Annual Emissions Inventory [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0765; FRL-9905-66-Region-7] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4703. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Implementation Plan; Alabama; Attainment Plan for the Troy Area 2008 Lead Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0173; FRL-9904-91-Region 4] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4704. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0014; FRL-9903-88] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4705. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Division, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Waste Management System; Modification of the Hazardous Waste Manifest System; Electronic Manifests [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2001-0032; FRL-9828-9] (RIN: 2050-AG20) received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4706. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning Financial Assurance Instrument Security Program [DT-13-31], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4707. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 11-003, Revision 2, Dispositioning Boiling Water Reactor Licensee Noncompliance with Technical Specifications Containment Requirement During Operation with a Potential for Draining the Reactor Vessel received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4708. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — TSTF-523, ''Generic Letter 2008-01, Managing Gas Accumulation'', Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process [Project No. 753; NRC-2013-0173] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4709. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30934; Amdt. No. 3569] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4710. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30935; Amdt. No. 3570] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4711. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Leesburg, VA [Docket No. FAA-2013-0033; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-1] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4712. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance for Determining Stock Ownership [TD 9654] (RIN: 1545-BL01) received January 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3578. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2571. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to notify and obtain permission from consumers before collecting nonpublic personal information about such consumers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2446. A bill to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with a five person Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 113–345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3519. A bill to amend the

Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent agency; with an amendment (Rept. 113–347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2431. A bill to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System; with an amendment (Rept. 113–348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 4005. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2015 and 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4006. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance benefits to present photographic verification at the time food is purchased with such benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 4007. A bill to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal mandates, direction, or control of specific instructional content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit an institution that participates in a boycott of Israeli academic institutions or scholars from being eligible for certain funds under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4010. A bill to provide for enhanced treatment, support, services, and research for individuals with autism spectrum disorders and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of mail service within the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4012. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 4013. A bill to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to establish a program allowing low volume motor vehicle manufacturers to produce a limited number of vehicles annually within a regulatory system that addresses the unique safety and financial issues associated with limited production, and to direct the Environmental Protection Agency to allow low volume motor vehicle manufacturers to install engines from vehicles that have been issued certificates of conformity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying contacts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. COLE, Ms. BASS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 4017. A bill to designate a peak located in Nevada as ''Mount Reagan''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4018. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land located in Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY OF FLORIDA (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the expensing of certain depreciable business assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain discharged student loan debt to be included in gross income ratably over 15 years and to disregard such income in determining eligibility for Federal means-tested programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. HUNTER:

H.R. 4005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4006.

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. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 4008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X of the Constitution, that states, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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 . . .

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4012.

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 with the Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 4017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8—18 To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which states that 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.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution

Amendment XVI to the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 184: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 351: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 375: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 409: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 455: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NADLER and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 498: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 508: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 522: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 543: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 647: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 831: Mr. MAFFEI and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 920: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1010: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1089: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1090: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1094: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1173: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1250: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1281: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1332: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1386: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1507: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1528: Mr. LATTA and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1563: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. YODER, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1690: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1750: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1779: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1814: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1852: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1921: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2173: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2468: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2502: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2536: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2672: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2737: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2745: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2785: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2831: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2841: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2847: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2901: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2909: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2945: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2955: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2996: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3086: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3155: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3327: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3370: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3395: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3453: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3461: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3467: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3544: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3549: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3578: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3658: Mr. SIRES, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3662: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3707: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. MARINO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. BLACKburn.

H.R. 3710: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3712: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3726: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3732: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 3747: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 3757: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3850: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 3855: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3873: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3899: Mr. UPTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3913: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 3921: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3969: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3972: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3973: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3976: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3979: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3991: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 3992: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 4000: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. CHABOT.

H. Res. 169: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 356: Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 425: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H. Res. 464: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 468: Ms. CHU, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 6, February 4, 2014, by Mr. MICHAEL HONDA on House Resolution 459, was signed by the following Members: Michael M. Honda, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Juan Vargas, Rush Holt, Karen Bass, Peter Welch, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Chris Van Hollen, Sheila Jackson Lee, Barbara Lee, Robert A. Brady, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Danny K. Davis, David N. Cicilline, Alcee L. Hastings, Frederica S. Wilson, John Conyers Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Tony Cárdenas, Robin L. Kelly, Jackie Speier, Gerald E. Connolly, John B. Larson, Al Green, Jim McDermott, Steve Israel, Eric Swalwell, Pete P. Gallego, and Filemon Vela.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2014 No. 23

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Immortal, invisible God, in whose patient hands the mighty seasons move with quiet beauty, hallowed be Your Name.

As our lawmakers face the complexities of their work, enlighten them with Your wisdom, lest the darkness prevent them from seeing the paths of Your providence. Lord, empower them to run and not be weary, to walk and not faint, keeping them always in Your care. May they find peace in the knowledge that You know and accept them as they are.

God bless America. Drive back the forces of evil and release the powers of goodness throughout our land.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

REPEALING SECTION 403 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 298, S. 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to Calendar No. 298, S. 1963, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1845, which is the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to that is 9:45 a.m. today, just a few minutes from now. The deadline for second-degree amendments to the Reed amendment and to the bill is 10:45 a.m.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent the cloture vote on the Reed substitute, which is now scheduled for 11 a.m., be at 2 p.m. There will be two votes at that time, and there could be another one. We will see what happens on the cloture vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. As I said, Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes. The first vote is on cloture of the Reed amendment. If cloture is not invoked, there will be a second cloture on the underlying bill.

We hope to be able to work something out for Senator BAUCUS's nomination to be ambassador to China this afternoon.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1996

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that there is a bill, S. 1996, due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1996) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with regard to this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

TRIBUTE TO MAX BAUCUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have had the good fortune of serving in Congress for more than three decades with a good man, the senior Senator from Montana MAX BAUCUS. We hope to schedule a vote sometime this afternoon on his confirmation to be our Nation's Ambassador to China.

Senator BAUCUS has served in the Senate for a long time. At the end of this year, he will have served 36 years. Prior to that, he served in the House of Representatives for 4 years. Prior to that, he served a term in the Montana State legislature.

He has his undergraduate and law degree from Stanford. He is an extremely

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

Printed on recycled paper.

smart person and is certainly versed on what goes on in the Congress.

After he received his law degree from Stanford, he worked as an attorney at the Securities and Exchange Commission and entered private practice in Missoula after that.

His mentor, and the person who got him interested in politics, was Mike Mansfield. I didn't know him—I shouldn't say I didn't know him. He attended the prayer breakfast, and I met him on a number of occasions at our Wednesday prayer breakfast. He was a very quiet man, and that is what everybody says about him. He was the worst guest in the world to interview on a Sunday show because he wouldn't say anything. He would just answer yes or no. He was well respected in the Senate by Democrats and Republicans.

I heard Senator BAUCUS tell the story many times about how Mike Mansfield suggested that he go into politics. Well, he did do that.

Senator BAUCUS served 2 years in the Montana State legislature before he was elected in 1974 to the House of Representatives. He served, as I indicated earlier, 4 years in the House before coming to the Senate. He has been elected and reelected to the Senate 5 times. As I said, at the end of this year, he will have served for 36 years in the Senate.

He has been chairman of the Finance Committee. He has been chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. He has a been a member of the Agriculture Committee for a long time. By the way, he was appointed to that committee on a temporary basis many decades ago and never left.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he was instrumental in developing lots of landmark legislation, but the most significant law he helped to pass in this body was the landmark health care reform bill, the Affordable Care Act, which is saving lives and a lot of money for American taxpayers.

He has been a long-time advocate for the Children's Health Insurance Program. He worked on that with a number of people—not the least of which is Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah.

While Senator BAUCUS is well-known nationally for his tireless work on health care, tax reform, and as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, he was also involved in public works projects.

I think the most important thing that Montanans will remember about him is that he always put Montanans first. He is an avid hunter. He authored one of the largest public land grant bills in American history which preserved 310,000 acres of forest land in northwestern Montana.

It is a testament to his love of the outdoors that MAX BAUCUS walked almost 1,000 miles across Montana in 1995 and 1996.

MAX and I have an ongoing dialogue about running. I have run a number of marathons, but MAX BAUCUS is a better runner than I am. He is faster, and he has run—I ran one 31-mile race, but MAX has run 50-mile races, and he has trained for 100-mile races. During one of those, he fell and hurt himself quite significantly. He hit his head because of a fall.

We have exchanged news articles and stories about runners. We enjoy focusing on our athletic skills. It was just the two of us, so we could say whatever we wanted because there was no one there to listen.

He is someone who loves running. He is still an avid runner, and I have admired him for his athletic skills in addition to his legislative skills.

Senator BAUCUS's independent spirit has made him a powerful advocate for Montana and for the issues he cares about. He is a respected member of the Democratic caucus and has great respect from the Republican caucus.

During the time that Senator GRASSLEY was the ranking member—I can't vouch for this, but I think I am right—and Senator BAUCUS was chairman of the Finance Committee, they met every week for lunch. Every week we were in session, they had lunch together.

His passion is well known to all of us. He has decades of experience in Congress. President Obama made an excellent choice in appointing Senator BAUCUS to represent America's interests in China, a growing power in our global economy.

He has never shied away from difficult issues of the day, and I have no doubt that his fearlessness will serve him well in his new role as a representative for our country in China.

Although Senator BAUCUS will be missed by the entire Democratic caucus and the Senate family, our loss will be the Nation's gain.

I wish the senior Senator from Montana the very best.

I hope we will vote this afternoon on Senator BAUCUS's nomination to be Ambassador to China. We have not locked that in yet.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

We will also vote at 2 p.m. to advance a 3-month extension of emergency unemployment insurance that will not add a penny to the deficit. We originally said 3 months and that it should not be paid for, but the Republicans said it had to be paid for.

We have had two, I thought, really uncontroversial issues that paid for it. The first one didn't work. I think that is wrong, but it didn't work. No one complained about the second one, so certainly any ''no'' vote on extending unemployment benefits is a ''no'' vote because they don't want to extend unemployment benefits.

For a number of years the junior Senator from Oklahoma has talked about how millionaires should not draw unemployment benefits. I agree with him. That is in JACK REED's amendment, which we are going to vote on later today. Under this legislation, we have accepted the suggestion of the junior Senator from Oklahoma that millionaires should not draw unemployment benefits.

We have virtually done everything that the Republicans asked. They will come up with excuses about why we can't do this and how they want amendments, but that is just a loss leader. We offered them 20 amendments before, but it wasn't good enough.

I hope that we could have a few valiant Republicans vote to help the people who are in desperate need of help. I am sorry to say that it appears Senate Republicans appear ready to filibuster this important legislation a second time despite the fact that we have compromised on every one of their demands. Republicans complained that the bill wasn't paid for, so we found an offset that was minimal to just about everything—at least certainly for those people who were originally on the bill—HELLER, MURKOWSKI, COLLINS. It is my understanding they accepted that. I hope more do. We need five Republican votes.

The Republicans have complained after the first vote that they wouldn't vote on an extension of unemployment insurance without reforms to the program, so we did that also.

I am beginning to believe there is nothing that will get Republicans to yes. With the exception of a few Republicans who have taken the human toll of obstruction into consideration, Republicans simply don't want to extend these benefits.

Their obstruction has already cost the Nation $2.2 billion in economic activity—a body blow to small businesses around the country. Every week they delay, another 73,000 Americans lose these crucial benefits, benefits that help them keep food on the table and a roof over their heads while they search for a job.

I shared the story about a 57-year-old Nevada woman who is couch surfing—I had never heard that term before, but I understand it—who is sleeping on friends' couches because she doesn't have a home anymore. She sold all her belongings so she could put gas in her car if she gets a job interview. This woman has worked all her life. She doesn't want a handout; she wants a job.

So I have had some good conversations with Republican Senators. I hope they will go ahead and let this important piece of legislation pass. We are going to move as quickly as we can to some bills that have been reported on a bipartisan basis out of committees. We are looking closely at the HELP Committee, the Energy Committee, and there are other committees we are going to look at to see if we can bring a bipartisan bill here to the floor, have an agreement on amendments, and try to move forward on that basis.

So as we vote today, I hope my Republican colleagues will keep in mind that we need to move forward—it is so important—to help people who are desperately in need of help such as this 57-year-old woman from Nevada. I hope

they will work with us to advance this bill and legislation in the future more expeditiously than we have in the past.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

THE IRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just last year, IRS officials and an inspector general report confirmed what we have been hearing from constituents for quite a while: The IRS was being used to target Americans for daring to exercise their first amendment rights, for daring to think differently, for daring to hold opinions contrary to high-ranking government officials. They confirmed that civic groups the administration opposed, including at least one in my home State of Kentucky, were harassed and bullied by the IRS. They confirmed that individuals who supported these groups were intimidated and attacked, and they confirmed something else too—that this happened in the runup to a national election.

So Americans were rightly outraged—outraged—when the worst fears of citizen organizations came to light. The American people rightly expected the Obama administration to take concrete steps to end this harassment once and for all—to put safeguards in place that would ensure the same kind of abuse never, ever happens again.

But that is not what happened. No, in fact, basically, the opposite of that happened. The Obama administration now seems to be trying to legitimize the harassment after the fact, to enact regulations that would essentially allow the IRS to bully and intimidate Americans who exercise their right of free speech. It is something they were originally planning actually to slip by while the harassment was actually still going on.

But here is the thing. The administration knew it could never get anything like that through Congress the democratic way, so it is trying to quietly impose these new regulations through the back door—through the back door—by executive fiat. Administration officials insist the rules change is just a minor bureaucratic adjustment. Nothing to it, they say. They claim it is just a ''good government'' idea from the IRS—a response to the inspector general report that brought these terrible abuses to light.

Of course, we know that is not true. We know the administration had been working on this proposed rule for at least 2 years—2 years—before the inspector general report came out, and from the looks of things there is nothing ''good government'' about this at all. As with so much of what we have seen with the Obama administration, it is almost purely political—transparently political.

Under the administration's proposed regulations, many citizen groups could be prohibited—prohibited—from participating in some of the most basic civic engagement activities—things such as voter registration, issue advocacy, and educating citizens about candidates before an election. This is just plain wrong. Grassroots groups shouldn't be persecuted for doing what Americans expect them to do. They shouldn't be forced to shut up or shut down or for engaging in the very kinds of educational activities that the 501(c)(4) designation was designed to support.

The idea is to shut up and shut down the voices that oppose the administration's priorities, and it comes on the heels of a long-running pet project of this administration to expose conservative donors to harassment in order to try to dry up their funding.

Americans who care about the First Amendment need to stand up to this regulation before the administration has a chance to finalize it. The American people need to stand up to this regulation before the administration has a chance to finalize it. And they actually are. More than 20,000 citizens have already submitted comments on this proposed rule at regulations.gov. Nearly all the ones I saw were opposed.

In the House, Representative DAVE CAMP has introduced legislation that would prevent the IRS from implementing any such regulation, and next week, I, along with Senator FLAKE, Senator ROBERTS, and others, will introduce companion legislation that would do the same in the Senate.

But I hope it doesn't have to come to that. There is a much easier fix available. There is a way out of this dilemma. The new commissioner of the IRS, John Koskinen, can put a stop to the rule right now if he chooses. He can stop this right now if he chooses. If he means what he said when the Senate confirmed him—the comments we heard about restoring integrity to the IRS—then he will do just that. The Speaker and I, along with top Senate and House leadership and the leadership of the relevant authorizing and appropriating committees, have just sent a letter to Mr. Koskinen on this topic, and we look forward to his response.

Back in the 1970s, Richard Nixon famously tried to influence the IRS into helping him punish his political opponents. The IRS has been in this spot before. Back then, the IRS commissioner stood up to President Nixon and said, essentially: No, that is not what this agency is supposed to do. So the history is that when a previous IRS commissioner had a President of the United States try to use him to target his political enemies, the Commissioner of the IRS stood up to the President and said no. He said no to the President. The President cannot use the IRS to target the President's political enemies. That act of courage and independence became the defining act of an already distinguished career, and it was something for which the American taxpayer should be forever grateful.

So, today, Commissioner Koskinen has a similar choice. He can either be remembered as the man who reformed this IRS at a time when Americans were deeply distrustful of it or he can be remembered as the man who allowed himself to be used by the administration for its own political ends. That is the choice.

The bottom line is this. Americans need to be able to trust the IRS again, and that means getting our Nation's tax agency back into the mission it was designed to perform such as processing tax returns, not regulating free speech. The Obama administration's proposed rule has almost nothing to do with actual tax policy. It is more about making harassment of its political opponents the official policy of the IRS. That is completely unacceptable. Remember, this is an agency that has access to some of America's most sensitive personal information: the power to audit, to penalize, to harass—power that is pretty wide-ranging.

So it is not surprising that groups all across the political spectrum, from the ACLU to the Chamber of Commerce, have expressed concerns about this rule.

Let's be clear. Let's be perfectly clear. Commissioner Koskinen knows the IRS has no business regulating free speech. He knows that. The eyes of America are on the IRS commissioner. They are counting on him to do the right thing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1845, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1845) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) amendment No. 2714, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2715 (to amendment No. 2714), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 2716, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 2717 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2716), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2718 (to amendment No. 2717), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 2 p.m be equally divided and controlled between the two

leaders or their designees and that all quorum calls during that time also be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in a few hours this Chamber will have the opportunity to restore benefits for 1.7 million American job seekers and help reduce the national deficit by $1.2 billion. I believe my colleagues understand that this is a fiscally responsible way to help job seekers who are still struggling in the aftermath of the great recession.

Unemployment insurance helps people to look for work while at the same time bolstering consumer demand and supporting the economy, which is why the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that renewing unemployment insurance for 1 year will save 200,000 jobs.

This is an imperative. We must do it. On behalf of the families who are struggling, on behalf of our economy that needs the support, this is something which must be done.

Now the question is whether we can move this critical bill forward and send help to those who are struggling through no fault of their own. Everyone understands that to qualify for unemployment insurance, they have to be working and they have to lose their job through no fault of their own, and they have to continue to search for work.

The reality in this market is that there are, in many cases, three applicants for every job. We have all heard the stories when we have gone home to our States.

There is a software engineer who worked for 20 years who has put out 300 resumes and who has followed people around to give them resumes. This individual was so persistent in trying to get a job in financial services that he would show up early in the morning and put his resume in the local newspaper for the head of the bank where he was interviewing. That eventually got him a callback, I am told, but not yet a job. It is very difficult.

We can do what we have always done—help these struggling Americans and help our economy.

At every point in this process, I believe we have responded to the issues raised by our colleagues to try to get this done. Instead of a full year of extended unemployment benefits—which I proposed, which we usually do—we compromised on a short-term extension just to get it done because since December 28 people have lost their benefits. They went off a cliff. Every week an estimated 70,000 more Americans lose their benefits. It is up to 1.7 million now, and it will be several million before this year has run out. So instead of a typical 1-year extension, we are asking for 3 months. Most of it or a large part of it is retroactive to make up to those people who lost their benefits beginning on December 28.

I was joined—and I must thank him for his tremendous leadership—by Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada. This is a bipartisan effort because this unemployment problem—particularly this long-term unemployment problem—knows no political dimension or geographic dimension or ethnic or gender dimension. It is an American problem, and Senator HELLER and I are responding in a bipartisan way. We put what we thought was a pathway to provide immediate aid to these job seekers and to give us enough time to work through these complex issues many of my colleagues have raised, issues such as, can we make the program, overall, more effective? Can we incentivize individuals to seek employment more efficiently? Can we integrate training? All of those are important issues, but in the context of a 3-month emergency extension, the first thing to do is to get the relief to the people and then sit down and conscientiously and deliberately work on the details.

When this concession on the short term extension wasn't enough to break the filibuster, Democrats put forth another proposal, again after consultation with our Republican colleagues. I thank Senator HELLER, Senator COLLINS, Senator PORTMAN, Senator COATS, and many others who consciously and conscientiously provided thoughts, provided input, et cetera. So this process was not ''my way or the highway.'' This was trying to find a bipartisan pathway, and we are still searching.

Based on those comments, we proposed a fully paid-for extension of unemployment insurance. We started off with 11½ months fully paid for. We used the pay-for that would have been an extension of the mandatory savings agreed to in the bipartisan budget agreement, which had been endorsed by House Budget Committee chairman PAUL RYAN. We also included in that proposal, the long-term proposal, a major policy change proposed by Senator PORTMAN addressing overlapping unemployment and disability insurance payments. None of these were easy to accept on our side.

The tradition has been unpaid-for unemployment extensions. Very few times have we paid for these benefits because they are considered emergency spending. This is an emergency. People are struggling out there. But we accepted the premise which our Republican colleagues suggested that this has to be paid for. Then we also accepted the premise that we couldn't pay for it with tax revenues. It would have to be paid for with something else. So we took a proposal that was embedded in the budget and we tried to use that together with a proposal that was first presented by Senator PORTMAN. But we had a vote, a cloture vote, and none of our Republican colleagues supported it.

Then we had a vote on the underlying measure, the short-term extension, the 3-month extension unpaid-for offered by Senator HELLER and me—Senator HELLER joined us on that vote, and I thank him for that—but we still did not have the significant number of Republican colleagues necessary not only to move this measure forward but also to do the right thing.

We are here today and we have had another round of extensive discussions, consultations, and we are now about to pay for a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits. Some of it is retroactive, all of it is fully paid for. I will point out that it is February and this extension will go forward until March. We are reaching the point, ironically, where we might have more retroactive payments than prospective payments. That is why we have to move and we have to move today.

It is not everything we wanted, certainly. As I said initially, we would have preferred a full year to give people certainty for the year. We would have, as we have done more times than not, declared it emergency spending. But in order to conscientiously and thoughtfully and cooperatively and collaboratively work with our colleagues, we have continually agreed to make concessions. I used to think that was the nature of political compromise, principled political compromise, and we have tried.

Now we have a 3-month bill that is paid for by a technique called pension smoothing, which we have enacted on a bipartisan basis. In fact, the vote was 79 to 19 in the 2012 Transportation bill, MAP–21. So this is not a controversial pay-for. This is something we have embraced before. It is something that does not involve raising revenues, which is one of the benchmarks our colleagues laid down. So we have a short-term, fully paid-for UI benefit which can go out immediately to people who are suffering and which is paid for by a noncontroversial mechanism.

Essentially, it will do what I think we have been requested to do by our colleagues on the other side. Our request is simply, support us in this effort so that we can get this legislation accomplished.

One of the interesting things about this pay-for is that not only is it in the Transportation bill—due to expire, and we will extend it—but also it has been used on numerous occasions by colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pay for a various assembly of different legislative proposals. So this is not a controversial mechanism. I don't think unemployment insurance is controversial. I think people hopefully recognize that it is necessary in this situation.

We have also included a provision in this proposal that has been championed aggressively and thoughtfully by Senator COBURN that will bar individuals with income of over $1 million from receiving Federal unemployment insurance benefits. It has passed this Chamber by a vote of 100 to 0.

The other factor which I would argue to my colleagues is that as we pay for this extension, we are also able to approve $1.2 billion over 10 years to reduce the deficit.

If my colleagues are looking for proposals that are fully paid for, reduce

the deficit, and provide needed assistance to Americans who have worked, are looking for work, and desperately want a job, we need their vote this afternoon. I hope we can move forward on this bill and help unemployed Americans who are searching for work, help employers—this pension-smoothing mechanism helps employers—and also reduce the deficit. That is a very good trifecta, something I think we should support.

The other point I want to make is that the notion that unemployment insurance, Federal long-term benefits, should be a political issue is in stark contrast to its history. Congress has renewed UI on a bipartisan basis in the past on numerous occasions. We did it three times under President Ronald Reagan. We did it five times under President George W. Bush. That is the precedent to get it done today. That is a pretty good precedent on a bipartisan basis under two Republican Presidents.

One of the questions that comes up is does the Republican leadership—not some of the Members whom we have collaborated with very closely—want this to pass or will they say: No, no, forget the substance, it is so compelling. Let's talk about process. This is about how many amendments we have. This is about whether we can reform and reauthorize an entire legislative program based on a 3-month extension—most of which is rapidly becoming more retroactive, than prospective, than going forward.

I think the American people see through this. The substance is clear. This program has been repeatedly reauthorized to deal with long-term unemployment under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents on a bipartisan basis. It is fully paid for. It is paid for by a noncontroversial technique that does not include raising revenues. In fact, the pay-for is something the corporate world supports.

There are others who might say we are disappointed because there is another major issue out there, and there is; that is, the COLA cuts for military retirees. This is an issue that has to be dealt with, and it will be dealt with. But, I wish to point out that COLA does not become effective—those reductions—until December of 2015. People receiving UI lost their benefits December of last year. They are already suffering. There is no more time for them, in terms of our fixing it, before it takes effect. We need to act today.

Indeed, it has been estimated there are 20,000 veterans who have been denied long-term unemployment benefits because of our failure to extend this. So for those 20,000 veterans, I don't think it would be sufficient to tell them they are not going to get their unemployment insurance because we are worried about what is going to happen in December of 2015 to other veterans. If we want to help veterans right away, today, we can help 20,000 of them by voting for this provision going forward.

Let us help both the unemployed and our veterans and not try to use one group against the other, for a legislative advantage in terms of any one particular measure. The emergency for unemployment insurance that encompasses at least 20,000 veterans is today, not a year or more from now.

We can't turn our back on 1.7 million Americans, with that number growing each week. We have to help them. It has been 40 days since unemployment insurance benefits expired for millions of Americans. That is 40 days too long for those who were downsized with the recession and now find their unemployment insurance benefits being downsized again by Congress—downsized practically to zero.

I also wish to remind my colleagues about some of the reforms we already accomplished in 2012, because many of my colleagues have some very good ideas and they have talked about, well, if we are going to deal with unemployment insurance, let us deal with it in a way we can also make some structural reforms. In 2012, I was part of the conference committee between the House and the Senate where legislation was formally considered in this body, in the other body, and brought to a conference in regular order and we had a very vigorous debate about the structure of unemployment compensation, and significant structural reforms were made to the program.

This is not a situation where we have neglected to look at the unemployment compensation program for years and years and years. It was 2 years ago we made these changes. We strengthened the job search requirement. We have indeed allowed States, if they choose to, to drug screen applicants, which is an extremely controversial provision. That was included because we were responding to particularly many Members of the House of Representatives who said this had to be something the States can do. Well, this is something the States can do. I don't think most States have taken up the option, but this is something they can do.

Indeed, after the House passed this agreement, Representative CAMP issued a statement noting—in his words—the historic reforms of the Federal unemployment programs are an important part of this agreement. These reforms will now help the unemployed get the training and resources they need to move from an unemployment check to a paycheck. The package overturns arcane 1960s-era regulations and allows States to drug screen and test those most at risk.

I am always willing to listen to proposals to make changes, but we have to recognize we made significant changes to this program, in Mr. CAMP's words—revising provisions that had been there since the 1960s, and that was about 2 years ago. So we have made these changes. But we are willing to work in good faith if additional changes are necessary. However, they shouldn't block a 3-month extension, much of it retroactive, that is pending before the Senate today.

Let me make one other point. In the context of this debate, there has been the suggestion that unemployment insurance is in some way inappropriate, immoral. It encourages people to avoid work. It makes us, as Americans, lazy and dependent. That is not what I see when I go back home. What I see are people who say—even recognizing my efforts to try to get this bill passed—that is fine, but what I truly want is a job. I want to work. I want to work for many reasons. One, the $350 a week I get, that barely keeps my family whole. It is a little help for gasoline, a little help with the rent, but I can't live on that. I have to have a job.

By the way, I think most Americans want to work because work defines us. Work gives us not just a place to go but gives meaning to all of us, just as family does. So this notion this is just this program that indulges those who don't want to work is profoundly wrong. Indeed, it is an insult to millions of Americans who desperately want a job.

By definition, unemployment insurance is based on an individual's work history. This is not a program you qualify for by showing up. You have to be let go, basically. You have to be told: We can't keep you anymore. We are sorry. You are a good worker, but we can't keep you. You have to go. In fact, if you are not a good worker, if you are fired for cause, you don't get these benefits. And then they actively have to keep looking for work. As I said, in the 2012 legislative provisions, we gave the States more authority to make that active search much more active, much more real—not perfunctory but an active search.

Because of the obstructions we have seen, most Americans now are just simply eligible for 26 weeks of assistance—the standard program administered by the States. But the Washington Post notes it takes an average job seeker about 32 weeks to get hired, and in some cases even longer because of high unemployment. In my State it is 9.1 percent. There are some States where it is remarkably low because of the particular economic conditions there. But as the Post points out, for the average worker, it is 32 weeks. Those 26 weeks will not cover their unemployment period as they desperately search for work.

The other cruel fact is the longer one is unemployed, the harder it is to get a job. That is what we know from research. That is what we know from our own sense of the economy. So the notion that someone, such as a chemical engineer who has been out of work for 7 months, who has a great work record—the first time he or she has ever lost their job—should take the first thing available to him or her at the lowest cost, the lowest wage, No. 1, I think devalues their lifetime effort; and No. 2, it potentially denies us of their productivity. I would rather see a

chemical engineer work at a job related to chemical engineering than stocking shelves because his productivity, his or her contribution to society, would be much greater doing the job they were trained for and they have the experience to do.

Our Nation is at its best when everyone has the opportunity to put their talents, their skills, and their experience to work. We need to get our country back to full employment. We all know that is the answer. This is an emergency provision, a bridge, if you will, to a job. We have to do more not only to put people back to work but to make the wages they receive allow them to live not just paycheck to paycheck but to live with the sense they are building some security for themselves and their family.

We have the resources to achieve this. We are paying for this provision. We are not putting it on the shoulders of the next generation. We are limiting it to a very short period of time so there is an opportunity to work and look at what we did in 2012 and see if we can do more. The question before us is, Does this Senate have the will to make it happen?

Renewing unemployment insurance isn't the end of our efforts. Our efforts are to get more jobs out there so people don't need unemployment insurance; that it is not 32 weeks to get a new job but is several days, we hope. This is the building block we need to put in place to move forward.

This process, this expiration, has caused Rhode Islanders in my home State great hardship. It is time to end that hardship. So I urge my colleagues to renew this program. This is one of those issues where it simply comes down, in my view, to this: This is the right thing to do. I honestly believe there are many more than 60 of my colleagues who fundamentally believe this is the right thing to do and the right way to do it. The question is, Will they vote that way in a few hours? I hope they do.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

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

IRAN SANCTIONS

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have been receiving a lot of phone calls and emails this week about the issue of Iran. Just last night, almost all of my colleagues on the Republican side and I, led by Senator KIRK, among others, sent a letter to the majority leader asking him to have a vote on additional sanctions on Iran. Of course, these sanctions would be conditioned on failure of the additional negotiations which the administration has announced will begin next week.

I wish to take a moment to explain to people back home, who are—rightfully so—writing and calling us about this issue, what is at stake and what is happening. So I will break it down to the most basic elements.

Iran is a country which, as we all know, beginning in 1979 was overtaken by a radical Islamic revolution which took control of the country and has been a sworn enemy of the United States ever since. In fact, until very recently—and perhaps they still do—after Friday prayers, they used to end them with the chant ''Death to America.''

It is one thing to say those things. It is another to actually do something about it. In fact, Iran has. They have been one of the most active sponsors of terrorism all over this planet but particularly in the Middle East.

We know they are actively engaged in undermining our interests all over the world. They have been linked to terrorist attacks against dignitaries from other countries in other countries abroad. About 2 years ago, a report emerged of the potential that they were trying to plot the assassination of a foreign ambassador here in Washington, DC.

In addition, they participate in things such as cyber attacks against the country, they destabilize their neighbors, and they continue to develop their weapons capability.

In addition to all that which I have just outlined, over the last few years Iran has begun to pursue a nuclear program. In order to have a nuclear weapon, you have to be able to process plutonium. This takes infrastructure, and while people know how to do that per se, it takes a lot of investment of time, energy, and expertise to actually build the facilities to enrich.

You can enrich for peaceful purposes. If you want to have nuclear reactors to power your cities, this requires enrichment up to a certain level. But Iran has gone well beyond that.

This is important for two reasons. The first is that there are plenty of countries in the world who have nuclear energy but don't enrich and don't reprocess. They import that material to use in their reactors. In fact, that is what most countries who have nuclear reactors do.

But the second is that Iran's program has always had strong elements of secrecy. They have had all these secret facilities they hide from the world—and the world is rightfully concerned.

The United Nations Security Council—which is lately usually a pretty useless body, but the United Nations Security Council came up with a resolution demanding that Iran stop the enrichment process. But they kept going. In fact, not so long ago they discovered more secret facilities where Iran was enriching uranium and reprocessing plutonium.

So the administration has made it a high priority, as has its predecessor, to stop that from happening, and they have made clear statements: We are not seeking to contain a nuclear Iran; we want to prevent it. That is the right approach. Now, here is the problem.

We recently entered into these negotiations with Iran to get them to stop, to back away from this. If you want nuclear power, if you want nuclear energy, you can have it without the need to reprocess—like most countries do, like many of our allies do.

The only reason why they even came to the table for those negotiations is because the United States, to be frank—despite the resistance of this administration, which each and every time sanctions and sanctions bills have come before the Congress have threatened to veto them and have blocked them and have been against them—despite all of that, these sanctions have been in place. They have been applied at a global level, and they have created a tremendous amount of pressure on the Iranian economy. As a result, they have come to the table to negotiate—not because the new president, Rouhani, is a reformer, as some like to call him, but because they have so much internal pressure and their economy is under so much duress that they are afraid of what their people may do about it in the long term.

The administration is pretty optimistic about these negotiations which were reached: An interim agreement—a temporary agreement, as they call it. A joint plan of action is the right terminology.

We had Secretary Sherman, who was in charge of those talks, here the other day before the Foreign Relations Committee. Her point is, we accomplished something. We got Iran to stop processing at a certain level and suspend it. That is her point. Now we are going to go into the second phase of negotiating a longer term solution, and we have to give diplomacy a chance.

The problem is that something is lost in translation. Perhaps before the Internet we didn't catch these things, but now we can see these things happening in real-time.

For some reason Iran does not have the same interpretation that the United States does of this joint plan of action.

For example, the head of Iran's atomic energy organization on November 24 said as follows:

> Work at the Arak reactor will continue. . . . Research and development will continue. All our exploration and extraction activities will continue. There are no activities that won't continue.

Their foreign minister on November 27 said:

> Iran will pursue construction at the Arak heavy-water reactor.

This is the same one I was just talking about.

Iran's top nuclear negotiator said—and this is really concerning:

> We can return again to 20-percent enrichment in less than one day, and we can convert the nuclear material again. . . . Therefore, the structure of our nuclear program is preserved . . . we . . . will in no way, never, dismantle our centrifuges.

These are concerning statements. Their foreign minister said something else on CNN on January 22:

> We did not agree to dismantle anything. . . . The White House version both underplays the concessions and overplays Iran's commitments . . . we are not dismantling any centrifuges, we're not dismantling any equipment, we're simply not producing, not enriching over 5%.

The problem is that maybe they are not enriching right now. Or, quite frankly, it would be tough to tell because they have always had secret capabilities we keep finding out about long after they have started. But more complicated is that they are keeping all the process and the equipment in place. If they wanted to—as they accurately said—they could return to enriching at whatever level they wanted in less than 1 day.

Now, we may ask ourselves: Why has Iran agreed to do these sorts of things? Here is what I said at the beginning and I know now to be true more than ever. Here is Iran's strategy. It is the same one employed by North Korea a few years ago:

Let's get into a negotiation. Let's see how many of these sanctions we can get lifted off of our shoulders. But let's not agree to anything that is irreversible.

Here is what they are gambling on. They are gambling that the world's attention will turn to something else; that the sanctions will erode and people will lose the discipline or the willingness to continue; that countries who are export driven want to sell things to Iran or get gasoline and petroleum products from them and will therefore agree to not continue with the sanctions.

Then eventually one day, in 1, 2, 3, 4 years or whenever, they can decide to restart this stuff and suddenly announce: We want to be a nuclear weapons power after all.

Do you know why I know—I don't think, I don't suspect—that Iran wants nuclear weapons? There are two reasons.

The first is because they believe this is the ultimate insurance policy. If they have a nuclear weapon, people can't interfere with their internal politics because they are a nuclear power.

The other reason why I know is because they are developing ballistic missiles. Ballistic missiles are rockets that travel at long distances, and they cost a lot of money to develop and a lot of time. The only reason why you develop that capability is to deliver a nuclear payload, to be able to deliver a nuclear weapon against somebody else far away.

The administration's argument is this is all for domestic consumption. This is all political posturing. This is what the administration is saying in reaction to Iran's top diplomat, who once again yesterday dismissed the Obama administration's demands on its nuclear program.

He said they have no value. The best part of this joint plan of action, he said, is that it is so clear that research and development has no constraint; we can continue research and development and increasing our capabilities; that all stays in place.

What he is really saying is this. Once the world is distracted and America moves to another topic or some other crisis happens somewhere else in the world, then we will do what we want to do.

That is what is happening here, and this is extremely dangerous for the future. Having a nuclear Iran is bad enough, but it isn't going to stop there. If Iran develops a nuclear capability and a nuclear weapon, every other country around them is going to want one as well. Saudi Arabia is going to want one. Potentially, Turkey is going to want one. Eventually, one day Egypt could want one. Could you imagine four or five nuclear weapons powers in the most unstable, dangerous region in the world? This is where we are headed.

What about these countries who don't enrich right now? South Korea is an example. We ask them not to enrich. We tell them: You don't need to enrich. We provide this stuff. How are we going to argue to them not to enrich now? How are we going to tell Jordan and Saudi Arabia and other countries: You shouldn't enrich but we have agreed to allow Iran to keep enriching? So we are going to tell our friends and allies: You can't have this capability; you shouldn't have this capability; but we are going to tell an enemy of this country and of world peace that they can?

This is why we want a vote on these sanctions. We don't have room for error here. We do not have the space to be wrong. We can't afford to be wrong.

There is no guarantee sanctions will prevent Iran from going nuclear, but it will make it extremely painful. It will influence their cost benefit analysis.

Failure to put these sanctions in place is already having an impact. Every day we see news reports of businessmen in Europe and around the world flooding to Iran on the idea sanctions might be eroding. How are we going to pull that back? We won't be able to.

I don't completely dismiss the notions the administration is saying. It is ideal to reach a negotiated solution with Iran. But we have to be wise. We have to learn the lessons of history, and we have to understand human nature. Iran's regime wants a nuclear weapon because it gives them supremacy in the region and they believe it makes them immune to outside pressure and interference in their internal affairs. They are headed for a weapon, and they are using these negotiations to buy time.

There are 59 Members of this Senate who have signed on to a sanctions bill and one Senator is preventing a vote on it, and that is wrong. We should have a vote on a matter of this importance. The use of procedural motions and the power of the majority leader to prevent a vote on something of this importance has extraordinary long-term implications on our national security.

Let me just close by making one more point in this regard. I recently read statements that those of us who want more sanctions are banging the war drum. That is false. On the contrary. We believe that a failure to put sanctions in place increases the likelihood of an armed conflict with Iran. Are we prepared to allow Iran to become a nuclear weapons power?

We are going into these negotiations with one arm tied behind our back. They are saying: Under no circumstances will we ever agree not to enrich, and we are saying we are open to that.

I am saying this on the floor so that it is recorded and so people know where I stood on this before it happened. If Iran is allowed to maintain any sort of enrichment capability within our lifetime—in fact, I believe before the end of this decade, God forbid—Iran will have a nuclear weapon and one day we will wake up to the news that they have tested a device or proven the capability of having one. When that day comes, God help us all.

I hope we can have a vote on the Senate floor on this issue. Let's have a debate on it. Let's have a frank and open discussion about it. Why are we preventing that from happening? Why is the majority leader preventing that from happening? It is inexcusable. It is unacceptable.

I hope we will have a vote on it sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday the Congressional Budget Office reported—and it continues to be the buzz about town—the latest report known as the long-term outlook. Of course, we know from the news that its report on the Affordable Care Act is absolutely devastating.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare will reduce full-time employment by 2 million workers in the year 2017 and 2.5 million by the year 2024. The reason for that is pretty clear. With the employer mandate and the additional cost associated with ObamaCare, many employers will simply put people from full-time work onto part-time work in order to avoid the employer mandate and those penalties and additional costs.

We human beings are enormously sensitive to incentives—both positive and negative—and this is predictable, and it is tragic. The Congressional

Budget Office says: The reduction will almost entirely be a reduction in labor force participation and in the number of hours worked.

In other words, this was a piece of legislation that we were told would enormously benefit, not only individual Americans by getting them access to care, but the President said it would benefit the economy as a whole. The sad truth is it is hurting the economy and hurting the very people whom I presume the President wanted to help.

I heard Representative RYAN on the news talk about this as a poverty trap. Of course, many of the folks who supported the Affordable Care Act—and I am thinking about organized labor—have petitioned the President and his allies and said: This is turning into a nightmare for us. This is one of the things they mentioned—people are being moved from full-time work to part-time work.

I might just add, the answer is not to say: We are just going to order an increase of 40 percent in the minimum wage. In other words, you can see that moving people from 40 hours a week to 30 hours a week—perhaps there will be some people who say we will compensate for that. We will order businesses to pay at least $10.10 an hour, when simple common sense tells us that many of the people, again, whom we are trying to help, are the ones who will be hurt the most with high unemployment among minorities and teenagers.

What is a small business going to do when the government orders them to pay $10.10 an hour without regard to the markets or economics? They are going to hire fewer people or perhaps go out of business. This sort of micromanagement and attempts to compensate for the effects of ObamaCare will make things worse, not better.

Needless to say, if the advocates of the Affordable Care Act had understood back in 2009 and 2010 what the facts would turn out to be today, then ObamaCare never would have passed. Millions of Americans said they liked the coverage they already had.

I think the poll numbers I have seen showed between 88 percent to 90 percent of the people said: We like what we have. We would like it to be more affordable, but we like the coverage we have. If these people knew they were going to have their coverage canceled because it failed to meet the mandates of ObamaCare, ObamaCare never would have passed.

The people who liked the coverage they had would still be paying lower premiums than they are being charged in the exchanges under ObamaCare, not to mention the huge deductibles. Families are now being asked to essentially self-insure up to $5,000 for their deductible. They can say you get the tax subsidy and you have better coverage beyond that, but you still have a $5,000 deductible, and those are the first dollars that come out of consumers' pockets. You might as well be self-insured but for catastrophic health care needs. Of course, there is a much cheaper way for people to buy that kind of coverage.

We also know an untold number of Americans would have access to at least 40 hours of work, which is not the case, sadly. Under ObamaCare—and we now know because of the projections of the Congressional Budget Office—things will continue to get worse.

The President's health care law has become a genuine public policy disaster. By the way, even the Congressional Budget Office said at least 30 million people will still be uninsured even if ObamaCare was implemented exactly as advertised. So not even that addresses what I always thought was the main reason for ObamaCare; that is, to cover more people.

ObamaCare is reducing full-time employment at a time when the percentage of people participating in job seeking—the workforce—is at a historic low. Many people have given up. They just quit looking, and they get dropped out of the unemployment statistic. So when the number comes down—and we actually think maybe we are doing better and maybe the economy is stronger. We found out, for example, in December alone that 345,000 people quit looking for jobs. They quit. They got worn out. They gave up because they have been looking for so long and the jobs just are not there.

To be clear, the question in 2009 and 2010 was not whether we would expand health coverage but how we would do it. ObamaCare represented one option, and it is obviously the one our Democratic colleagues chose to adopt on a party-line vote. Despite what the President suggested, yet again, in his State of the Union Message, there are a lot of options out there, so it is not ObamaCare or nothing, which is what is so often mentioned.

I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: We have to have ObamaCare because only then can we cover people with preexisting conditions. That is poppycock. It is not true. We can do it cheaper and more effectively by other alternatives.

We hear people say: The only way young people can be covered up to age 26 is under their family's health care with ObamaCare. That is poppycock too. It is just not true. To suggest that you have to basically have the whole enchilada—you have to buy all of ObamaCare, which is trillions of dollars, along with all of its negative consequences—in order to address these health care concerns is false. It is not true.

If I heard the President say this one time, I heard him say it 1,000 times. He said: If critics of ObamaCare have a better idea, just bring it to me.

I would like to respectfully suggest that the President has a tin ear when it comes to alternatives and he is not listening.

One of the latest proposals came out of three of our best experts on the Republican side on the health care issue: Senator ORRIN HATCH, the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator RICHARD BURR, and Senator Dr. TOM COBURN. They released a comprehensive blueprint for what our alternative might look like.

At some point there has to be a resolution because policies are being canceled. The costs for people with coverage are going up, and it is hurting the economy. It is turning full-time work into part-time work. At some point—I don't know when it is. Maybe it will be sometime after the November election. I am just guessing. At some point we will have to confront this reality and deal with it in order to protect our constituents, the people we are privileged to represent.

The alternative to the government's takeover and the President's command and control—one-sixth of our economy—under ObamaCare is that the government gets to choose, and under our alternative you get to choose.

I wish to highlight a few more of the findings in the Congressional Budget Office report. Last March the President told ABC News that ''for the next 10 years [America's national debt] is going to be in a sustainable place.'' I am afraid the President is falling in a trap because we are living in a surreal time when interest rates are so low because of what the Federal Reserve is doing that, yes, the interest we have to pay on our debt is not as much as it would be if it went back up to historical norms—4 or 5 percent.

By the way, somebody is going to have to pay that back someday. These young people who are sitting here and listening will be the ones left holding the bag, as well as people such as my two daughters who are working in Austin, TX. Somebody is going to have to pay that money back.

For the President to say our debt is sustainable for the next 10 years ignores the fact that we have a moral obligation to deal with it today so as not to dampen the aspiration of these young people by saddling them with a bunch of debt they didn't charge up.

The fact is our debt is highly contingent on three factors: the economic growth of our economy—how fast our economy is growing; inflation is the second one; and interest rates, which I alluded to.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, if America's real economic growth rate were just one-tenth of a percentage lower than it projects currently each year over the next decade, our cumulative debt—the annual difference between what we collect in taxes and what the Federal Government spends over the next 10 years—would go up by $311 billion. That is with a ''b.''

Likewise, if annual inflation was 1 percentage point above what the Congressional Budget Office projects, our cumulative deficit—in other words, the difference between what we bring in, in tax dollars and what the Federal Government spends projected over 10

years—would be $762 billion higher. That is just inflation. Just minor changes in the growth rate or in inflation can have dramatic consequences in terms of the debt. Yes, you don't have to just pay the principle back, you have to pay the interest on that debt.

As I said, interest rates are at historic lows because of the quantitative so-called easing that the Federal Reserve is doing—churning out dollars. Of course it has been a boon to the stock market and the top 1 percent of our economy. Working people are finding their wages have been stagnant for the last 5 years. If interest rates were to rise 1 percentage point above the current Congressional Budget Office baseline each year, our cumulative deficits or our debt would go up $1.5 trillion—that is with a ''t'', not a ''b''—$1.5 trillion.

So these numbers confirm that despite the short-term deficit reduction produced by the Budget Control Act—we have seen some bending of the spending curve under the Budget Control Act; and, of course, those caps have been lifted as a result of the budget negotiations between Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN—America is still dangerously vulnerable to a fiscal shock. We experienced one of those back in 2008, and we are still vulnerable to a fiscal shock, if things change in terms of growth, inflation, and interest rates. Any one of those could have a dramatic impact, making things much more difficult and much worse.

To quote the Congressional Budget Office once again: Over the next decade, debt held by the public will be significantly greater relative to GDP than at any time since just after World War II.

Coming out of a world war, we can understand why the debt was high, but debt held by the public will be significantly greater relative to the economy than at any time since that time, and we haven't had a comparable world war that would justify this huge runup of debt.

They went on to say:

> With debt so large, Federal spending on interest payments alone will increase substantially as interest rates rise to more typical levels.

I mentioned that.

Going on, they say:

> Moreover, because Federal borrowing generally reduces national savings, the capital stock and wages will be smaller than if the debt was lower.

That is what they call the ''crowding out effect.'' So if the Federal Government is borrowing all of this money, it makes it harder and more expensive for the private sector to do the borrowing they need, and there is a crowding-out effect and a depressing effect on economic growth.

America's massive debt is already hurting our economy. It is exacerbating the already difficult situation that people are experiencing when they are looking for work and they can't find work, and the problem will get worse, not better, as time goes by because we have seen the difference inflation, growth, and interest rates can have, which can allow this to spiral out of control. That doesn't even address the other concerns many of us have about the unsustainability of Medicare and Social Security. These are sacred promises we made to our seniors; that those programs would be there for them once they reach a qualifying age, and they will not be, on the current track. These young people, I doubt any of them believe Social Security or Medicare will be there for them. We have a way to deal with that today if we will simply take advantage of that opportunity.

I wish to note that every single Member of the Republican caucus has cosponsored a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I hear it from Members of my own party who have said: You guys weren't all that great when you were in charge; you guys spent money we didn't have, and that is true. We were pikers by comparison, because back in 1997, the debt was $5.3 trillion—$5.3 trillion in 1997. That was the last time we had a vote in the Senate on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and we came within one vote of passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. But today the debt is $17 trillion-plus—$17.2 trillion. The President says our debt is on a sustainable path. It is not true. It is whistling past the graveyard and it is endangering our prosperity and our opportunity, not only for the younger generation but for people today who want to find work and want to provide for their families and pursue their version of the American dream.

We can't defy the laws of fiscal gravity forever, and we can't expect to keep piling up debt without damaging our economy.

I expect next week Senator SANDERS of Vermont will bring a bill to the floor ostensibly to help our veterans—something we all support—but which is unpaid for and would add roughly $25 billion—at least $25 billion—to the national debt. We just can't keep doing this day after day after day without enormous risk.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire on the floor, so I will close with this thought: Here are the sad facts since President Obama took office in January of 2009—admittedly coming off of a fiscal crisis at a very bad place for our economy. This is his record over the last 5 years: The number of long-term unemployed has increased by close to 1.2 million people—increased—and the labor force participation rate I mentioned a moment ago has fallen by 2.9 percent. There are 2.9 percent fewer Americans actually looking for work today than there were in January of 2009.

Here is another sad statistic: Since January 2009, the average amount of time the unemployed have been without a job has nearly doubled. People have doubled the time they have been out of work, looking for work, since January 2009, rising from 19.8 weeks to 37 weeks.

The number of people on food stamps has increased by 48.3 percent, reaching 37.4 million people in October. In 2008, the total cost of the Food Stamp Program—something we all support as a safety net program for the most vulnerable—but we spent $37 billion in 2008, and now it has more than doubled to almost $80 billion. This is under President Obama's 5 years in office.

The number of people receiving Social Security disability has increased from 7.4 million people to 8.9 million. Meanwhile, the total number of Social Security disability beneficiaries, including spouses and children of disabled workers receiving benefits, has increased from 9.3 million to roughly 11 million.

This is not the way it is supposed to be. I know everyone who is out of a job wants a job and the dignity and the self-respect that comes with it. Certainly we need to protect people who are at risk of falling through the safety net, but more than anything we need to give them the opportunity to get back to work and to provide for their family, put food on the table. We can't be content with the status quo, with huge amounts of money being spent on disability, huge amounts of money being spent on food stamps, and huge amounts of money being paid to people who can't even find a job.

We have to get our economy growing again so these folks can lift themselves up and get back in the workforce and provide for their families and pursue their dreams.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I came to the floor because later today the Senate will vote on a short-term extension of emergency unemployment benefits for thousands of citizens in New Hampshire—hundreds of thousands; really over 1 million throughout the country—who are being hurt right now by our failure to act to extend unemployment benefits.

I have heard from a number of New Hampshire constituents since the unemployment insurance extension expired back in December. They make the case much more eloquently than I can about why we need to extend these unemployment benefits. I will read some excerpts from some of those letters.

One of my constituents is a 62-year-old woman from Windham, and she explained that despite her best efforts she will be one of the many long-term unemployed without any unemployment benefits if she doesn't find a job by March. She began working at age 8 delivering papers with her brother. She put herself through college and earned a master's degree with the help of her employer. She wrote:

I am not too proud to do any honest job. I am losing my house and can't afford to pay my mortgage any longer. There are so many of us out there.

Another woman from Windham wrote to me. She is 55 years old. She has held a job since she was 16. Last August, she was laid off in a merger. She has been actively seeking a job in her field, which is health care. She explained that her unemployment check has helped her pay for her essential living expenses. She and her sister take care of their 90-year-old parents in their home, and this income is critical not just to her livelihood but to the care of her parents.

Then we heard from a 58-year-old woman from Merrimack who learned she lost her job in May of 2013 and has had nine interviews but no offers. Without unemployment assistance, she will not be able to afford her car payment, her mortgage, food or utilities.

A constituent wrote to me explaining that after 29 years as a teacher, that teaching job has been eliminated. She has been on unemployment since June. She has applied for nearly 100 jobs. Think about just getting up every day, trying to figure out where you can apply to just have a shot at getting back to work. Her savings are exhausted. She is on the verge of losing her house since her unemployment benefits—her only source of income—have expired. She wrote:

This seems unfair to me. Having worked hard and been a taxpayer into the system all my working life, I fail to see how not extending benefits will be beneficial to me and the 1.3 million other Americans, especially in light of an already fragile economy. Please do your best to remember those of us who never planned to have to depend on unemployment for this long, but who have fallen victims to these times.

Then I did a tele-townhall conference on Monday night. I heard from thousands of people across New Hampshire. One of the people I heard from was a woman named Kathy from Danbury. She told me she had worked since she was 14 and she is now out of a job. Her unemployment benefits have expired and she doesn't know what she is going to do.

We need to think about Kathy and all of the people whom we are hearing from in our offices. We are supposed to represent the people who need help across this country. My constituents are exactly right. We are threatening the fragile economic recovery by failing to extend unemployment insurance.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that the expiration of unemployment insurance is going to cost the economy an additional 310,000 jobs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that each dollar we spend on extending unemployment insurance generates about $1.50 in economic growth. We learned this week that failing to act has already drained more $2.2 billion from the economy, including $1.8 million from New Hampshire, not to mention all of the people whose personal stories are tragic because they want to work, they are out of a job through no fault of their own, and we need to provide them some assistance while they try and get back on their feet, so they do not lose their homes, so they do not lose their cars, so they can put food on their tables.

I urge my colleagues to come together today. It is time for us to act, to support an extension of unemployment insurance. I certainly hope we are going to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I be permitted to engage in a colloquy as in morning business.

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

SMALL BUSINESS TAX CERTAINTY AND GROWTH ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the ongoing debate on unemployment compensation shines a spotlight on the underlying problem; that is, extremely sluggish job growth in our still-lagging economy. Putting people to work is my number one goal.

As American families continue to struggle to get the jobs they need at the wages they deserve, it is more important than ever for Members on both sides of the aisle to come together on legislation to promote economic growth and job creation. Today, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleague Mr. CASEY to discuss our legislation to do exactly that: the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act, which we introduced last year. Our bipartisan legislation focuses on areas of consensus that both parties can embrace to rekindle opportunity by helping small employers start up or grow and create or add good-paying jobs.

It is often said that small businesses are our Nation's job creators, and the data bear that out. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, small businesses generated 65 percent of the net new jobs that were created between 1993 and 2009. Together, America's small businesses employ nearly half of our Nation's workers and generate half of our Nation's GDP.

Even the smallest employers have a huge impact on our economy; 18 percent of all private-sector employees work for businesses with fewer than 20 workers.

Senator CASEY and I recognize that employers cannot grow and add jobs unless they have the money to invest in building and expanding their businesses. That is why our bill focuses on making it easier for them to plan their capital investments and aims to reduce the burden and uncertainty of taxation, all in the name of creating jobs.

Let me explain a few of the provisions of our bill.

First, let me start by stating the obvious: Starting a new business that can hire workers costs money. Our bill eases the tax burden on new employers by permanently doubling the deduction for start-up expenses from $5,000 to $10,000.

There are two other provisions in our bill that affect employers both large and small that we propose to extend: first, the so-called bonus depreciation, and second, the 15-year depreciation for improvements to restaurants and retail facilities. Unfortunately, these important provisions were allowed to expire at the end of last year, causing great uncertainty and thus discouraging investment and the creation of jobs.

Just think about this: The law has reverted to a provision that says that a restaurant has to depreciate its renovations over 39 years. Can you imagine a restaurant waiting to renovate only once every 39 years because it is going to take that long to write off, to depreciate the cost? The 15-year depreciation schedule for improvements is far more realistic.

Our bill also provides certainty for small employers who use section 179 of the tax code. That is the small business expensing provision. Recent studies by the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, which has endorsed our bill, show that the constant changes in the tax code are among the top concerns of small business owners. Indeed, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania and I have both found in talking to smaller employers in our States that they are yearning for some certainty in tax policy. They simply cannot deal with a tax code where one year the deduction is at one level, and the very next year it is uncertain whether Congress is going to renew the provision or let it expire.

The level of expensing allowed under section 179 has been unpredictable from year to year, and has changed four times in the past 7 years. This uncertainty makes it difficult or even impossible for small employers to take full advantage of this tax incentive in their long-term investment planning. Our bill would fix this problem by making the maximum expensing allowable under this section permanent at $250,000 and indexing it for inflation. We also expand the ability of small employers to use simplified methods of accounting.

Let me give a real-life example of what the small business expensing and the bonus depreciation provisions can mean. Last year I spoke with Rob Tod, the founder of Allagash Brewing Company, which is based in Portland, ME. Allagash makes some of the best craft beer in the country. In fact, Maine is known for its craft beers. Well, Rob's operation started out as a one-man show in 1995. In the 19 years since, it has grown into a firm that employs approximately 65 people and distributes craft beer throughout the United States.

Rob noted to me that his company's ability to expand was fueled in part by bonus depreciation and section 179 expensing. New to the craft beer business,

Rob had difficulty obtaining financing on favorable terms, but these cost recovery provisions allowed him to pay less in taxes in the years he acquired the equipment needed to expand his business. Those tax savings were then reinvested in his business, thus creating jobs.

Just think about that. What a difference these provisions made to this company, which has gone from a one-man operation to employing 65 people. This economic benefit is multiplied when you consider the effect of Allagash's investment on the equipment manufacturers, the transportation companies needed to haul new equipment to his brewery, the increased inventory, and the suppliers of the materials needed to brew additional beer.

We are all too familiar with the litany of polls showing how little faith the American people have in their elected leaders and how much they want us to work together to solve our Nation's problems.

I have been privileged to work with Senator CASEY to do exactly that. The legislation that we have introduced is neither a Republican nor a Democratic proposal. It is, instead, a bipartisan plan to help spur America's economy, to assist our small employers, and, most of all, to create good-paying jobs. I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan bill. I would ask our leadership to bring this legislation to restore economic growth and job opportunity to the Senate floor for action as soon as possible.

I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I first want to commend and salute the work that has been done already on this legislation by the senior Senator from Maine and for her leadership. Senator COLLINS appropriately focused on the issue of jobs and jobs creation.

I know in our State at present we are finally below the half million unemployed number. We went many months where the unemployment rates went as high as 550,000 people. It went down, but it hovered around half a million people for far too many months. We are below that. Now we are at about 443,000. That is still a big number—below 7 percent but just by a little bit.

So job creation has to be job one for me and for most of us if not all of us in the Senate. If that is the reality, that our No. 1 obligation is job creation, we have to be able to show the people we represent that we are doing something about it. We cannot do much of anything unless we can get bipartisan cooperation. That is why I am so grateful Senator COLLINS has been willing to work with me on this legislation and to move it forward and to come together as a team to say to both of our leaders that we want to have legislative action on this bill this year.

The reasons are pretty fundamental. If you have run a small business, you know what we are talking about. But even if you have not, even if you have not had that experience, you have encountered the challenges that small business owners face. In some cases it is not just challenges; it is real anxiety and worry that is compounded by uncertainty.

There is uncertainty created by what does not happen in Washington or what does happen. When you shut the government down, that creates not just uncertainty but more than that. But there is also uncertainty when they do not see action here to bring the sides together. I am sure the Presiding Officer, who served as mayor of a big city, knows what it is like to talk to small business owners and to hear about their struggles, which have been especially acute in this very tough economy.

One part of their struggle is that even if they can identify the problem and even maybe the solution to rectify the problem, they cannot hire a team of accountants or lawyers or tax professionals or consultants to help them. They often have to do these things on their own. Giving them some measure of certainty as it relates to tax policy would help enormously.

So that is why we came together on the bill, the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act. Senator COLLINS outlined some of the provisions. Let me just go through a couple of them by way of either reiteration or reemphasis.

One she mentioned is the 15-year depreciation, what is sometimes referred to as the 15-year straight line depreciation schedule for restaurants. Why would we go back to the old policy which was that you had to get your increment—or piece of benefit I would call it—of depreciation in little slices over 39 years.

Why not keep it at 15 years so that business owners know in each of those 15 years they are going to have a negative depreciation. It is a more realistic reflection of the useful economic life of the qualifying asset. It makes all the sense in the world to have that in place.

Senator COLLINS also mentioned faster cost recovery that is reflected directly in a company's bottom line. It frees up cash that can be used to expand business operations and hire new workers. These tax provisions can actually allow folks to have the capacity to hire new workers. This is especially important in the restaurant industry which supports—get this number—535,000 jobs in Pennsylvania alone. That number is 13.5 million jobs nationwide in the restaurant industry.

A study by the National Restaurant Association found that uncertainty about depreciation—the very thing we are talking about—and other tax provisions forced restaurants to forego improvement projects that would have produced around 200,000 jobs nationwide. So just one provision about one type of uncertainty could unleash substantial job creation.

Secondly, the maximum allowable deduction, the so-called 179 expensing. Again, why should a business that is already under tremendous pressure to meet a bottom line, to be able to deliver a product or a service, and has all of those pressures—why should that business not have the certainty to know that this year and next year and for as long as they are in business, they can depend upon, rely upon a deduction level that is set at $250,000 instead of fluctuating as that number has fluctuated.

So making that deduction permanent is critically important. This section, this so-called section 179, allows taxpayers to fully deduct certain capital asset purchases in the year that they make the purchase. This type of extension provides an important incentive for businesses to make capital investments. We want them to make those investments. But we cannot just say to them: Go ahead and make that investment, and we hope we can help you in some uncertain way.

We need to tell them that the rules of the road are going to be much more certain. That is the one provision that we believe should be made permanent.

The deduction under this section 179 has changed three times in the past 6 years. This unpredictably makes it difficult for businesses to plan, for obvious reasons, and neutralizes much of the impact. It is not worth much if you are not sure it is going to be in place the next year. So by making it permanent and indexing it to inflation is a very important point.

By indexing it, the bill provides the kind of certainty that businesses need to take full advantage so that they can hire more workers—just what we are hoping they will do and just what we hope we can help them do.

A third provision, the so-called bonus depreciation, would help small businesses in much the same way as the expensing rules I just talked about. The bonus depreciation allows companies to expense half the cost. Imagine that—half the cost of qualifying assets that they buy and put into service in the same year. It provides an added incentive. Again, that word is important because we try to put Tax Code provisions in place that incentivize the kinds of actions that lead to job growth.

Here are two studies I will cite quickly. In a 2013 report the U.S. Treasury Office of Tax Analysis concluded that this particular provision, the 50-percent bonus depreciation policy, increased small business investment by 31.2 percent between 2008 and 2009. Whether you count that as 2 or 3 years, it is a rather short time period. That provision alone, that bonus depreciation, increased small business investment by more than 31 percent.

A separate report from the same department, the Treasury Department, said that this provision lowered the cost of capital by 44.1 percent. So no matter how you measure it, this bonus

depreciation policy works. It creates jobs, and it will keep working if we put it in place and provide added incentive.

Two more provisions on deductions for start-up expenses are very important. In the accounting rules—we have heard this for years—just by doubling that threshold level for one particular type of accounting and allowing firms to have more leeway with those accounting rules, they will have much more certainty and a much better policy.

In 2010, another study by the Kauffman Foundation found that start-ups and young firms were responsible for most of the job growth in our economy, creating 3 million jobs per year on average.

So when you add up all of this, it is really about common sense. I do not say that in a theoretical way. We know these provisions work. We are certain of that. There is no dispute that each of those policies is directly responsible for substantial job growth. So that is the first thing we know. Second, we know they are supported across the board by both parties.

Every Member of the Senate, even the newest Members, at one time or another has either voted for one of these provisions or supported it. So it makes sense in terms of the dynamic of how to get bipartisan legislation done here. We should put ourselves as best we can to stand, so-called, in the shoes of others. We should try to stand in the shoes of small business owners, try to understand what they are up against, and try to understand some of the pressures they face.

One of the most difficult problems they face is something as simple as uncertainty. Putting these provisions in place would remove a substantial degree of uncertainty. If we can do that, they can unleash job creation the likes of which we probably have not seen in the last couple of years.

I am grateful that Senator COLLINS was willing to work with me to move forward with this bipartisan legislation which will be an effective and a proven creator of jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks. I think it is obvious that both of us have reached out to employers in our States and asked them what would make a difference. What would allow you to create new jobs, preserve the ones you have, and pay your workers more?

To a person, they identified provisions in the Tax Code, the uncertainty that occurs when they expire, the difficulty to plan and to hire new workers when you do not know what the Tax Code is going to be. That formed the basis for our bipartisan bill. We listened to what employers were telling us. I hope more of our colleagues will help us bring this bill to the Senate floor.

Every day that I am talking to an employer in Maine, I am asked: Are the provisions that expired at the end of last year going to be renewed? Will they be retroactive? Can we count on them?

They put their hiring plans on hold until we give them the certainty that they deserve. So, again, it has been a great honor to work with my colleague. I do urge our leaders to bring this important bill to the Senate floor.

Madam President, I do have another statement that I would like to give seeing no one seeking the Senate floor. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL CURRIER

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, the world's best athletes have come together in Sochi, Russia, for the 22nd Winter Olympic Games. Among them is Russell Currier, from the small northern Maine town of Stockholm. It is in Aroostook County. It is very near Caribou where I grew up. I rise today to celebrate the determination, hard work, and community spirit that enables Russell Currier to represent our great country in the Olympic Games.

Russell competes in the biathlon, the demanding and increasingly popular sport that combines cross-country skiing with sharpshooting. He secured his place on America's team by winning three out of four qualifying races in January at the U.S. biathlon Olympic trials.

But Russell's snow-covered trail to Russia began long before that. Fourteen years ago, as a seventh grader, he joined the local Nordic skiing program. A former coach described him as a quiet youngster with no particular interest in the sport.

That quickly changed. The next year, Russell won a county-wide middle school championship. The year after that, he won third place at the junior nationals. Caring coaches and encouraging teammates lit a fire in him that burns so brightly today.

On Russell's personal profile on the U.S. Olympic Team Web site, he wrote that his favorite quote is, ''Less talking, more doing.'' He has embraced that motto with all of his strength, and his perseverance has turned his Olympic dream into a goal he has achieved.

I have a particular rooting interest in Russell's success. He and his parents, Debbie and Chris, are graduates of Caribou High School, as am I. Debbie and I grew up spending summers at Madawaska Lake at camps that were very near each other, and we spent endless summers playing together. I have known this wonderful family for many years, and I am thrilled for them. While the world watches the Winter Olympics, the entire population of Aroostook County and indeed of all of Maine will be riveted to the biathlon competition.

As the name suggests, the town of Stockholm, ME, was settled by Swedish immigrants. When the first 21 families came to Aroostook County in the 1870s, they brought with them an unsurpassed work ethic, a strong sense of community, and a love of skiing. In fact, the entire ski industry of Maine, both Nordic and alpine, can be traced to these hardy, outdoors-loving newcomers.

Nearly a century and a half later, the work ethic and the love of skiing remains strong, and the sense of community is more powerful than ever. When Russell won his place on the U.S. team, friends and neighbors held a fundraiser, a spaghetti dinner at Caribou High School, serving up more than 300 spaghetti dinners so Russell's parents, Debbie and Chris, could make the long and expensive trip to Russia to cheer on their son.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article the local newspaper, the Aroostook Republican, published on the community's support behind the Currier family.

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

[From the Aroostook Republican]

BENEFIT SUPPER SENDS CURRIERS TO SOCHI

(By Theron Larkins)

CARIBOU.—By now, Russell Currier is a household name for residents all over Aroostook County and Sunday night was a time to congratulate and support his family, as many County residents attended a benefit supper held at the Caribou High School.

The goal of the event was to raise enough money through donations to send Russell's parents to Sochi, Russia, where they will soon be able to watch their son compete for Olympic gold. Thanks to hundreds, who came from all over Aroostook County to attend the benefit, well over $6,000 was raised to send Debbie and Chris Currier to the Sochi Winter Games.

There were a number of students, 'teachers and community members who volunteered at the event. Whether volunteers were serving food, taking donations, or playing piano in the background, the towns of greater Caribou were well represented, as citizens came to show their support and appreciation for the pride Russell has brought to the region.

One Stockholm resident, who came out to show his support was Russell's former coach and director of competitive programs for Maine Winter Sports Center, Will Sweetser, Sweetser coached Russell since junior high, but he certainly recognized Russell's success was aided by much more than just his coach, es.

''They say it takes a community to raise an athlete, and I think you can really see that in this room today,'' said Sweetser.

Currier, who is already training for the Winter Games, in Italy, could not be in attendance at the supper, due to the rigorous schedule typical of any Olympic athlete. However, that didn't hinder the community's reminiscing. Friends and family stayed well beyond the supper's two-hour allotted time to eat and share their stories about a young Russell, as they watched a slideshow of photos capturing the native son not only on the slopes, but in a number of candid moments, as well.

''A lot of people I've seen here tonight, throughout Russell's entire career, have given pretty selflessly and everyone is really excited to see him reach this point,'' said Sweetser.

As Sweetser pointed out, a large number came out to back the Currier family during this hectic time. The last few weeks have been overwhelming for all of us, as Debbie Currier, told many attendees, but the community coming together in such a way has undoubtedly helped cope with the stress.

''It's wonderful, it really is,'' said Debbie. ''I see all the faces who have come out to support us, a lot of the parents who had children that grew up playing sports with either my daughter or Russell, they've all just been so supportive over the years. Since this whole thing started we've been able to go to all the venues in different towns and meet all the people who are part of the skiing community, and it's really awesome that so many came,'' she added.

When asked how special it would be for Russell to have his parents able to attend such a major event, Debbie's reply may not have been what would expect.

''Well, in the beginning he didn't really want us to come, That's why, originally, we didn't have plans to go,'' she said. ''But, I wanted to go so badly. I think he's kind of worried. We are not travelers. We've never been to any of his races outside of Maine and New Brunswick, so our very first event to go to in Europe will he the Olympics, and it's in Russia at a time when things are so unsettled.''

The concern over the last few weeks in relation to continuous terrorist threats, in Russia, may be worrisome for many, but 10,000 Americans are still expected to make their way to snowy Sochi for the event. A spate of suicide bombings and jihadist threats during the last months have left potential travelers wary of attending the Winter Games but Russian and American security forces are vehemently working to put minds at ease.

Many precautions are being taken, not only by Vladimir Putin's specially assigned task forces, but the U.S. will also deploy two Navy ships to the Black Sea to evacuate Americans should an incident occur.

The concerns regarding safety at the upcoming Winter Games is certainly something that neither Russell, nor his parents are overlooking, but for the most part the Curriers have faith in the joint effort, between the Russians and Americans, to keep athletes and spectators safe. Security within the Olympic circle remains extremely tight, yet there's still concern pertaining to transit points and scanning areas leading into the venue. If nothing else, the terrorist threats have succeeded in creating an atmosphere of paranoia that is tainting what has always been a jovial celebration of sport and country.

Andrew Kuchins of the Center for Strategic & International Studies in Washington told journalists recently that Russian authorities want to handle security alone, even though the country ''has no experience with an event of this magnitude.''

Thousands of tickets have yet to be sold for numerous events in Sochi and there is a growing concern that the increase in security will disturb the very nature of the Games. While no country has yet withdrawn from the Games, many are taking extra precautions, including the U.S. Olympic Committee, which will be providing its own set of protective agents and has advised American athletes against wearing any clothing that may identify them as part of the team.

''I think it worries him, but it worries us that he's there too,'' said Debbie Currier.

Despite the negative publicity and numerous threats surrounding the Games there is a sense that authorities are doing everything possible to keep the event a celebration rather than a tragedy, and Debbie and the rest of the Currier family are confident that everything will go according to plan.

The U.S. Biathlon Association sent out some information to help guide us and they seem to think it's safe enough. They believe that Russian and American authorities are doing everything they can to keep us all safe.''

The Curriers are planning to leave Caribou on Feb. 5th and hope to be landing in Moscow sometime late the next day.

Ms. COLLINS. Russell's dedication and his community spirit have a strong ally in this remarkable story, the Maine Winter Sports Center. The center was founded in 1999, with the purpose of rekindling Aroostook County's skiing heritage, spurring economic development in that rural region, bringing families together in wholesome recreation, and countering the sedentary lifestyle that leads to so many health problems among our greater population. The Center's world-class facilities in Fort Kent and Presque Isle, ME, have hosted national and international cross-country and biathlon competitions. For the 2006 and 2010 Olympics, 13 Members of the U.S. biathlon team trained at the Maine Winter Sports Center, but Russell is the first homegrown Olympian to come up entirely through the center's program.

Russell Currier demonstrates that growing up in a community that works hard and works together can be such a great advantage when combined with individual desire, determination, and skill. The success Russell has achieved in realizing his Olympic dream and the support along the way that he has received are truly inspiring.

I am so proud of Russell and all who helped him achieve his dream. I wish him and his teammates all the best.

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

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

EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ''FIRST TVA CITY''

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate a special occasion for the Tennessee Valley Authority and the city of Tupelo, MS.

Eighty years ago, on February 7, 1934, Tupelo, MS, became the first city to receive electricity from the Tennessee Valley Authority. If you visit today, you will see the sign at the intersection of Gloster and Main Streets proclaiming Tupelo as the ''First T-V-A City.''

Tupelo's connection to TVA power has had a tremendous impact, improving the quality of life and economic well-being for residents of Tupelo, the State of Mississippi, and across the South. The success helped Northeast Mississippi become a pioneer of rural electrification. As a resident of Tupelo myself, I am proud of the partnership Mississippi has built with TVA over the past eight decades.

Anyone who has experienced a power outage can attest to our reliance on electricity today. It touches almost every aspect of our lives. But imagine a time when access to electricity was confined to major cities and densely populated areas. Luxuries such as the radio, the washing machine, and the refrigerator were known only to those who lived in cities because it was not profitable for energy companies to provide electricity to rural areas.

In those days, the difference between life with electricity and life without it was so great that a large migration was taking place from rural to urban areas. Already impoverished regions of the country were at risk of lagging even further behind.

Like much of the rural South, Mississippi struggled with restricted access to electricity and the economic limitations it perpetuated. It became clear that improving rural life depended on access to electricity.

By 1930 nearly 85 percent of homes in large urban areas had electrical service, but barely 10 percent of rural homes had the same access. In Mississippi, only 1.5 percent of farm homes had electricity—the lowest in the country.

The creation of the TVA was a game changer. As America spiraled into a devastating depression, Mississippi Congressman John Rankin worked with Nebraska Senator George William Norris to improve and expand rural electrification. The result of their efforts was the TVA Act, passed by Congress on May 18, 1933. TVA began serving Mississippians in 1933 and powering Tupelo in 1934. The goal was simple: to improve the living and economic conditions of seven Southeastern States. By providing affordable electricity to rural communities, TVA was an important economic boost, delivering a needed commodity to one of the country's poorest regions.

Tupelo's proximity to the Wilson Dam on the Tennessee River enabled it to become the first TVA city in 1934, allowing its residents to purchase electricity at some of the most affordable rates in the country. This completely revolutionized life for the citizens of Tupelo and even more Mississippians as TVA expanded.

About 50 miles north of Tupelo, the town of Corinth, MS, was also at the forefront of rural electrification, proving that an electric power cooperative could work. In McPeters Furniture Store, ''The Corinth Experiment'' led to the creation of the Alcorn County Electric Power Association—the first electric power cooperative in the United States.

In November of 1934 President Franklin Delano Roosevelt came to Northeast Mississippi, stopping in Corinth and Tupelo. We still talk about that visit today.

The effort and dedication of the communities in Northeast Mississippi paid off. From 1930 to 1940 the number of farm homes in the State with electricity skyrocketed from 4,792 to 27,670. Today TVA provides reliable, clean,

low-cost energy to more than 332,000 households in Mississippi.

The TVA of 1934 is much different from the Tennessee Valley Authority of 2014. Eighty years ago hydroelectric dams provided TVA's power. Since then, TVA has developed coal, nuclear, natural gas, and renewable energy—all of the above serving approximately 9 million customers in seven States.

I look forward to TVA's continued success, and I congratulate the many Mississippians who have contributed to the legacy of TVA over the past 80 years.

Madam 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. FRANKEN. 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. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling on the Senate to pass an extension of emergency unemployment insurance. I am deeply disappointed and frustrated that millions of hard-working Americans are now wondering how they will put food on their family's table and a roof over their heads because Washington has been unable to extend critical unemployment insurance.

A few weeks ago we had a bipartisan vote to move forward with debate on the extension of what is called emergency unemployment compensation. I hope we can build on that vote and move forward as quickly as possible to restore this vital lifeline before more Americans who have worked hard and followed the rules their entire lives slip from middle class into poverty.

The expiration of emergency unemployment insurance is an urgent problem for tens of thousands of Minnesotans and for millions of Americans. At the end of this past year, unemployment insurance expired for 1.3 million Americans, including 8,500 Minnesotans. If we don't renew that unemployment insurance over the next year, this lifeline will run out for another 3.6 million Americans, including 65,500 Minnesotans. These are real people. These are fathers and mothers. They are people whose families and local communities are struggling.

As I have traveled around Minnesota, I have had the chance to speak with many of the Minnesotans who are affected by the expiration of unemployment insurance. It is not the fault of these people or these workers who have lost their jobs.

Very often, these workers were just unlucky enough to be working in the wrong sector of the economy at the wrong time. Sometimes they were from communities that lost a large employer.

A few weeks ago I held a roundtable with unemployed workers who have been helped by unemployment insurance. These are long-term unemployed. There were also some workforce professionals who are helping these folks and others find jobs in today's recovering economy. The unemployed women I spoke with—Ann, Amy, and Robin—had been working and paying taxes for unemployment insurance for decades. One of them is in her forties, a mom with two kids, one a 3-year-old. The other two women are older workers, one in her fifties, the other in her early sixties. The one in her fifties was a meeting planner. When the recession hit, businesses cut costs by holding fewer meetings, and she couldn't find a job in her field but is trying to find a job in any field. These women had all been skilling up, getting the skills they could to try to get an office job and be more conversant in Excel or some computer program.

All the Minnesotans I have spoken with have been working hard to find jobs, but they face a tough situation in our economy. In November the Labor Department reported that for every job opening there are almost three people seeking jobs. That doesn't mean you will get a job if you apply for three jobs. A few weeks ago a job counselor in Minnesota told me that there are often hundreds of applicants for every good job posting and that these jobs are often filled internally. I am glad businesses are hiring from within or promoting from within, but it is stories such as these that highlight why we need emergency unemployment—to help those workers who were working in a sector that has experienced a major downturn or live in a community where it is particularly hard to find a job and particularly if they are of a certain age.

One of the women I met at the roundtable, Ann from Eden Prairie, had also written me. What she told me really illustrates the situation so many Minnesotans are facing. Ann wrote:

> I have been extremely active in my job search, but have regrettably not found new employment. My Minnesota Unemployment Insurance ran out last week and I applied for Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation just this past week . . . I ask you to please ask yourself what you would do to provide for your family. I have a 9 year old daughter . . . and a 3 year old son. I am the sole provider for my family . . . I am not looking for a handout, nor do I believe that staying on unemployment insurance is in my best interest. But the $483 a week it provides will at least allow me to make my mortgage payment.

Ann is remarkably articulate. She volunteers at her son's school, partly because she wants to be involved in her son's life but also to network. One of the counselors there said: The hardest job there is is looking for a job.

Minnesotans such as Ann and the millions of Americans around the country in the same situation have worked for decades. Every one of these women had worked and been paying into unemployment insurance for decades. They don't deserve to be punished or to lose their homes because they are unable to find a job within 26 weeks. Often, they need unemployment insurance so they can put gas in the car to look for a job or so they can keep their phone.

The economy is recovering, but things are still tough for many people. Now is not the time to cut off unemployment insurance. Not only is unemployment still above average, but the long-term unemployed—workers who have been looking for work for at least 6 months—make up 37 percent of today's unemployed. Congress has never allowed extended unemployment insurance to expire when the long-term unemployment rate is as high as it is today. Today the 2.5-percent long-term unemployment rate is nearly double the level it was when previous emergency benefits were allowed to expire, and the current unemployment rate of 6.7 percent is 1.1 percentage points higher than when George W. Bush signed the current round of emergency unemployment compensation into law.

We know the unemployment crisis is not over. It remains a significant issue for workers, especially older workers, who experience longer periods of unemployment than younger workers when they lose their jobs.

Extending unemployment insurance also makes economic sense. In 2011 the Congressional Budget Office stated that aid to the unemployed is among the policies with ''the largest effects on output and employment per dollar of budgetary costs.'' CBO estimates that extending benefits through 2014 would help expand the economy and contribute to the creation of an additional 200,000 jobs. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that without a full-year extension, the economy will generate 240,000 fewer jobs by the end of 2014.

Unemployment insurance has been shown to help people stay in the workforce, allowing them to contribute to our economic recovery rather than slip into poverty. The Census Bureau estimates that unemployment benefits have kept 2.5 million people who are trying to stay in the workforce out of poverty in 2012 alone and have kept 11 million unemployed workers out of poverty since 2008.

Extending unemployment insurance for those who need it is far from the only thing we should be doing to help people get back to work. I have spoken many times about one of my highest priorities in this area—addressing the skills gap by supporting workforce training partnerships between businesses and community and technical colleges. There are other things we should be doing, such as rebuilding our infrastructure. But it would be a tremendous mistake to fail to renew the unemployment insurance that has lapsed.

People such as Ann and Robin and all those I meet around the State of Minnesota, and the millions of others around the country, when they are

looking really hard for work, are spending hours a day looking for work, almost 24 hours a day because they keep their phones on. They are thinking about it constantly. Let's not pull the rug out from under them now. They are trying to catch up in an economy that is recovering but still has a long way to go. We shouldn't be jeopardizing their families' economic security and we shouldn't be jeopardizing our Nation's economic recovery with a short-sighted decision like letting this critical safety net expire.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to speak of my colleague, our friend Senator BAUCUS, who hopefully will be confirmed by the Senate to his new post in a few hours.

I have, of course, known Senator BAUCUS since I came to the Senate, but even before, one of my first impressions of him was a picture of Senator BAUCUS in his white cowboy hat on his ranch in Montana. To me, a kid from New York City, he looked like the Marlboro Man. He was handsome and he was in the cowboy hat. So I said: Wow.

When I met Senator BAUCUS, I found his heart, his brain, and his soul were every bit as good as the outside. He was a great leader of the Finance Committee. First, he had great intellect. MAX BAUCUS would see an issue, understand the issue, and get to the heart of the issue quicker than almost anybody else. He understood the vagaries of legislation, and he knew how to try to get things done. He always worked in a bipartisan way. He reached out to Republicans, and many criticized him sometimes for doing it, but given the gridlock in this body, in retrospect, everybody would think: Wow, that is what we should be doing. And he tried and tried.

Of course, his crowning legislative achievement was health care. I know there are some—particularly on the other side of the aisle—who criticize it, but I have no doubt that MAX BAUCUS will be regarded as a giant in what he did in coming up with the health care reform bill. I have no doubt that as the kinks are worked out and as the effort moves forward, it will be regarded as one of the pieces of landmark legislation of this decade and this century, and it wouldn't have happened without MAX BAUCUS.

There are 37 million Americans who now have access to health insurance, a whole generation of young adults who will be insured through the age of 26, and protection of all Americans with preexisting conditions because of the diligence, the never-give-up attitude Senator BAUCUS had. On so many other things in the bill—getting after the private insurance companies; now community health centers are providing health care for the poorest among us in a better way—this is one of many issues on which MAX BAUCUS took the lead.

As I say, he was a premier legislator, worked long and hard, figured out what he thought the right thing to do was, tried to get colleagues from the other side of the aisle as well as on our side of the aisle to support it, and then got it done. The list of his accomplishments is long. He took the bull by the horns, never backing off.

I know Senator BAUCUS will be an outstanding ambassador to China. It is one of the most important foreign policy positions our country has to offer, and having someone with MAX BAUCUS's acute mind, great persistence, good heart, and good soul will mean a lot.

Not only are we going to miss MAX, we are going to very much miss his wife Mel. She is terrific. They met not too long ago, and I know how happy they make each other. I think it makes all of us feel happy as well.

MAX, you are truly the best of the ''Last Best Place,'' and we will all miss you.

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

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I rise to talk about the impact of the Affordable Care Act on the workplace. A report by the Congressional Budget Office came out yesterday stating that the number of jobs affected by the Affordable Care Act was triple what they estimated in 2009. At that time they estimated this would cost us up to 800,000 jobs. Yesterday they said it would cost us up to 2.3 million jobs. I guess those who voted for it didn't have an impartial observer tell them that there would be substantial workplace costs. Now that same group, after looking at the application and how the law is going to affect people, says there will be three times as many jobs lost because of people moving from full-time work to part-time work.

This is another strong indication that the Affordable Care Act has not been good for the workplace, and I think we are seeing more and more that the Affordable Care Act is not good for most people. I am sure that out there somewhere—just the law of averages—there are people who benefit. I think there are other ways we could have reached out to those people and included them.

I have some emails and letters that were addressed to my office that I will read into the RECORD. We verified all of the correspondence with the people involved. We wanted to make sure we could use their first names so I could talk about this, and I believe the people who wrote us—some stories are beyond belief—were well intentioned.

John, from Farmington, MO, said he is one of the founding shareholders for his company and has been since 1975. They provided insurance for their employees and their families, but this year their insurance person came to them and said there will be a 50-percent increase when they renew their coverage later this year. In this small company, they are currently paying $12,000 a month and will be paying $18,000 a month. John says: We are a profitable business, but we are not so profitable that $6,000 a month doesn't make a big difference to us when our insurance premiums go up 50 percent.

Lisa, in Baldwin, MO, said she is an insurance broker. She contacted us to talk about the examples many of her clients have had and the way they were affected by the health care bill. This is one of her letters:

> I have a family of five people—a husband, wife, and three children—who were paying $437/month for a Health Savings Account plan. Their rate for a comparable plan under ACA was $805/month.

So that $437 this family was paying—if they replace that, along with everything else they are doing in a given month—is now $805.

She says:

> I have quoted plans for numerous people over the last few months. All have lesser benefits than what they currently have and are far more expensive.

She doesn't say ''some,'' she says ''most.'' And this is coming from someone who does this for a living. She said that in every case she has quoted, there have been higher costs and fewer benefits.

William, from Desloge, MO, said that his wife had a pacemaker installed 3 years ago. He goes on to say:

> Recently, she called to set up a follow-up checkup on the pacemaker with her hospital. She was told that due to the budget constraints placed on the hospital due to the Affordable Care Act they no longer provide those services.

According to William, instead of driving 10 miles for these services, they have to drive 60 miles one way. They have to drive 120 to 150 miles to go to one of the places located in St. Louis when they used to drive just 10 miles. The reason the hospital gave is that the Affordable Care Act has created that.

This is a letter from a broker:

> I have a client in her late 50s who makes $20,000 and qualifies for the subsidy. Even with the subsidy, her premium was around $300 a month for the lowest possible level in the plan.

I think that level is called the bronze plan. For the lowest level plan, her subsidy is $300 a month, and that was about 50 percent more than she had been paying for comparable coverage.

Mark and Janet, from Platte City, MO, were informed in September 2013 that as of January 1, 2014, their premiums would double. Here is what they say in their letter:

While we do not think ObamaCare, as it now stands, is good for this nation, at least it was an attempt to do something—

These are people who were hopeful about this and were still not critical of people who were trying to do something—

about out-of-control medical costs. It needs serious revisions and parts of it should be repealed. People in their 60s do not need maternity coverage! And mental health/substance abuse coverage should not be mandatory either.

That is the view of Mark and Janet.

Mary Ann, in Scott City, MO, said she has had continuous health care coverage for 36 years without ever having a day without health insurance coverage. After being diagnosed with cancer, her insurance was canceled and she was forced to get insurance somewhere else. Why was her insurance canceled? She had been in the high-risk pool that the State runs.

In 2009 I proposed other ways to do this and expand those high-risk pools. I think by the time the high-risk pool went out of existence on December 31, there were slightly more than 1,000 people still in it. I think we are eventually going to get 4,000 letters. What were they paying? They were paying 135 percent of the premium everybody else was paying. They had a high risk already, and they were generally able to go to the doctors they wanted. According to the letters we get, they are no longer able to go to the doctors they want. Doctors are important, but, frankly, doctors are even more important if you have been sick. If a doctor has been your doctor through an illness, that is something Mary Ann and others would like to have finished.

Let me read one other:

As of December 23rd, I was finally able to enroll. It's costing me more and I'm getting less. Unbelievably, healthcare.gov wouldn't allow me to enroll my healthy 18-year-old son. I thought he was the healthy young person they needed in order to make this program work.

That may have been a Web site problem. The Web site will be solved. The President said the Web site is working exactly the way it is supposed to, so maybe that has been solved.

I don't think the appeals process is working yet. I am told there are a lot of people appealing information that somehow wrongly got into the Web site. They can't get that solved.

Mary continues to say that the ACA has been a disaster for her and her family. She says: Shame on us for letting this happen. I want my old insurance back. I don't appreciate being mandated at the last minute to buy something that has inferior health coverage. It is administratively inept and costs more. Please resolve this disaster before it gets worse.

Myron, from Hannibal, MO, says:

My company told me last November to go to my wife's group health insurance plan because they didn't know how ObamaCare was going to work out.

On advice from an insurance broker, my company got me off their group policy. As a result, my health insurance premiums went from $198 a month to $549 a month.

Natalie, from Meadville, says:

My health insurance costs for my family of four have doubled and my benefits have decreased. I no longer have office visit benefits and my deductible has gone from $3,500 to $10,000.

She said that she raised her deductible to try to lower her insurance premiums.

She goes on to say:

At the end of 2014, when we are forced to sign up for an Obamacare plan, we will probably cancel our insurance if it is cheaper to pay the penalty.

I can't tell you how many letters we have that say: My premium has gone up and my benefits have gone down. There has been a huge number of people who have contacted us about that.

Pat from Kansas City is worried about her kids, her oldest daughter, and her family. Her premium went from $5,000 to $10,000 a year.

Scott from Lee's Summit says his premium went up 27 percent for himself and his son. He was told it would have gone up 7 percent anyway, but 20 percent of that 27 percent—or actually more than 20 percent—that 20 percent of the increase was because of the change in health care policies.

I think the more we know, the more we know the kinds of things we could do to make the health care system work better. I would like to see us get back to doing that. Until we do, these letters are going to continue to come in, and we are going to continue to try to help these people find a better answer. But the government involvement here may mean there is not a better answer until the government figures out how to create a bigger marketplace and more choices and let people have the health care they think meets their family's needs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order of business right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the unemployment compensation bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I rise to talk about the absolute necessity to pass this unemployment compensation bill. We should do it because it is the morally right thing to do, it is the economically right thing to do. We have listened to our Republican friends, and even though they always said in the past: Do not worry about paying for it—they passed it almost five times under George Bush without paying for it—now all of a sudden they say: Pay for it. We do pay for it in this bill. So I do not know what it is they exactly want.

They claim they are empathetic to people unemployed, the long-term unemployed, and we know that rate is very high—long-term unemployment—even though we have seen in the last, I guess, how many months, 8 million jobs—in about 46 months—but not everybody is fortunate to get those jobs. Clearly, we came out of the worst recession since the Great Depression, brought about by Wall Street. It happened under George W. Bush. We were bleeding jobs—bleeding jobs—700,000, 800,000 jobs a month. It was frightening. The GDP was contracting.

President Obama turned it around. I predict he will go down in history as one of the great Presidents because we were almost flat on our backs, and yet he acted. Luckily, we had a few Republicans who helped us pass that stimulus, which in my State made a huge difference and all over the country. It got us on our feet. We have made reforms that are very important.

I also have to say, the ''Bad News Bears'' on the other side—every day, negative stories and negative stories and negative stories about ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. I daresay, they ignore the millions and millions and millions of Americans who for the first time are able to get affordable health insurance. It is private health insurance, not a government-run system, except for the Medicaid part, which we expanded. The exchanges are private insurance.

They are able to afford it because the way we wrote the bill there are subsidies for the middle class on those exchanges, which is making it affordable for people. You should see the letters I get. I have read many of them and put them in the RECORD. People who had a preexisting condition, who never could get health care before, they write me they are thanking God—thanking God—that we passed that bill. Their kids, who were going to be thrown off their health care, are now on that health insurance until they are 26 years old. Being a woman is no longer an excuse to have your rates doubled and tripled. It is not a preexisting condition to be a woman anymore. If you have diabetes or you have had cancer, you still get your insurance. The insurance company cannot walk out on you just when you need it the most. Come on.

I say to my Republican friends, step up to the plate. Yes, we have kinks in the system. We knew that when we said: If you love your insurance, you could keep it—I admit, I should have said: If it meets the basic standards because we do not want people having junk policies. But we fixed that. The President has stepped up to the plate and fixed that.

So all they do is focus on the negative, while people are on their knees thanking God they have health care, many for the first time.

I am kind of stunned at it, really. I really am. We are ready, willing, and able to fix whatever glitches there are, and the President has been totally honest about the disastrous rollout. We

understand that. Despite that, we have millions and millions of people with new, affordable health care for the first time.

Now we look at extending emergency Federal unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed.

We did not act in December. That was a moral outrage. We did not have the votes. The Republicans are filibustering. We need to get 60. So 1.7 million Americans have lost their extended benefits since the end of December. In my home State, 276,000 people have lost their extended unemployment benefits. Think about it: 276,000 Californians. Some of our States have populations of 600,000, 700,000—276,000 people just in California.

What does that mean? It means they are suffering. It means their families are suffering. It means they are faced with disaster. It also means they cannot go down to the corner store, they cannot go fill their car with gas. They have all these problems and it trickles down through the community and the community is hurting. That is why we know our bill is so important, because it not only helps the individual, it helps the communities.

We know—we know—that GDP is, in fact, affected if we do not act. Last month my colleagues on the other side blocked a one-year extension of unemployment benefits, even after we offered to pay for it. We gave them votes on the amendments of their choice. We gave them everything they asked for. It is never enough. We had one Republican Senator, and I thank Mr. HELLER, who voted for cloture last month.

I just hope my colleagues will listen to the people and support this extension. I would like to, for my remaining time, read to you some of the letters I am getting and emails I am getting from real people—real people.

This is Kristen from Chatsworth:

> I am writing you to please continue to help get an extension on unemployment.
>
> After working over ten years in the clerical field, I was let go and was on unemployment. I have been constantly searching for jobs and after rejection after rejection I have not given up. It is scary to hear that my claim will be up after 26 weeks of unemployment. I do not know how I will make ends meet if they do not extend unemployment.
>
> I know I am not alone on this subject and millions are as scared as I am. I have never been on welfare or any assistance even being a teenage mother.

My friends on the other side are always talking about how if a teenager gets pregnant, she should have the child. Here is someone who did that. We should help this woman. We should help this woman.

Here is another one, Jay from Albany:

> Please keep pushing for the unemployment extension. I am one of those who were cut off in December. I'm 61, have 3 college degrees and am a Vietnam-era veteran.

This is a man who is a Vietnam-era veteran. He has three college degrees. This is what he says:

> I am not a number or a lazy or stupid individual as some Republicans would like you to believe. Those checks are our only lifeline.
>
> With several lay-offs in the last twelve years, the Dot.com crash, and the worst economy of my life, I have sadly had to run through my life savings and 401Ks.

Think about it, having to run through your life savings and your 401(k). Think about it, a veteran who put his life on the line for his country. He is insulted that the Republicans are intimating that he is lazy or stupid—his words. This is what this man writes—and then I am going to yield my time so my friend from Montana can add his eloquence to this—this is what he writes:

> I have worked since I was 15 and fear I may be homeless soon if I don't get those federal unemployment checks.

Listen to what he says:

> I eat one meal a day . . . and I'm starting to feel quite desperate. Please convince . . . your colleagues that this is something we all paid into and desperately need now and not in a month or two.
>
> We are not receiving welfare checks, but checks we worked for and earned. I know you have always stood up for your constituents and those in times of need. I pray—

He writes:

> I pray you are successful along with your fellow senators and representatives.

This is Jay in Albany.

Jay, there are a lot of us here who are not giving up on this. Your voice is heard.

I have to close with this one thing because it is so important. Sylvia from Pasadena—this is how she talks about this:

> I want to be a normal person again and talk with friends and family about my day at work and what I achieved for my company or the recognition I received from my boss. I am not a lazy woman; I want and need to be a normal woman with a fair chance at finding a job.
>
> I want my government to be patient . . . and show some compassion. Instead, I get Members of Congress calling me names and making me feel ashamed for losing my job through no fault of my own, and making me feel desperate because I don't know how I will be paying my bills.

Sylvia writes to me:

> Please don't give up on me Mrs. Boxer. I ask you to continue to fight as I can still provide value to this great country. . . . I believe I'm worthy of a little compassion and not name calling.

These letters move me to tears, and I am not afraid to say it. I am not afraid to say it. Our friends wanted a short-term bill. That is what they have before them. Our friends wanted a pay-for. This is a pay-for they have agreed with. If they do not help us today—when I say ''help us,'' I mean help those who have written to all of us with their stories—they are turning their backs on the backbone of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to very quickly thank the Senator from California for her remarks before I get into my prepared remarks.

We have just come through the worst recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Unemployment is still at 7 percent. We need to get it lower. The bottom line is there are still some folks out there who need some help, and as the economy continues to improve—we are not where we need to be yet—we ought to give those folks the help they need to get back on their feet, to give them the hope they need to reenter the workforce and become valuable parts of our economy again.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

Madam President, there is a beautiful small town in the farthest corner of northwest Montana. The town is called Libby, and it sits in the heart of the Kootenai Valley, surrounded by majestic snow-capped mountains. It is a beautiful place. But despite Libby's postcard-worthy views, the town has a troubled history.

Starting in 1919, mining companies began pulling vermiculite from the mountains outside of town. Vermiculite was used to bake, to build soil in gardens, and to insulate buildings. It was not long before the families of Libby began to pay the price for keeping their fellow Americans warm.

Mining vermiculite exposed Libby's miners and residents to asbestos dust. That asbestos got into their homes, their schools, and—eventually—their lungs. Over the decades, hundreds of folks in Libby died from asbestos exposure, and thousands more continue to suffer today.

When the W.R. Grace company bought the mines in 1963, the company denied that asbestos caused the illnesses plaguing the town's residents. Instead of sounding the alarm, they kept quiet while building corporate profits on the backs of Libby's suffering families and workers.

Word about Libby's fate finally made it to national news in 1999. The plight of Libby's families caught the attention of one man in particular, Montana's senior Senator MAX BAUCUS.

MAX soon began his crusade to get the EPA and the Department of Health and Human Services to take action. Despite MAX bringing countless government officials to northwest Montana to see what asbestos had done to the men, women, and children of Libby, it took 10 years for the government to declare this region a public health emergency, the first of its kind. Thanks to MAX, Libby today is home to a state-of-the-art medical clinic that screens and treats residents for asbestosis.

Thanks to MAX, the Affordable Care Act extended Medicare coverage to everyone in the emergency zone. Thanks to MAX, funds are flowing into Libby to remove asbestos from homes, schools, and playgrounds. Due to MAX's hard work and the determination of the people of Libby, the town is slowly putting the sordid legacy of W.R. Grace in its rearview mirror. MAX's hard work for the people of Libby is the MAX BAUCUS that Montanans have come to know.

But MAX's work for the people of Montana started many years before he

led the fight to help the people of Libby. In the early 1970s when MAX started in public service, he traveled to Butte to meet a fellow by the name of Harp Cote. Harp knew the lay of the land in Butte, but he did not know MAX. MAX did not know Butte. Harp was instantly impressed with MAX's willingness to work or, as Harp said it, MAX's ''fire in the belly.'' MAX asked Harp to introduce him to Butte's leaders and voters. Unlike other candidates, MAX did not want Harp to lobby the folks of Butte on his behalf. Instead, MAX went door to door himself to win their support.

That kind of work ethic, where you put your own shoe leather into the fight, is the reason for MAX's many achievements in Congress, achievements that include saving Social Security from privatization, leading the charge to modernize the Clean Air Act, passing six farm bills and three highway bills to strengthen Montana's and America's economy.

Folks in Washington do not always recognize MAX's hard work. In a town where too many people race for the nearest TV cameras, MAX's preference for hard work does not always do him any favors. That is practically a mortal sin around here. But not for MAX. MAX has represented Montana in Congress since 1975.

His long record of service proves that Montanans do not want a showman. They do not want someone who yells across the aisle. They want someone who will reach across that aisle and find a way to say yes even when saying no is easier to do. It is like the folks in Libby. Montana wants someone who will work hard for them, who will get results and fight to improve our quality of life. Montanans have a soul mate in MAX BAUCUS.

I first met MAX in 1998 at an economic development meeting in Havre, MT. MAX is famous for his economic development summits in Butte. So it was no surprise that we first crossed paths when MAX was working to improve Montana's economy. At that point in his career MAX's record was already impressive.

In 1972, as Director of Montana's constitutional convention, MAX helped pass one of the most progressive state constitutions to date, enshrining protections for clean air, for clean water, and for the right to a quality education into law. He then walked the entire length of our State to introduce himself to Montanans and win a seat in Congress, meeting more men and women along the way like Harp Cote.

As MAX gained experience in the Senate, he became Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Soon thereafter, well into his 50s, MAX hiked 820 miles, from one corner of our State to the other, to earn the support of Montanans during his 1996 reelection. So MAX, in your new role as Ambassador, take my advice and do not try to walk from one end of China to the other.

MAX next rose to become Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. As chairman, MAX did not have the luxury of not getting the job done. The Finance Committee has been home to some of our Nation's hardest-working Senators and greatest examples of bipartisanship because failing to support critical programs like Social Security and Medicare is simply not an option.

On the Finance Committee, you cannot sit back and throw stones. You have to roll up your sleeves, you have to find common ground, and you have to get the job done. That is what MAX did. He passed legislation to reduce Americans' tax burdens, improve children's health, and, most recently, to reform our Nation's broken health care system.

MAX's penchant for hard work and thoughtful, independent-minded leadership stems from another great Montanan that he and I both admire, former Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. MAX met Mike as a teenager, and for many Montanans of today, myself included, MAX connects us to Mike's legacy as a champion for the greater good, as the champion for putting service and sacrifice well before self, and a champion for Montana.

Montana's leaders always put Montana first, and MAX is no exception. Just as Montana has shaped MAX, MAX has shaped Montana. MAX's dedication to our public lands is legendary. Montana is known as the Treasure State because of our incredible natural resources and unrivaled public spaces. From Yellowstone to Glacier, Montana is a place like no other. Throughout his career, MAX has set out to preserve our treasured lands for future generations to enjoy. In 2008, the same year he won reelection and became the first person to win all 56 counties in Montana, MAX helped set aside 320,000 acres of prime hunting and fishing lands across our State.

This land, which will forever be open to the public, is part of MAX's brainchild called the Montana Legacy Project. MAX's love of our outdoors extends to those who share his love. In March of 2000, he came to the Senate floor to remember a young Montanan, Sean-Michael Miles, who had tragically died in a car accident just over a year before.

MAX dedicated a scholarship in Sean's name. MAX repeated Sean's words:

> I know this land may pay a price for being beautiful, as change advances, carrying with it the prospect of loss. It is a land I desperately love. It is a part of me. It hurts so much to care so much. Yet as a westerner, I am invited to breathe it all in deeply each day.

MAX, Sean would be proud of your hard work to preserve our treasured places. I pledge to carry on your efforts so Montanans can continue to cherish our special places and pass our traditions down to our kids and our grandkids.

But it is not a stretch to say that I would not be here if it were not for MAX BAUCUS. MAX has brought world leaders to Butte for his economic development summit. He brought camera crews onto construction sites and small businesses as part of his famous Montana workdays. He operated forklifts in warehouses, made bread in Montana's bakeries, and dug ditches—all to get a better feel for hard-working Montanans each and every day.

He fought for Montana farmers and ranchers who feed our Nation. But he also helped bring a dry-land farmer from Big Sandy, MT, to the Senate. MAX, I cannot tell you how much you have meant to me as a friend, as a partner, as a mentor. I have lost track of how many meetings and rallies we have attended together across our State. But I do know that at each one you have had my back.

So when I arrived in the Senate in 2007, it was because of you that a guy with seven fingers and a flat-top haircut quickly figured how to get from his office to the Senate floor. It is because of you that I had a model for working across the aisle to pass thoughtful, responsible legislation. It is because of you that I always know that I have a friend to turn to when I need advice; that is, because along with your tremendous staff, you have always put Montana first. You have built the Montana Democratic Party into a beacon of common sense, freedom, and opportunity in the West. Our party is stronger because of you and your dedication to our State.

After retiring from the Senate in 1976, Mike Mansfield became the Ambassador to Japan. Now you are posed to continue following in Senator Mansfield's footsteps as Ambassador to China. I know that you will continue to serve Montana, even as you serve our Nation's interests overseas. I wish you the best. While you are gone, I will keep up your fight for Montana, particular the Montanans who need someone to fight for them. Montanans like Les Skramstad. Les was a long-time Libby resident. For years, he saw politicians come to Libby with a promise to help. That help never arrived.

When MAX came to Libby, Les told him he would be watching. Les passed away in 2007 before Libby began getting its help. But MAX keeps Les's photo close because in Montana a promise to help is a promise to keep. That is the Montana way. That is the MAX BAUCUS way.

MAX, it has been an honor to serve with you. It is an honor to call you friend. The Senate will be a lesser body without you. I wish you God's speed and good luck. This is an incredibly important job. I know you are more than up to that task. Thank you for your service to this Senate and to Montana and to this country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. I know we are shortly going to be voting on, among other issues, the nomination of Senator MAX BAUCUS to be the next U.S. Ambassador to China. I would expect that he would have a unanimous, if not nearly unanimous, vote in the Senate.

I said in the Foreign Relations Committee this week that clearly one of the biggest challenges and the biggest opportunities before U.S. foreign policy today is getting the relationship between the United States and China—in the context of our rebalance to the Asia-Pacific—right. I can think of few more able or qualified at this important moment in history than our friend and colleague, the Senator from Montana, to help provide advice and guidance to the President and to Congress about how to get that relationship right.

He is an expert on trade issues. He understands what we face in the coming years as China's economy continues to grow. He is fully aware of the facts that we have had U.S. exports to China that have increased by almost $40 billion in the past 4 years alone, creating and sustaining millions of sustaining U.S. jobs in sectors across the board—automobiles, power generation, machinery, aircraft, and other vital industrial sectors. His trade missions to China, since he has been the chairman of the Finance Committee, have given him the perspective he needs to deal with the realities of our policy options.

From the hearing he clearly understands that through the rest of the 21st century and beyond, much of the strategic, political, and economic future of the world is likely to be shaped by decisions made by Washington, Beijing, and the capitals of Asia over the next 4 to 5 years. How we get that rebalance right is incredibly important, and the Ambassador to China is incredibly important in that regard.

Finally, trade is not the only issue as it relates to China. Our collective security, having China pursue a rules-based system, is incredibly important, as well as what happens in the South China Sea—all of the issues Senator BAUCUS addressed in his nomination hearing with great ability, insight, and a willingness to take them on.

As the very final point, human rights is an incredibly important issue as it relates to China. I want to read briefly from the transcript where he was asked about the question of human rights. He described a moment as a Senator in which he raised the issue with then-President Jiang Zemin.

Senator BAUCUS said:

> He said [the President of China] I did not know what I was are talking about, basically. But then I went to Tibet, went to Lhasa and raised the same point there. And sure enough, within about 2 or 3 weeks, this person was released. . . .
>
> Protection of human rights is the bedrock. It is the underpinning of American and world society. . . . People look to America, look to America to lead on so many issues, including the protection of human rights, religious freedoms, freedom of the press, all the rights that are enumerated in the universal declaration. It is what most progress springs from.
>
> And the answer is yes, Senator [Cardin]. You have my commitment [on human rights].

I think the totality of trade, currency manipulation, security, human rights, and the answers that he gave in his hearing, clearly show manifestly that he is very capable of being the next Ambassador.

I urge a unanimous vote in the Senate, and I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. First let me add my accolades to those of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about Senator BAUCUS. He is superbly prepared to be our next ambassador to China. He is a friend and colleague. The President chose wisely, and I anticipate his confirmation.

In a few minutes we will have the opportunity to provide relief to 1.74 million job seekers, to help local business, to get people back to work, and to do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have thoughtfully engaged with us to find a path forward. Many of their ideas are incorporated into this principled compromise. It has been 40 days since these Americans have had their unemployment insurance cut. Now is the time to act and help our economy grow.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of providing aid to 1.7 million Americans—growing each week by an estimated 70,000. This is the right thing to do. At this moment, this is the right way to do it, and the only question before the Senate is will we do the right thing for the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, it has been over a month since Congress allowed the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program to expire. That means that more than 1.5 million out-of-work Americans—including more than 6,000 Rhode Islanders—have by now lost a critical lifeline. While Republicans obstruct here in Washington, families in Providence and Bristol and Westerly are scrambling to pay the mortgage or keep the heat on in the dead of winter. Over the coming months, thousands more Rhode Islanders will not be eligible to receive extended weeks of unemployment benefits as their regular unemployment benefits expire.

Congress passed—and President Bush signed—the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program in response to the epidemic of joblessness brought on by the great recession, just as we have done during previous economic crises. The program has been extended several times as our Nation continues to struggle under stubbornly high rates of unemployment. Yet Senate Republicans would not agree to extend this lifeline to families before the holidays, and just this week, they voted to prevent us from restoring the emergency assistance.

Even with the worst of the recession behind us, too many Rhode Islanders are still unable to find work. The unemployment rate in my State—9.1 percent in December—remains well above the national average. The sheer depth and duration of this jobs crisis have plunged unprecedented numbers of Americans into long-term unemployment. The share of workers unemployed longer than 6 months is still greater than the previous record set in the early 1980s. Now is not the time to pull the plug on our fellow Americans.

Nationwide, there are three unemployed workers for every available job opening. For some, the jobs just aren't there, and a strategy to make people desperate creates nothing but cruelty.

My Republican colleagues who think this assistance doesn't make a real difference should talk to the 74 year-old woman from Westerly, RI, who contacted my office. She was laid off in July after 11 years with the same company and is still unable to find work. She has moved in with a neighbor to cut costs. She says emergency unemployment assistance helped her keep her head above water.

Those who think extended unemployment discourages people from seeking work should talk to the forty-five-year-old husband and father from West Warwick, who finds himself unemployed for the first time in his life. Since losing his job 5 months ago, he has applied to nearly 100 jobs with no success. With only his wife's wages coming in the door, his emergency unemployment helped this family to barely make ends meet.

Unemployment benefits spent on rent, groceries, and other basics contribute directly to economic activity. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the country could lose 200,000 jobs if unemployment benefits aren't extended.

My senior Senator JACK REED has led the fight to maintain this basic support for Americans still struggling to get back to work. He has worked tirelessly across the aisle to find a thoughtful compromise. Rhode Islanders are grateful for his leadership and he has my full support in the effort to restore emergency unemployment assistance to American workers. The Senate must not turn its back on those struggling the longest to find work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 Reed (RI) amendment No. 2714 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Barbara Boxer, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Elizabeth Warren, Patty Murray, Mark Begich, Sherrod Brown, Jeff Merkley, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2714 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 23 Leg.]

YEAS—58

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—2

Moran	Roberts

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP).

On this vote, the yeas are 58 and the nays are 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the Reed of Rhode Island amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is entered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the benefit of all Members, we are going to have another vote right now on the other cloture motion that has been scheduled. Then the Republican leader has said we can move forward on the Baucus nomination at that time.

I ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Elizabeth Warren, Patty Murray, Mark Begich, Sherrod Brown, Jeff Merkley, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—2

Moran	Roberts

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 43. Three-fifths of the Senate duly chosen and sworn having not voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer a motion to reconsider the previous vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. I know everyone is in a hurry to leave, and I will be very brief. I wish to make sure I am clear where we stand. We are one Republican vote away from restoring unemployment insurance for 1.7 million Americans, including 20,000 veterans who have lost their benefits during the last 5 weeks. We all support this on this side of the aisle.

Right now there is one Republican vote standing between 1.7 million Americans and the lifeline they need to make ends meet. I ask my Republican colleagues to think about the woman from Nevada who is 57 years old. She is couch-surfing. Younger people know a little bit about that term, but I hadn't heard the term before. She has because she has been forced to understand what it is—going around to friends' homes, apartments, and sleeping on their couches. She is 57 years old, worked from the time she was 18 years old. She lost her job and can't find a job. She is long-term unemployed. If she had just lost her job last week or a couple of months ago, she could go get unemployment, but she has been out of work for too long to be able to get it. She has sold everything she has except a clunker of a car, sold all of her personal things so she can buy gas in case she gets an interview.

People are in the same position as she in every State. Our job is to do right by them. All we need is one more Republican vote, one more Republican to step up and do the right thing. We are going to bring this vote up again sometime. I have spoken to my colleague Senator HELLER. I said: Dean, let's get this done. Tell me what is needed to get this done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. REID. Madam President, after having consulted with the Republican leader, I now ask unanimous consent to move to executive session to consider Calendar No. 629, the nomination of our friend MAX BAUCUS to be Ambassador to China; further, I ask that all time be yielded back, with all of the provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS, of Montana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS, of Montana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China?

Mr. REID. Madam President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS (when his name was called). ''Present.''

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Corker	Inhofe
Ayotte	Cornyn	Isakson
Baldwin	Crapo	Johanns
Barrasso	Cruz	Johnson (SD)
Begich	Donnelly	Johnson (WI)
Bennet	Durbin	Kaine
Blumenthal	Enzi	King
Blunt	Feinstein	Kirk
Booker	Fischer	Klobuchar
Boozman	Flake	Landrieu
Boxer	Franken	Leahy
Brown	Gillibrand	Lee
Burr	Graham	Levin
Cantwell	Grassley	Manchin
Cardin	Hagan	Markey
Carper	Harkin	McCain
Casey	Hatch	McCaskill
Chambliss	Heinrich	McConnell
Coats	Heitkamp	Menendez
Cochran	Heller	Merkley
Collins	Hirono	Mikulski
Coons	Hoeven	Murkowski
Murphy	Rubio	Thune
Murray	Sanders	Toomey
Nelson	Schatz	Udall (CO)
Paul	Schumer	Udall (NM)
Portman	Scott	Vitter
Pryor	Sessions	Warner
Reed	Shaheen	Warren
Reid	Shelby	Whitehouse
Risch	Stabenow	Wicker
Rockefeller	Tester	Wyden

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Baucus

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn	Moran	Roberts

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Utah.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I am pleased that my colleague and very dear friend MAX BAUCUS was confirmed by this body the way he was. He will make a fine ambassador to China. We all know what an honorable, decent man he is. We all know of his abilities. We all know he has run a very tough committee, a very important committee, and has done a terrific job in doing so.

All I can say is I rise to wish my good friend Senator MAX BAUCUS good luck as he departs to serve as the next U.S. Ambassador to China.

We are going to miss MAX. I do not think it is fair to this body, but, nevertheless, I think it is fair to our country because MAX will make a great ambassador. Senator BAUCUS first came to the Senate in 1978 and has the distinction of being Montana's longest serving Senator. So, as you can see, I have served with Senator BAUCUS for a long time—longer than the two of us would like to admit sometimes. Over the years I have come to respect his commitment both to his constituents and to his principles. Having worked side by side with him on the Senate Finance Committee, I know a lot about his constituents and his principles. He raises his constituents constantly and his principles I do not think he ever wavered.

If you want to understand my friend MAX BAUCUS's priorities, take a look at the sign on his Senate office desk. Like MAX, it is to the point and unequivocal. The sign says: ''Montana comes first.'' Plain and simple, not much nuance, the language is pretty declarative.

That is MAX BAUCUS. In his long and distinguished Senate career, he always put the people of Montana first.

Both Senator BAUCUS and I are westerners, and westerners expect a certain amount of independence in their Senators. They expect us to work across the aisle and attempt to solve problems and work together.

Of course, we Republicans tend to view that problem-solving as less government and Democrats tend to view that problem-solving as more government. That is not universal, but that is where the two sides usually come down. That being the case, MAX and I have often found ourselves on different sides of some of these issues. However, we share the desire to solve problems and, as MAX's sign says it, to put our constituents' interests first. Senator BAUCUS has always understood that notion very well, and I am here to declare that to everybody who listens.

As a result, his disposition—particularly as chairman of the Finance Committee—has been to try to find a way to a bipartisan yes rather than a partisan no. I have always respected him for that.

Over the last few years, as I have served along side MAX as the ranking member of the Finance Committee, I have greatly appreciated his willingness to put partisan differences aside for the greater good of all.

One adjective you could use to describe Senator BAUCUS is one that was used by his predecessor as chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan. The term I am thinking of is ''indefatigable.''

Whether it was preparing for and running a marathon, walking across the wide expanse of his home State, or working at one of the many jobs he regularly undertook back home on recess visits, MAX has been indefatigable.

He has been a tireless legislator. Just ask his staff. They will affirm that fact. As a Senator, he was always working. I have no doubt he will do the same as our Nation's Ambassador to China, arguably the most important diplomatic post in the world today.

As we saw today, the vote on his confirmation was not even close. That is because all of his colleagues know that MAX BAUCUS is a committed public servant who will serve the American people with competence, dignity, and a tireless commitment to our Nation and its interests.

I have to say I feel personally about this nominee and about this nomination. I like MAX very much. Having served with him on the Senate Finance Committee, he has always tried to be fair. He has always tried to consider the other's point of view. He has always tried to consider different ways of solving problems, and he has worked to do so. That is about all we can ask from our colleagues on the other side—either Democrats or Republicans.

I just want to at this time wish Senator BAUCUS and his lovely wife Melodee and, of course, his family the best of luck in this and all future endeavors.

As MAX departs the Senate, Senator BAUCUS leaves behind a great legacy

and very big shoes to fill. So at this particular point, I hesitate to say farewell to my friend MAX BAUCUS, but I only say farewell knowing that he is going to go on to a very important job for our country, where I think he will do a very good job.

He will have my support as he serves over there, and let's just hope that we on the Finance Committee can do a better job or at least an equivalent job to what Max has done to keep these very important issues on the most important committee of the Congress moving along.

I have nothing but respect for Max. I appreciate him very much. I am his friend, and I intend to continue this friendship as long as we both live.

With that, I congratulate Senator BAUCUS. I am proud of the Senator, and I intend to support him while he is there as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, the Chinese New Year began, as you probably know, just a couple days ago. I do not know a lot of words in Chinese, but among the words I have learned is how to say ''Happy New Year.'' It is a new year in China. It is a new year for Chinese Americans in this country as well. I think the way we say ''Happy New Year'' is ''Gong Xi Fa Cai.'' So I say that to my friend.

When word came out that MAX had been nominated by the President for this role, I say to our friend from Utah, I ran into MAX. He was about to go into an elevator, I think in the Hart Building, and I said: I know the President has nominated you for this, but you can't leave. We need your leadership on tax reform. We need your leadership on an SGR fix and doctors and all these other issues—trade policy. You can't leave now.

He said: Well, the President has nominated me.

I said: Well, I am going to put a hold on your nomination.

He was about to get in the elevator and go away, and he put his head back out and said: Oh no, you are not.

I was tempted. I was tempted because there is a lot he leaves. Actually, I think he leaves at a time when this place is working better. I am encouraged by that. Frankly, I am encouraged by the relationship the Senator has kindled with Senator HATCH. I am encouraged by the relationship the Senator has kindled with our friend DAVE CAMP from Michigan over in the House as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. MAX has set an example for the rest of us.

It is ironic the chairman of the committee and the ranking member are sitting here across the aisle from each other, but the two of them, in terms of providing personal examples—the kind of leadership we need; do as I do, not as I say—both of them are terrific at reaching across the aisle, doing what the people sent us to do: find principled compromises, get things done.

I wish to mention—let me just ask, and he can maybe nod his head—my recollection is, when we took up the issue of whether there should be a Medicare prescription drug program that was supported initially by Senator Kennedy and by President George W. Bush, I think in the end the version that prevailed was the version preferred by President Bush.

My recollection is that Senator BAUCUS may have gone across the aisle and supported that version of the bill and took me and probably another 10 or so Democrats with him—not an easy thing to do.

I remember going back to Delaware—I have told him this story before—I went back to Delaware and held a number of townhall meetings, if you will, on that issue and got excoriated, eviscerated by mostly Democrats. They would come and say: How could you do this? How could you support that prescription drug program, the Medicare Part D Program.

I explained I thought it was a principled compromise. I thought it would work. A year later, it has an 85-percent approval rating by the people who use it. For 6 or 7 straight years—it still has an 85-percent approval rating, a little higher than ours. If you look at how we are doing in terms of anticipated costs, it is 7 years under budget—under budget.

When the time came to try to find a compromise on comprehensive health care reform, I remember the Senator did not just work with 3 or 4 Republican colleagues on the Finance Committee—Senator GRASSLEY, Senator Snowe, Senator ENZI. The Senator did not work with them for a couple of days to try a find a principled compromise, Senator BAUCUS worked with them for weeks—I think months—to try to do that. Ultimately, the Senator was unsuccessful. But the Senator led us through a difficult mark-up in committee and on the floor. I know there are reservations in that law that we should tweak and change and make it better. But I think in the end, the Senator's leadership will be vindicated by a lot of Americans, just like we did with the Medicare prescription drug program. Obviously, that was the right thing to do. Thank you for the leadership you provided.

On a personal level, I would say, as Senator HATCH has said, this is a personal loss to me, and I know to many Democrats and Republicans. But the Senator leaves behind a wonderful legacy. You leave behind a whole lot of people, and they all have their resumes—no, not really. One or two of them may have. But you have a reputation as surrounding yourself with really good people. I sought to do that. I kind of learned from you and Senator HATCH, but I have always sought to surround myself by people smarter than me. My wife always says that it is not hard to find them.

You have done a great job surrounding yourself with terrific people. They are here today sitting behind you, over in the Republican side, up in the galleries—a lot of love here. I hope you feel it from all of us.

In the Navy when people pull up their anchor and prepare to sail off into the sunset or the sunrise, whatever the case may be, we always like to say: Fair winds and a following sea. Fair winds and a following sea. That is what I wish to you and to Mel. We are going to miss you here, but we are really going to miss her. We hope we will have an opportunity to see you again and to work with you again.

We hope the same, that we will have an opportunity to see Mel. We think the world of her. Good luck to both of you. May God bless you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I just want to make a brief statement before Senator BAUCUS speaks and thank him for his service in the Senate, thank him for representing Montana, and accepting some of the toughest assignments in the Senate. We have a similarity in our background. We were both inspired to this position by Senators who served before us; in his case, Senator Mansfield, who was an extraordinary leader in the Senate and an extraordinary man when you consider his contribution to our country. He served in two world wars, if I am not mistaken, perhaps in three different branches of the military. It was just an exceptional life of public service which ended with his ambassadorship to Japan.

Now, Senator BAUCUS, who was inspired to public life by Senator Mansfield and followed in his footsteps in representing the State of Montana, serving in one of the highest leadership spots in the Senate, is now off to an ambassadorship, which, when you consider the ebb and flow of history, is singularly the most important ambassadorial assignment which the United States of America can make.

Today, this overwhelming bipartisan vote in the Senate is a fitting tribute to Senator MAX BAUCUS for his service, his friendship, and his continued dedication to be a servant of our Nation. I wish you and Mel the very best in this new assignment. We hope to get a chance to come to see you, and also, more importantly, to work with you, to make sure that our relationship with China remains strong for decades to come.

Thank you, MAX, for being such a great colleague and a friend.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to my colleague, MAX BAUCUS. Senator BAUCUS has been a leader in the areas of tax, trade, health, agriculture and the environment. I have served with him on the Finance Committee and the Agriculture Committee and have enjoyed working with him and learning from him. On the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS worked to improve the

health care of all Americans, most notably with the passage of the Affordable Care Act. It should also be noted, one of his last acts as a Senator today was to introduce a bipartisan and bicameral agreement on Medicare physician payment reform. On the Agriculture Committee, he was a passionate advocate for farmers. MAX leaves a legacy he should be proud of. I wish him well in China and thank him for his continued service.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate Senator MAX BAUCUS for his confirmation as Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with him for several years in the Senate and on the Finance Committee, which he chairs.

MAX's entire life has been dedicated to public service. He was a member of the Montana House early in his career, before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and then the Senate in 1978. Few people have served as long in the Senate as MAX and led such an illustrious career here. MAX has been behind many landmark pieces of legislation that will benefit people's lives and the country for years to come. As chairman of the Finance Committee, he has influenced so many issues that have an impact on American families every day, from tax policy to pensions, health care, and education.

What is more, I have seen firsthand MAX's unique desire to work with people across the political spectrum. MAX's commonsense approach and collegial nature, learned from growing up on a ranch in Montana, has played a significant role in his ability to get things done. I hope that all Senators will learn from his example. In fact, I believe it is what we must do to best serve the people who elected us.

On behalf of all Floridians, I want to thank MAX for serving his country in the Senate for more than 3 decades. And I wish him well as he follows in the footsteps of his mentor, Senator Mike Mansfield, in becoming Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, MAX BAUCUS has never been afraid of the long haul. As the son of Montana ranchers, he knows the meaning of a long day's work. Before his 1996 election, he walked the length of Montana, more than 800 miles. In 2003, well past his 60th birthday, he ran a 50-mile ultra-marathon.

For the last three decades, I have had the privilege of running a different sort of marathon with MAX. We entered the Senate together after the election of 1978, and have served together since then. Today we mark the end of that marathon, as Senator BAUCUS prepares to become Ambassador Baucus and assume one of our Nation's most important diplomatic posts as ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, MAX BAUCUS has played a central role in some of the most important legislative accomplishments of recent decades. He has helped bring health care coverage to millions of Americans by working toward establishment of the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Affordable Care Act. At the same time, he was worked tirelessly on issues of major importance to Montana, fighting to support his State's agriculture, and to support important educational and economic development initiatives.

He moves from this important role to another. Our relationship with China is more important than ever. Decisions made today will affect that relationship for decades to come. We are seeking to cement a positive relationship, one in which China joins with our friends and allies in the Asia-Pacific Region to support collective security and economic growth, and fosters stability through adhering to international norms. As the representative of the American people in Beijing, MAX will be instrumental in getting and keeping the U.S.-China relationship on a positive footing. He will be in a crucial position to help open Chinese markets to American goods.

I will miss MAX as a friend and a colleague, but I am grateful for his willingness to take on this job, to continue serving his Nation in a new and challenging capacity.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Let me begin by thanking so many of my friends here: Senators DURBIN, CARPER, HATCH, and so many others. I must say to you, you have expressed your remarks, and they mean a lot to me. But they probably mean more to me than I think you know. They mean so much to me. Thank you for what you have said.

I would also like to begin by thanking the people of Montana. The people of Montana have given me the honor of representing them in the Congress for nearly 40 years. It is 39 now, and actually at the end of this year it will be 40 years. I want to thank President Obama very much for the opportunity to serve the American people as Ambassador to China.

I also want to recognize one of the best teammates and friends anyone could ever ask for, Senator JON TESTER. Thank you, JON. There is nothing greater in life than the love of family. I have been an incredibly lucky man. I would like to thank my wife Mel, my son Zeno, his wife Stephanie. I would also to thank our children, Katie and Joey.

Mel, Zeno, Stephanie, Katie, and Joey, you inspire me daily. I am so grateful for each of you. I am so blessed to have Mel in my life. Her energy, her zest for life, her positive outlook, and her love have transformed me. I am the luckiest guy in the world because of Mel. Katie and Joey are clearly inspired by their mother. They are great kids, great achievers. I think the last grades I saw—one is in law school and the other is in college—they had all As. Why? Because they are inspired by their mother. That is why they do so well, in the best sense of the term.

My son Zeno is one of the best kids parents could ever wish for. I am so proud of him. He is so smart, intelligent, and decent. He is currently an assistant U.S. attorney, living in Helena with his wife Stephanie. I am proud of him. You may have read about that case where a lady pushed her husband off a cliff in Glacier Park, MT. He is the prosecutor in that case.

I am very proud of him. Again, an indication of how proud I am of him, I learned more about that case reading the papers than I did from him. He keeps his cards close to his vest and is such a decent, smart, effective guy.

Stephanie, his wife, has jumped right into life in Montana. She is so talented and special, and the Helena community is very lucky to have her.

Thanks so much to my parents Jean and John Baucus. I wish they were here today.

Growing up on a ranch in Montana, you learn the simple lessons, the measure of life. You learn to cherish the land. It gets in your blood. You work hard. It is humbling. There is so much you cannot control working on a ranch. You cannot control the weather, whether it rains or it does not rain. You cannot control the prices. It gives you a little perspective to feel philosophical about life.

On the ranch you are charged also with nurturing life, nurturing livestock, producing a small part of nature's bounty. You have an obligation to learn as a rancher.

It is also the Montana way to love the outdoors. We are outdoors people in Montana. We hunt, we fish, we backpack, we hike, we grow crops, we raise livestock, we mine coal, and we cut timber. I think Montanans are more outdoor people than any other people in the country. We love it. It becomes part of our soul. Montana writer Bud Guthrie said: ''Somehow I am part of it, a mortal partner to eternity.''

I grew up this way, and it shored up my belief that we all have a moral obligation to our kids and grandkids when we leave this place, to leave it in as good a shape or in better shape than we found it. That internal compass is also a lasting gift from my parents and their love of the land. My mom is one of the most special persons one could have the privilege to know. She had the class of Grace Kelly and the spunk and grit of Katherine Hepburn. She was a combination of them both—an intelligent, classy lady, always positive, always upbeat. She was so intelligent and so well read. She even read more books than I did. I would come home at night and say: Mom, what are you reading?

She would tell me all about the book. One she was reading was President Obama's second book, which he wrote when he was a Senator. What do you think about that, mom?

Oh, it is a pretty good book. It has something to say. It is a little long, though.

Anyway, she wrote a note to the President and told him that she liked it. He wrote back, and they became pen pals. It was very nice.

Someone asked me last week what my mother would have thought of all this. She would have been incredibly excited and fascinated with the adventure ahead. Although I miss her every day—in fact, I talked to her every day at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. That hour goes by daily, but I keep thinking of her. She is always on my mind, as is my father. He loaded bombs on airplanes in Europe during World War II. A product of the Great Depression, he instilled in me the values of hard work, humility, and good faith. He worked me hard on the ranch, stacked a lot of hay, a lot of fencing. I know why he did it—for the right reasons. I did not complain because I knew that he was trying to raise me in the way that he hoped would help me later in life.

He was also such a decent person. No one ever spoke an ill word of my father—ever—such a rock solid character. The Republican Party in Montana asked him to run for Governor. He would not have anything to do with it. He did not care about that politics stuff. He was a rancher and liked what he was doing—ranching. I was so blessed to have such great parents.

Now 52 years ago, I was full of youthful idealism and curiosity about life beyond the ranch. I am sure it was caused somewhat by my parents. As a college student at Stanford, I decided to take a year off from my studies between my junior and senior year. I grabbed a knapsack and I hitchhiked around the world for 1 year. It was June-August 1962 to about August-September 1963.

I set out to visit countries I had only imagined—India, Japan, and China, to name a few. Before I departed, I had never thought about a life in public service. But that trip opened my eyes. It charted my course. I realized how people across the globe were interconnected. We are all in this together.

I saw the indispensable role that America plays as a leader on the world stage. It was so obvious. I knew right where I was, in the middle of the then-Belgian Congo, and I had an epiphany. All this realization hit me that we are so connected, that our natural resources are diminishing. Somehow we have to work better together if we are going to have better lives, not only for ourselves but for everyone on the globe. We are so connected.

The world is getting smaller. Our natural resources, in fact, are diminishing. We have to find a way to work better together. I returned home with a commitment to a career where I could improve the lives of my fellow Montanans and of all Americans. I would not be standing here today had it not been for that trip where I hitchhiked around the world, probably the most defining era of my life.

It was by far the most influential, and that 1 year set into motion a series of opportunities to serve that I would never have dreamed would take me back to China to represent the United States 50 years later. When I first ran for statewide office in 1973, no one knew me from Adam. I had been away from the State for many years.

I needed some advice. I had met Mike Mansfield when I was in high school. Instantly there was a man I totally respected and honored. He planted the seed, I know, for later interest in public service. It was not a defining moment, but I could tell at the time. He told me I should run; I should go back home and serve. I was then working at the SEC, just a short distance from here.

If I wanted to run for Congress, he said, it would take a lot of hard work, a lot of shoe leather, and a little bit of luck. I took his advice literally. I wore out as much shoe leather as I knew how. I walked the entire length of the State of Montana from Gardiner in the south—Gardiner is next to Yellowstone Park—up to the Yaak, a remote part of Montana near the Canadian border.

I got to know so many great people who later put me to work for them in the House. It was right in the middle of the Watergate political scandal. I joined a congressional class determined to restore good faith and trust in government, a terrific bunch of folks. They were just great, the ''Watergate class.''

I think of my friends Chris Dodd, TOM HARKIN, Paul Simon, HENRY WAXMAN, and GEORGE MILLER, to name a few. It was a great class. They were running for office and serving for the right reasons.

When I hitchhiked around the globe as a young man, I also realized that no country has a monopoly on religion, culture or virtue. We are all together. We are all in this together. All people basically have the same dreams for their families—to put food on the table, to make ends meet, to take care of the kids, health care they could afford, and a clean environment for their families to explore and enjoy.

The Senate can make people's dreams a reality. We are so lucky as Americans to have this institution under our Constitution written by our very perceptive forefathers. It offers what few institutions in the world can boast—the opportunity to make a difference when history calls.

One of the greatest privileges I have had in this job is having one of the best staffs on the Hill. They are sitting behind me—some of them. They are terrific. They have always been ready with big ideas and dedication to answer history's call. If there is a vanguard of vision, my staff has been in it.

I might say, parenthetically, I am very proud of my staff for another reason. My office has spawned about six marriages. A woman or a man working in my office who didn't know each other until they started working in my office got together and got married—six times—and they have all worked but for one. I don't know, but maybe I worked them too hard or maybe not hard enough. Whatever the reason, over the years after they were married, to see their kids, it has been terrific. It meant so much to me.

How many people have served since the time I have been here? The answer is 1,423 folks have worked on behalf of Montanans and on behalf of Americans, each person making a positive difference to the lives of others.

I thank them all very much.

In the years I have been in the Senate, we voted to send our sons and daughters to fight wars overseas, to protect our national security. I think the strongest human instinct is self-preservation. When you come from a beautiful place such as Montana, and from the wonderful people of our State, you will stop at nothing to defend them.

Montana has a tradition of answering the call to serve. As a matter of fact, more Montanans have volunteered for service per capita than nearly any state in the Nation.

My own nephew Phillip left college to enlist in the Marines. Before long he was far away in Anbar province serving our country. I loved Phillip as a father. His fellow marines looked to him for support, counsel, advice, and leadership as they faced many firefights. He made lance corporal in record time. He gave his life to our Nation and then returned to the family ranch for the very last time.

Phillip, like each one of the fallen heroes who bore our battles, left behind big dreams undone and countless broken hearts. Dust to dust—we still shudder.

President Lincoln concluded his second inaugural address with a call for the Nation to ''care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.'' Lincoln's commitment remains our sacred duty today.

In the Senate we have made progress. We enacted tax credits for businesses that hire veterans and enacted a new GI bill. In the past 10 years Congress has doubled support for the VA. That is an investment of which we should be proud. Someone once wrote: ''In war, there are no unwounded soldiers.'' It is important we remember that. We make the tough votes to authorize war, and we must also find the courage to band together so that our troops return to a nation that honors their service.

Of all the bills that I have worked on, there are two that stand out. In 2010 we took the Montana National Guard's model of improved PTSD screening and expanded it nationwide. That concept of very meaningful PTSD screening began in Montana with the Montana National Guard. It worked so well I got it in the defense bill, and it is now being enacted nationwide to make sure we do the very best to protect our kids who are coming home.

The new screenings have resulted in more than 800,000 servicemembers who

have received personal and private one-on-one attention from a trained health care provider—both before and after deployment. Make no mistake; these screenings are saving lives.

I am also proud of another life-saving bill, the Affordable Care Act. It has been almost 4 years since President Obama signed that act into law, and in that time the law has done more than any other in the past half century to expand access to health coverage. It has provided 71 million Americans free preventive service. More than 6 million seniors have received discounts on vital prescription drugs.

More than 3 million young people have peace of mind knowing they will be allowed to stay on their parents' health plans. I am especially proud that now no child will ever be denied health care coverage because they had been sick or had a preexisting condition.

It has been a tough road. It has been a challenge I am proud to have taken on. While the debate over the law continues, I am proud to stand for it because it is helping millions of Americans.

Take Julie from Helena. Julie wrote to me that she is self-employed and finally able to get access to affordable, quality health care coverage because of the ACA.

John, from Missoula, has a daughter who survived ovarian cancer. Thanks to the ACA, she was able to stay on her parents' insurance and win her battle against cancer.

I am very proud of the role I played in helping to make health care more accessible and more affordable to many Americans.

In this Chamber there are brilliant men and women. With great respect to my colleagues, I insist that, in the most important respect, Senators are just ordinary people—big, not-so-big, tall, short, men and women. We are just people.

It is only through the extraordinary institution of the Senate that the ordinary people have the power to make life better for all Americans. We belong to something bigger than ourselves. When I first came to the Senate, Senators from opposing parties actually had lunch together in the private Senate dining room on the floor below the Chamber. It was called the inner sanctum.

In those daily rituals we learned about each other's families, home States, and developed real friendships. Senators dined together—no spouses, no staff, only Senators from both sides of the aisle. We compared notes, talked about our kids, and talked about our family. We talked about legislation, and we got to know each other. It was wonderful getting to know each other, to build trust, confidence, and understanding. It was the backbone of respect that we all relied upon.

Those friendships provided a refuge from the political firestorms and common ground to turn to after the wrangling over the disagreements of the day.

Now schedules are packed with caucus meetings and political fundraisers. The Senate is losing the spirit of friendship and forgiveness that, in the words of Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, ''is the final oil of harmony in all human relations and which rests upon the contrite recognition that our actions and attitudes are inevitably interpreted in a different light by our friends as well as foes than we interpret them.''

Friendship and forgiveness, that is the oil of human relations that brings us together. That private Senate dining room now carries only the echoes of the friendships once forged at its tables, and we are poorer for it. Yet there is nothing inevitable about this trend. The hope of this body lies in individual Senators. The heart set upon solutions to problems will win over the heart devising traps for political gain.

It is my honor to have friendships that formed the basis for solving some of the Nation's most difficult problems. I will never forget working together with the late Senator John Chafee on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I worked with John for years before finding out he was an amazing war hero, decorated for his service in Korea. He didn't tell us that. It took years before I learned what a hero he was, a self-effacing kind of guy. Few people knew about his war record because he didn't brag about it or use it for political gain. He served because he believed in it, not because he thought he could benefit from it. Without a doubt, we need more John Chafees in the world.

Between 1989 and 1990, we sat together in a small room off the Senate floor, facing wave after wave of unhappy Senators—sometimes until 1 or 2 in the morning. He was the ranking Republican member of the EPW Committee. I became chairman of the Environmental Protection Subcommittee.

Together we met with our colleagues ironing out the compromises on acid rain, ozone depletion, air quality permits, and scores of other issues. Senator Chafee later became chairman of the full committee. We had our disagreements, but by-and-large under Senator Chafee's chairmanship I recall an oasis of civility.

That friendship helped us to pass the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. I am very proud of that effort. I was chairman of the committee at that time, and we finally got it.

It is a small point, but I always respected that he never raised his voice. He was always civil, always decent, always positive, upbeat, and trying to find a solution. John never lost his temper. He listened carefully to the other person's point of view.

He was a paragon of the Senate—as is my good friend from Iowa CHUCK GRASSLEY.

CHUCK and I began our friendship by deciding to meet weekly face-to-face in his office or my office. It turned out to be 5:30 p.m. every Tuesday. We would bring our staffs together. Pretty soon our staffs were talking to each other. The health care staff after a while started talking to each other and our trade staff started talking to each other.

Heck, we were basically one office. If you were a fly on the wall, you would think this was one office where people were trying to get together to solve problems.

CHUCK is a Republican; I am a Democrat. We have differences, but our goal is to solve the problems and find solutions while adhering to our principles.

Our friendship led to a culture of respect and honesty in the Senate Finance Committee that helped us pass important agreements of other bills to expand trading opportunities with the rest of the world. I am especially proud of our work together to successfully shepherd the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003. Senator CARPER referred to it just a short while ago.

I thank my good friend DAVE CAMP. DAVE is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. We have worked together a lot over the past couple of years on tax reform. We have bridged the partisan divide to help pass the most recent highway bill and the payroll tax cut. DAVE is a super, super American and a wonderful man. I am very lucky to have him as a friend.

It has also been a terrific honor working with my good friend Senator ORRIN HATCH.

ORRIN, DAVE, and I recently worked together to introduce Trade Promotion Authority legislation to make Congress a full partner in trade negotiations. In trade, as in so many important areas, working together is the only way to get the job done. The Senator is a real American—ORRIN HATCH. He is the salt of Utah and cares about his State and his country. The Senator is a wonderful person to work with. I can't thank him enough.

Thank you, Senator HATCH.

In 1961, President-elect John F. Kennedy said: ''Our governments, in every branch, at every level, national, State, and local, must be as a city on a hill—constructed and inhabited by men aware of their great trust and their great responsibilities.

If we are indeed a city on the Hill, it rests firmly on the bridges that Senators built when they faced even the deepest of divides. I mention my closest friendships across the aisle because it is those bridges that we lack the most today.

The epiphany I had as a young man hitchhiking around the world 52 years ago I believe is even more relevant today. Advances in technologies and communications have made us more interconnected as people than ever before.

The challenges of globalization bind us even more. Climate change—we are all in this together—terrorism, economic development, and education can

all be addressed with good faith and a commitment to finding common ground.

I am committed in my next chapter to meet these challenges. The United States-China relationship I believe is one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world that will shape global affairs for generations. We must get it right.

Thirty-eight years ago, Mike Mansfield said farewell to this institution by simply declaring: ''There is a time to stay and a time to go.''

Now, as I face my own crossroads, I am humbled to have the opportunity to follow in his footsteps.

As America's ambassador to Japan, Mansfield worked hard to strengthen and improve America's relationship throughout history. I will try to do the same.

Many of you know I love to run. I actually have my eye on the Beijing Marathon—but, to be more honest, maybe I will scale it down to a half-marathon, something a little shorter. When I think about my next endeavor, I am reminded of something a professional runner, Paul Tergat, once said:

Ask yourself: ''Can I give more?'' The answer is usually: Yes.

I can give more; we all can. I thank President Obama for asking me. I am indeed energized to serve America in this new role and to look at this as my sprint to the finish.

I trust Montanans to choose wisely as they have so well with my friend, the great Senator from Montana JON TESTER.

My final message is not for my esteemed peers but for the young people chasing their dreams across the Montana Hi-Line, searching for meaning through the Yellowstone River Valley or climbing toward their future along the Rocky Mountain Front.

The headlines paint the picture that there is no honor in public service. I disagree. I think the greatest noble human endeavor is service—service to friends, service to family, to church, to synagogue. Public service. The most noble human endeavor is service. So I urge you young folks to take up that challenge that politics is not an honorable profession. It is more than honorable. It is an obligation to serve. And I urge you to follow and serve. Choose to serve others. For me, it has been the honor of a lifetime. I am so lucky. And be ready—because history is calling.

It is with deep gratitude and respect that I say for the last time, with full faith in the highest forms of the Senate, I yield the floor. But before doing so, I just have to say I am not going anywhere. I am just taking a trip, maybe for a year or two, across the Pacific—just a trip. I will be coming back because we all are together on different journeys that we take.

I thank all of you, my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I would like to make a few comments about Senator BAUCUS.

Our part of the world has sent to the Senate some of our most distinguished and thoughtful Members. The great Pacific Northwest sent Wayne Morse from my home State to the Senate and Warren Magnuson and Scoop Jackson of Washington State. I note that Senator CANTWELL is here. Frank Church of Idaho was sent to Washington, and, of course, Mike Mansfield, Senator BAUCUS's mentor and pioneer in terms of promoting closer relations between our country and Asia. It is very fitting that this afternoon MAX BAUCUS joins that very special group of Senators from our part of the United States.

Second, I wish to caution Senators on one point, and the distinguished Senator from Utah and I have had a little bit of a laugh about this. MAX is exceptionally friendly, and he always tells Senators: Our paths are going to cross again. I look forward to working with you in the days ahead. And Senator HATCH and I just want everyone here in the Senate: However close you are to Senator BAUCUS, that doesn't mean every Senator can insist that MAX come back from China to talk about the latest twist in the debate about currency manipulation or some other issue.

The last point I want to mention is a personal one. When you are here in the Senate for more than three decades, you deal with scores of bills and amendments, and you talk about coalitions that were built to pass measures that needed to be passed, and from time to time you have to build a coalition to stop something that shouldn't be passed. But what I want to do—out of those thousands of bills and thousands of amendments—is talk about a special Baucus commitment that was especially important to me; that is, the needs of senior citizens.

MAX BAUCUS had some particularly celebrated wins in the fight for seniors—something in which the Presiding Officer of the Senate is very involved. The reality is that the person who did more to stop the privatization of Social Security here on the floor of the Senate was MAX BAUCUS. He was the one who led the coalition. He reached out to Senators on both sides and said: Look, of course we need to save more for private retirement savings, but we are going to do that on top of Social Security, not as a replacement for Social Security. So Senator BAUCUS was there building that coalition, making the case for why this special program, this intergenerational program has been so important for our country.

What I remember best about Senator BAUCUS and seniors, though, is when the Finance Committee blew the whistle on some of these ripoffs in supplements sold to older people, and eventually these supplements really became the delivery system for Medicare as we know it in much of the country. Senator CANTWELL and I, of course, know of the Medicare Advantage Program.

We would have hearings in the Finance Committee where we would hear about efforts in the private sector to sell health insurance to seniors that was not worth the paper on which it was written. I remember—kind of bringing my Gray Panther roots into the cause—talking to MAX about this change and that change, and it would get pretty dense pretty quickly. MAX just said: This is wrong. This is wrong, to rip senior citizens off this way. And we were able to get those changes. The consumer protections MAX BAUCUS locked into the law for the Nation's vulnerable seniors essentially remain the protections of today that are used as the model for senior rights.

Senator CANTWELL and I, since we are both on the committee, also know that in the budget discussions, when it came time for hard choices, MAX always made it a priority to stand up for what are known as the dual eligibles—the seniors who are the most vulnerable, the seniors who don't have political action committees and don't have clout and can't participate in all of what we normally think of as today's politics, from fundraising to all of the grassroots work.

I will close by saying that when you see somebody week in and week out stand for the most vulnerable people in society, such as those dual eligibles, you learn a lot about what a person feels strongly about, what values are important to them. So I want to close by saying that when we talk about the Senators from our part of the world—and Senator CANTWELL remembers so well the legendary Warren Magnuson and Scoop Jackson and Frank Church, who, by the way, was chair of the Senate Select Committee on Aging. I met him for the first time when I was director of the Gray Panthers and had a full head of hair and good looks. MAX was always on those issues, year after year after year.

I hope today, as we reflect on his contributions and certainly all the bills and amendments he offered in the Senate Finance Committee, people will also remember that there is a reason MAX belongs with those distinguished Senators I mentioned from the Pacific Northwest. It is because he had a heart for people, he had a heart for seniors, and he had the values that represent the best in public service.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I too come to the floor to say goodbye to our colleague from Montana and wish him well in his new endeavor as Ambassador to China—something the Pacific Northwest cares dearly about. So I know we will be working with him in his new capacity, but it really is a very historic moment for all of us and certainly for those of us in the Pacific Northwest.

I will never forget MAX and I riding back to our offices on the subway once

and talking about the Inland Empire. I think people thought we were making something up, but that is how we refer to our part of the country and the interior, which is this huge economy that is built on agriculture, built on trade, built on natural resources that we hold so dear and for which we fight.

To come to the Senate and to sit in the seat Scoop Jackson once held and think about how you will have the wherewithal and ability to remember all of what Scoop and Maggie and everybody fought for and to know the incarnation of that is right there in MAX BAUCUS, the person who worked with them, who saw them, and who then carried that torch on these important policy issues, to me, is so important to recognize today because he really is a legislator in the mold of Magnuson and Jackson.

I thank MAX for one thing in particular; that is, doing deals. Around here people sometimes criticize doing deals. But you know what. The art of compromise and moving our country forward requires that, and MAX became a model dealmaker in the context of these important policies on which we have worked, whether the modernization of the trade legislation for dislocated workers and expanding that program and making it more robust because it needed to be modernized or whether some of the changes we have made to CHIP, because I can tell you he certainly helped us in Washington State in making sure we had our fair share as regards the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Just speaking about CHIP in general, I can't say enough about CHIP as a program. When you get discouraged around here about what we are actually getting done or what problems we are solving, if you think of nothing else but CHIP—just the Children's Health Insurance Program—and literally giving health insurance to millions of children across America who wouldn't automatically get health insurance, this job is worth it right here and now. So I thank MAX for that.

Certainly on the Affordable Care Act I have often said that MAX applied his marathon skills to the patience of Job in actually crafting that legislation. I think we probably worked every day for 2 years in committee to make that legislation a reality, and it took a lot of patience. Many times late at night I would have lost my patience with the process and our colleagues, but MAX didn't, and the end result is that this country is moving forward on a major health care policy that I know 30 or 40 years from now will be in the same category as our other key programs such as Social Security and Medicare, as a foundation and as a base of what we are doing to make sure people have affordable health care in this country.

MAX, I thank you for the staff you hired as well because in the Finance Committee, while we didn't always agree on every single policy, they also came to the table ready to make things happen, and I certainly appreciate that.

To my colleagues, I feel as though we really are losing a piece of our institution today and somebody who really understood the issues that I care about in the Pacific Northwest and somebody who really knew how to make things happen. I know our path forward is a new course on the Finance Committee, but I hope we will continue in the way that MAX brought forth issues because in the end it is about improving the lives of the people we represent, and that means we are not always going to agree, but we are going to have to put ideas on the table and we are going to have to get them passed into law.

So, MAX, as you go across the big Pacific, I know you will remember us, but we will be looking to you too because there is a lot we have to get done. I know that as you are running around Beijing, you will have that little app they now have that shows the level of pollution in Beijing that comes right off the U.S. Embassy, and you will be talking to the Chinese about how we have to work together on a clean energy strategy, and we will applaud you for that. But don't forget all of us here because there is a lot of work to be done. We are very proud to call you a former colleague and a key leader in the history of the Inland Empire. Thank you very much, MAX.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this past Sunday before the Super Bowl, President Obama sat down for an interview.

The President was asked about the failure of his healthcare.gov Web site. He talked about how there are always glitches with technology. But then he said this about the Web site:

> It got fixed within a month and a half, it was up and running and now it's working the way it's supposed to.

According to the President of the United States, healthcare.gov is now ''working the way it's supposed to.'' The President of the United States is in denial.

This is an incredible statement that he has made. I find it especially hard to believe, when I looked at the Washington Post the next morning—on Monday, the day after the President's interview where he said ''it's working the way it's supposed to.''

Then look at the headline on the front page of the Washington Post on Monday, ''Health site can't handle appeals.'' Thousands of requests for fixes were filed but unprocessed.

Is this what the President of the United States means when he says now ''it's working the way it's supposed to?'' Is the President oblivious to what is happening in this country with his signature piece of legislation? According to this article:

> Tens of thousands of people who discovered that HealthCare.gov made mistakes as they were signing up for a health care plan are confronting a new roadblock: The government cannot yet fix the errors.

The President may think it is perfect, but there are a lot of errors with his Web site. To say it is working the way it is supposed to, to me, cites Presidential denial.

''About 22,000 Americans,'' the article says. Is this what President Obama means when he says the Web site is working ''the way it's supposed to''? I am talking about the front page of the Washington Post, above the fold. One woman quoted in the article says that because of a mistake by the Web site, she is paying $100 a month more than she should and her deductible is $4,000 too high. She said she needed the insurance, and now she is stuck.

Is this what President Obama thought the Web site was supposed to do? Was it supposed to overcharge this woman $100 a month and set her deductible too high by $4,000? Was it supposed to prevent her from appealing that mistake?

You are stuck with it. The mistake was made by the Web site. You are stuck. This is what the President seems to think.

Here is another headline which ran on Monday, the day after the President's interview. This was in the Anchorage Daily News in Alaska. It says, ''Enroll Alaska mistakenly releases hundreds of e-mail addresses.''

Alaska is one of the States which doesn't use their own exchange. They are part of the Federal exchange which uses healthcare.gov.

The article says:

> Enroll Alaska mistakenly released about 300 email addresses Monday afternoon when an employee sent out a mass message about a healthcare.gov glitch without masking its recipients.

So, No. 1, there was a glitch. Remember, the President says now ''it's working the way it's supposed to.'' So there was a glitch; they sent out an email explaining the glitch, and they end up releasing all of the people's personal email addresses when they are trying to point out to the incompetence of the Web site in the first place. Is this the way President Obama thinks things are supposed to work with his Web site?

This is the kind of security issue many of us have been worried about from the beginning. People have to provide a lot of their personal information in this Web site—financial information, health information, Social Security number, demographic information. There is not enough assurance the information is being properly protected.

So this time they sent out people's email addresses. Maybe next time they

will send out people's Social Security numbers, their health information, their financial information or other personal information.

That is not even talking about the lack of security on the Web site and whether hackers can break in and steal information. This is just human error, carelessness, and what people connected to the site are sending out by mistake. It is a very real concern.

For the President to not take this seriously—and I believe he doesn't take it seriously. I believe he has his head in the sand on all of this, and he has dug in on this law. For the President to not take this seriously and say that everything is going ''the way it's supposed to'' is a very real problem with the man in the White House.

That is just the Web site. That is what the President was talking about in the interview. What else about the health care law is working the way it is supposed to, I ask the Presiding Officer.

Is it the millions of people who will be dropping out of the labor force because of the law? On Tuesday morning, the Congressional Budget Office said that is exactly what is going to happen.

Here is how the papers reported it:

The New York Times, ''Health Care Law Projected to Cut the Labor Force.''

The Wall Street Journal, ''Health Law to Cut Into Labor Force.''

Here is how The Hill put it, ''ObamaCare will cost 2.5M workers by 2024.''

Is this the way the Obama administration thinks its health care law is supposed to work? They are actually saying, yes, it is. Jason Furman, the President's top economist, said the health care law ''is helping labor markets, is helping businesses, and is helping jobs.''

Helping labor markets?

Because of the failed policies of the Obama administration, we have the lowest labor force participation rate in 35 years. People have given up looking for work. The administration should be doing all it can to increase the labor force participation, not celebrating that its health care law is going to push that number even lower.

Middle-class Americans all across this country have seen their insurance premiums go up significantly because of the health care law's costly mandates. They have seen their deductibles go up. Millions of hard-working Americans have had their insurance policies canceled. Why? Because of the law.

Now we are seeing people's personal information put at risk and we are seeing the damage the law is doing to the labor force.

President Obama says, ''It's working just the way it's supposed to.'' The President is wrong. The Web site is not working and his health care law isn't working. It is not working for the American people.

The Web site is just the tip of the iceberg. People are finding they can't keep their insurance even if they like it. The front page story today of the Wall Street Journal: It is harder to keep your doctor, even if you want to keep your doctor, in spite of the President's promise.

We have millions who have had their policies canceled, others losing their doctors. We have seen premium costs go up, we have seen deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses go up and the issue of security fraud.

The Web site is a problem. The Web site failure is just a tip of the iceberg. It is time to get rid of this terrible health care law and replace it with real reform before it does additional damage to America's labor force and to the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about one of our greatest national security challenges, which is a nuclear-armed Iran. I have long thought of it as a bipartisan national security issue, not a partisan political issue. At the end of the day, it is a national security issue we must approach in the spirit of bipartisanship and unity, which has been the spirit for which we have worked together on this matter. I hope we will not find ourselves in a partisan process trying to force a vote on a national security matter before its appropriate time.

Let me say at the outset that I support the administration's diplomatic efforts. I have always supported a two-track policy of diplomacy and sanctions. At the same time, I am convinced that we should only relieve pressure on Iran in exchange for verifiable concessions that will dismantle Iran's nuclear program. Our success should be measured in years, not months, and that it be done in such a way that alarm bells will sound from Vienna to Washington should Iran restart its program anytime in the next 20 to 30 years.

I am here to unequivocally state my intention as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to make absolutely certain that any deal we may reach with Iran is verifiable, effective, and prevents them from ever developing even one nuclear weapon.

Let's remember that while we in the Senate are not at the negotiating table, we have a tremendous stake in the outcome and an obligation, as a separate coequal branch of government representing the American people, to provide oversight and an expression of what we expect as to what the end result would be. But it is the administration that is at the negotiating table with the Iranians, not us. The administration is ultimately responsible for negotiating a deal to conclusively end Iran's illicit nuclear program. It is the administration that will have to come back to Congress and tell us whether Iran will continue to be a nuclear threshold state.

My sincere desire is for the administration to succeed. No one has worked harder for a peaceful outcome or to get Iran to comply with sanctions than I have. But based on the parameters described in the Joint Plan of Action and Iranian comments in the days that have followed, I am very concerned. This is not a ''nothing ventured, nothing gained'' enterprise. We have placed our incredibly effective international sanctions regime on the line without clearly defining the parameters of what we expect in a final agreement.

Ali Akbar Salehi, head of Iran's nuclear agency, spoke last month about the agreement on Iranian state television and said:

> The iceberg of sanctions is melting while our centrifuges are also still working. This is our greatest achievement.

Well, it is my greatest fear.

Any final deal must require Iran to dismantle large portions of its illicit nuclear program. Any final deal must require Iran to halt its advanced centrifuge and research and development activities, reduce the vast majority of its 20,000 centrifuges, close the Fordo facility, stop the heavy-water reactor at Arak from ever possibly coming online, and it should require Iran's full disclosure of its nuclear activities, including its weaponization activities. For the good of the region and the world, Iran cannot remain a nuclear weapon threshold state, period.

A final agreement should move back the timeline for a nuclear breakout capability to beyond a year and insist on a long-term, 20-year-plus monitoring and verification agreement. That is the only way to force Iran to abandon its nuclear weapons aspirations. Anything else will leave Iran on the cusp of becoming a nuclear state while it rebuilds its economy and improves its ability to break out at a future day.

David Albright, a respected former International Atomic Energy Agency inspector, said that for Iran to move from an interim to a final agreement, it would have to close the Fordo facility and remove between 15,000 and 16,000 of its 20,000 centrifuges. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he had a long list of elements that he thinks are critical toward a final agreement.

However, even after such dramatic steps, we are looking at a breakout time of between 6 and 8 months—depending on whether Iran has access to just 3.5 percent enriched uranium or access to 20 percent enriched uranium. DENNIS ROSS, one of America's preeminent diplomats and foreign policy analysts who has served Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has said Iran should retain no more than 10

percent of its centrifuges, which is, in essence, no more than 2,000.

These estimates are crucial because at the end of the day we in this body will have to decide whether this is enough to merit terminating sanctions. Is a 6-month delay in Iran's breakout ability enough, even when combined with a robust 20-year inspection and verification regime—understanding that in allowing Iran to retain its enrichment capabilities, there will always be a risk of breakout. It may be that this is the only deal we can get. The real question is whether it is a good enough deal to merit terminating sanctions.

My concern is that the Joint Plan of Action does not speak to these recommended centrifuge limitations DENNIS ROSS or Dr. Albright suggests. In fact, Iran has already made its views about the limitations of the agreement quite clear. What the Joint Plan of Action does concede is that Iran will not only retain its ability to enrich but will be allowed a mutually agreed upon enrichment program.

Here is what Iran's Foreign Minister Zarif said about the interim agreement:

> The White House tries to portray it as basically a dismantling of Iran's nuclear program . . . we are not dismantling any centrifuges, we are not dismantling any equipment, we're simply not producing, not enriching over 5 percent.

That is a quote from their Foreign Minister.

What does President Ruhani of Iran say? He was adamant in an interview on CNN in saying that Iran will not be dismantling its centrifuges. He said:

> We are determined to provide for the nuclear fuel of such plants inside the country, at the hands of local Iranian scientists. We are going to follow on this path.

On that program, Fareed Zakaria asked him:

> So there will be no destruction of centrifuges, of existing centrifuges.

President Ruhani said:

> No. No, not at all.

In fact, Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi said that Iran would comply with the interim agreement by removing the connections between networks of centrifuges that have been used to enrich uranium to 20 percent so they can enrich only to 5 percent. Then he said:

> These interconnections can be removed in a day and connected again in a day.

That is not the type of safeguard we need. Clearly, their intention—at least in these negotiations—is to retain their capability notwithstanding the agreement. That is pretty clear to me.

In January President Ruhani tweeted:

> Our relationship with the world is based on Iranian nation's interest. In Geneva agreement world powers surrendered to Iranian nation's will.

When this tweet was broadly reported on, President Rouhani took it down. In a speech when Rouhani was leaving his post as Iran's chief negotiator in 2005, he said:

> While we were talking with the Europeans in Tehran, we were installing equipment in parts of the facility in Isfahan— which is a uranium conversion facility—

which is a uranium conversion facility—

> but we still had a long way to go to complete the project. In fact, by creating a calm environment, we were able to complete the work on Isfahan.

In essence, they were able to complete the work of the uranium conversion.

Now, sometimes I think it is worthy to listen to the words of these individuals now in leadership positions to understand the mindset of the negotiations that are taking place. Basically, what President Rouhani was saying is that he was able to get the West to not pursue sanctions and ultimately to not take any other action, as Iran continued to march forward with its nuclear program. I find comments such as that deeply troubling. I find troubling the fact that even after an agreement was reached in November, the Iranians reportedly fired a rocket into space to improve their ability to develop a long-range ballistic missile system.

In an interview with Reuters, U.S. missile defense expert Rikki Ellison said of the report:

> If it's true, they continue to expand and grow their long range missile capabilities regardless of their overture to the West with self-reduction of their nuclear capabilities . . .

These realities—these statements, these actions—are just as much about the spirit of the interim deal as it is about the letter of the deal, and it places in question the political will of the Iranians and our ability to reach a verifiable agreement with those who have been willing to so deceive.

In terms of both Iran's political will and its ballistic missile capability, James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, said the following:

> Tehran has made technical progress in a number of areas—including uranium enrichment, nuclear reactors, and ballistic missiles—from which it could draw if it decided to build missile-deliverable nuclear weapons. These technical advancements strengthen our assessment that Iran has the scientific, technical, and industrial capacity to eventually produce nuclear weapons. This makes the central issue its political will to do so.

So what the analysis reveals is that years of obfuscation, delay, and endless negotiation has brought the Iranians to the point of having, according to the Director of National Intelligence, the scientific, technical, and industrial capacity to eventually produce nuclear weapons. As to their will to do so, I would say that if they are—I would say that what they are hiding at the Parchin Military Industrial Complex, if revealed, would clearly show their will to build a nuclear bomb. The only thing that has thwarted that will is crippling sanctions. The Iranians have fought back every step of the way with the international community getting access to Parchin, and the world largely views Parchin as the place in which their militarization of nuclear energy—therefore nuclear weapons—was taking place. In my view, the Iranians are negotiating in bad faith, as we have seen them do in the past. They say one thing behind closed doors in Geneva and say another thing publicly. I know the administration will say this is what President Rouhani needs to do for his domestic audience.

But his deeds need to go beyond his words, and they need to be verifiable. In fact, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, David Albright, of the Institute of Science and International Security and an expert on the proliferation of atomic weapons, said that under the interim agreement:

> The breakout times, if Iran used its currently installed centrifuges, would lengthen from at least 1 to 1.6 months to at least 1.9 to 2.2 months.

That effectively means that without dismantling currently installed centrifuges, Iran has a breakout time of 6 to 8 weeks, unless we demand real consequences in a final agreement—6 to 8 weeks. That figure is going to be very important, as I will get to later, because 6 to 8 weeks is a lot shorter than the time frame to invoke and make sanctions effective.

Another major concern is the Arak heavy water reactor—a facility that DENNIS ROSS has described as ''grossly inefficient for producing electricity, but not for generating plutonium for nuclear weapons.''

The Senate was told that this facility would be taken care of in the final agreement, which most of us understood to mean that it would be dismantled. Now, the Joint Plan of Action and the implementing agreement suggest something less than dismantlement. The implementing agreement says that Iran has to ''take steps to agree with the IAEA on the conclusion of a safeguards approach to Arak.'' Iran has not provided required design information for Arak, as we thought was going to happen, and in the final agreement it seems possible that either Iran will be allowed to complete the reactor and operate it under IAEA safeguards or the reactor will simply be mothballed—not dismantled but mothballed—or perhaps converted to a light-water facility that carries its own risks.

Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister has said that the Arak reactor is the fastest way to get the material for a nuclear weapon. So while I understand the agreement also does not permit Iran to construct a related reprocessing facility at this time, the implication of the agreement's language is that the final agreement will not actually require the dismantling of the Arak reactor, meaning that Arak could, at a future date, give Iran a relatively quick path to a weapon, and I find that simply unacceptable.

In my view, Iran's strategy, consistent with their past approaches that

have brought them to a nuclear threshold state, is to use these negotiations to mothball its nuclear infrastructure program just long enough to undo the international sanctions regime.

Iran is insisting on keeping core elements of its programs—enrichment, the Arak heavy-water reactor, the underground Fordow facility, and the Parchin military complex. While they may be subject to safeguards so they can satisfy the international community in the short run, if they are allowed to retain their core infrastructure, they could quickly revive their program sometime in the future. At the same time, Iran is seeking to reverse the harsh international sanctions regime against them.

The bottom line is this. If they get their way, if they dismantle nothing, we gut the sanctions, and troubling signs have already appeared.

Since the interim deal was signed, there was an immediate effort by many nations—including many European nations—to revive trade and resume business with Iran. There have been recent headlines that the Russians may be seeking a barter deal that could increase Iran's oil exports by 50 percent; that Iran and Russia are negotiating an oil-for-goods deal worth $1.5 billion a month—$18 billion a year—which would significantly boost Iran's oil exports by 500,000 barrels a day in exchange for Russian goods.

To the administration's credit, when we have raised this issue, they have said they are aware of those concerns and have told the Russians that, in fact, if they were to pursue that, it would be actionable, meaning it would be subject to sanctions. But I am not sure that Vladimir Putin really is going to be thwarted by such warnings.

A coalition of France's largest companies is already visiting Tehran. Iran welcomed more than 100 executives from France's biggest firms on Monday, the most senior French trade mission in years. Since November there have been 20-plus trade delegations from Turkey, Georgia, Ireland, Tunisia, Kazakhstan, China, Italy, India, Austria, and Sweden. What is the result? Iran's economy is recovering. The Iranian rial, which is in essence their dollar, had plummeted from an official rate of 10,440 rials to the dollar to a staggering 41,000 to a dollar in October of 2012. But it has begun to recover. As of January 29, that rate has gone from 41,000 to a single dollar to 25,000 rials to the dollar.

International Monetary Fund figures also show Iran's negative growth turning around, with Iran having a projected growth rate of 1.28 percent to almost 2 percent in 2014 and 2015.

As Mark Dubowitz, the executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week, the $7 billion in actual relief Iran will definitively receive under the Joint Plan of Action is very significant—comprising approximately 35 percent of Iran's fully accessible cash reserves, which are estimated to be $20 billion.

So while the Iranian economy is described as being much larger, the assessment that this is a drop in the bucket is simply not accurate. Moreover, that relief fails to consider the $4 billion to $5 billion in revenue that Iran would have lost if we had not suspended sanctions on Iran's crude oil exports as required under existing law. Sanctions relief, combined with the ''open for business'' sign that Iran is posting, is paying returns. It seems to me the sanctions regime we have worked so hard to build is starting to unravel before we ever get a chance to conclude a final agreement with Iran.

The fact is that any final deal as inadequate as the one I have outlined will end any pressure on Iran for the foreseeable future. Put simply, we need a policy that guarantees Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons capability, period.

To understand how to proceed, we must also understand the facts. We need to put the negotiating into context. First, Iran has a history of duplicity with respect to its nuclear program, using past negotiations to cover up advances in its nuclear program, and, most startling, at the undeclared Fordow enrichment site, buried very deep in a mountain to prevent its discovery and protect against destruction. That begs the question: Why would they bury a facility so deep so that it could not be discovered if it was solely for the peaceful purposes they claim? It seems unlikely, as Iran's leaders have made clear in recent days, that Iran will make any concessions that fundamentally dismantle its nuclear program.

The fact is Iran is simply agreeing to lock the door on its nuclear weapons program, as is, and walk away. Should they later walk away from the deal as they have in the past, they can simply unlock the door and continue their nuclear weapons program from where they are today. It sounds a lot like North Korea.

Let's not forget that President Rouhani, as the former negotiator for Iran, boasted:

> The day that we invited the three European ministers to the talks, only 10 centrifuges were spinning at Natanz. We could not produce one gram of U4 or U6. We did not have the heavy water production. We could not produce yellow cake . . . Our total production of centrifuges inside the country was 150 . . . We wanted to complete all of these—we needed time. We did not stop. We completed the program.

So 150 then; 20,000 today. The simple truth is he admitted to deceiving the West.

Given President Rouhani's own words on his country's nuclear weapons ambition, it seems to me a good deal is not one that equates dismantling with mothballing. A good deal would prevent Iran from being able to get back to work on its nuclear weapons program from where it left off.

Second, despite diplomatic entreaties to the Iranians in recent years where hands were extended and secret talks were pursued, Iran has grown its support and advocacy for terror.

The history of Iranian terror against U.S. citizens and interests is lengthy and robust, grounded in the view that the United States is the great Satan, and with its funding and support of Hezbollah that has carried out attacks against American interests. Colleagues will recall that 241 American servicemen died in the 1983 Marine Corps barracks in Lebanon and 19 in the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia. In recent years, we have traced responsibility for lethal actions against American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan to Iran, as well as the fortunately thwarted attack on the Saudi ambassador at a Washington restaurant in 2011.

Today Iran is actively sponsoring a proxy war in Syria, sending money, weapons, and fighters on a weekly basis.

Simultaneously, it is sponsoring attacks against Sunnis in Iraq and promoting regional sectarian violence that could easily result in a broader regional conflict. So while smiling at our negotiators across the table, they are simultaneously plotting in the backroom.

With all this in mind, I believe in the wisdom of the prospective sanctions I proposed. I believe in the lessons of history that tell us Iran cannot be trusted to live up to its word without external pressure, and I believe an insurance policy that guards against Iranian obfuscation and deception is the best way forward.

I know there is a difference of view, but I truly believe that what got Iran to the negotiating table is the only element of peaceful diplomacy that can keep it there and ultimately drive a successful negotiation.

My legislation, cosponsored by 59 Senators, would simply require that Iran act in good faith, adhering to the implementing agreement, not engaging in new acts of terror against American citizens or U.S. property, and not conducting new ballistic missile tests with a range beyond 500 kilometers.

The legislation is not the problem and Congress is not the problem. Iran is the problem. We need to worry more about Iran than we need to worry about the Congress. We need to focus on Iran's long history of deceptions surrounding its nuclear program and how this should inform our approach to reaching a comprehensive deal.

To those who believe if negotiations do not result in a deal or if Iran breaks the deal we can always impose new sanctions, then let me be clear: If negotiations fail or if Iran breaks the deal, we will not have time to pass new sanctions that would have a real consequence.

New sanctions are not a spigot that can be turned off and on, as has been suggested. Even if Congress were to take up and pass new sanctions at the

moment of Iran's first breach of the Joint Plan of Action or if they do not reach an ultimate agreement that is acceptable, there is a lag time of at least 6 months to bring those sanctions online and at least 1 year for real impact to be felt.

That has been our history here. I authored most of these, and they need a lead time. You need to give countries and companies the time to be noticed as to what is going to be sanctioned so they can rearrange their engagements. Then you have to have the regulations to go through and then you have to have the enforcement take place.

This would bring us beyond the very short time Iran would need to build a nuclear bomb, especially since the interim agreement does not require them either to dismantle anything and basically freezes their capability as it stands today. So let everyone understand, if there is no deal, I do not think we are going to have the time to impose new sanctions before Iran can produce a nuclear weapon.

Everyone agrees the comprehensive sanctions policy against Iran—which was led by Congress and originally opposed by the administration—has been an unquestionable success. Iran's oil exports fell to 1.1 million barrels a day in the first 9 months of 2013, down from 1.5 million barrels in 2012. The fall in exports was costing Iran between $4 billion and $8 billion a month in 2013, and the loss of oil revenue had caused the rial to lose two-thirds of its value against the dollar and caused inflation to rise to more than 40 percent.

There is no dispute or disagreement that it was the economic impact of sanctions that has brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. But passing those sanctions and having them in place long enough to be effective took time—time that I am concerned we no longer have.

The question now is whether our goals align. Has the ideology of the regime altered so substantially in the last 6 months that they are ready to forswear a 20-year effort—a 20-year effort—to develop nuclear weapons or are they, as the Supreme Leader has stated, seeking to beat us at the game of diplomacy—''to negotiate with the Devil to eliminate its evil''—and retain their nuclear threshold and enriching abilities while degrading the sanctions regime?

Let's not forget it is the Ayatollah—I know we are placing a lot of faith in President Ruhani and the Iranian Foreign Minister—but it is the Ayatollah who holds the nuclear portfolio, and his main goal is what. Preservation of the regime. It is the Ayatollah who gave the green light to Ruhani to negotiate. Why? Because the sanctions were causing the Ayatollah to be concerned about regime change taking place within Iranian society due to the consequences of sanctions on the Iranian economy.

Interestingly enough, who benefits from the sanctions relief? The Ayatollah. In a Reuters story with the title ''Khamenei's business empire gains from Iran sanctions relief,'' it goes on to talk about that:

> Khamenei controls a massive business empire known as Setad that has invested in Iran's petrochemical industry, which is now permitted to resume [its] exports.

It also states:

> In an interview with Reuters this week, a Treasury Department official estimated that Iran would generate at most $1 billion in revenue—

Mr. President, $1 billion in revenue—

> from petrochemical exports over the next six months.

Who is the one who has a great deal of interest in the petrochemical section? The Ayatollah, by his control of Setad.

I have worked on Iran's nuclear issues for 20 years, starting when I was a Member of the House, pressing for sanctions to prevent Iran from building the Bushehr nuclear powerplant and to halt IAEA support for their uranium mining and enrichment programs.

For a decade I was told my concerns had no legitimate basis; that Iran would never be able to bring the Bushehr plant online; and that Iran's activities were not the most major concern.

History has shown us that those assessments about Iran's abilities and intentions were simply wrong. The fact is Iran's nuclear aspirations did not materialize overnight. Iran has been slowly, methodically working up to this moment for decades, and now—if its capability is mothballed rather than dismantled—they will remain at the cusp of being a declared nuclear state should they choose to start again because nothing will have changed if nothing is significantly dismantled.

Make no mistake. Iran views developing a nuclear capability as fundamental to its existence. It sees the development of nuclear weapons as part of a regional hegemonic strategy to make Tehran the center of power throughout the region.

That is why our allies and partners in the region—and not just Israelis, but Emiratis and Saudis, among others—are so skeptical and so concerned. Quite simply, our allies and partners do not trust Iranian leaders, nor do they believe Iran has any intention of verifiably ending its nuclear weapons program.

So while I welcome the diplomatic efforts, and I share the hope that the administration can achieve a final comprehensive agreement that eliminates this threat to global peace and security, I am deeply—deeply—skeptical based upon these 20 years—based upon these 20 years—of experience.

The simple and deeply troubling fact is Iran is literally weeks to months from a breakout, and the parameters of the final agreement laid out in the Joint Plan of Action do not appear to set Iran's development capacity back by more than a few weeks.

The Joint Plan of Action conceded, even before negotiations had begun, Iran's right to some level of enrichment, despite a U.N. resolution calling for Iran to suspend enrichment.

It provides no guarantees that we will resolve our concerns about Iranian weaponization activities, that Iran will cease advanced centrifuge research. Why is that important? Because we heard testimony that the more advanced the centrifuge, the less centrifuges you need, the quicker you can produce enriched uranium to be able to acquire that bomb and the increasingly less verifiable it is. So Iran should have to cease its advanced centrifuge research. It also provides no guarantees that we will resolve our concerns that the IAEA will gain access to the Parchin military base, that Iran will dismantle thousands of centrifuges or that the Iranians will disclose the scope of their activities.

It suggests that the resolution for the Arak heavy-water reactors, which can provide a quicker plutonium pathway to nuclear weapons, may be to put it under IAEA safeguards rather than require its dismantlement. It seems to me we do not have time, under the testimony taken before the committee, for Iran to hedge and obfuscate. They have done a pretty good job of that, and that is what has brought them to the cusp of being a nuclear state. There should be no chance for Iran to buy more time, which, in effect, leaves us exactly where we are—just hitting a pause button—with the state of play unchanged and Iran weeks from breakout. To me that is a bad agreement, and in my view we should be negotiating from a position of strength.

Last Tuesday night in the State of the Union, the President said:

> If John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan could negotiate with the Soviet Union, then surely a strong and confident America can negotiate with less powerful adversaries today.

I agree. But I would point out to my colleagues that they did so from a position of strength. President Kennedy sent U.S. warships to face down the Soviets in Cuba, and Ronald Reagan dramatically built up U.S. military might to an extent that what was the former Soviet Union could not keep up the pace. We need to negotiate with Iran from a position of strength, and then, yes—then we should have no fear about any such negotiation.

The concerns I have raised are legitimate. They are not, as the President's Press Secretary has said, ''warmongering.'' This is not saber rattling. It is not Congress wanting to ''march to war,'' as another White House spokesman said, but exactly the opposite.

I find it interesting—as someone who was then in the House of Representatives and was in a small minority voting against the war in Iraq, when an overwhelming number of my colleagues and many Members of this body were voting for the war—to somehow be portrayed as a warmonger. It is my mind that the use of sanctions—which is a limited part of an arsenal of peaceful

diplomacy tools—can get us to the successful negotiations we want.

At the end of the day, trying to keep the pressure on Iran to completely satisfy the United Nations' and the international community's demands for Iran to halt and reverse its illicit nuclear activities is the best way to avoid war in the first place—to avoid war in the first place.

Iran has proven in the past it will not negotiate in good faith except when it has no other choice—as the tough sanctions we passed have proven, by getting Iran to the table.

Iran says it will not negotiate with a gun to its head. I would suggest it is Iran that has put the potential of a nuclear gun to the world's head.

At the end of the day, name-calling is not an argument, nor is it a sound policy. It is a false choice to say a vote for sanctions is equivalent to warmongering. More pressure on Iran does not in any way suggest that Congress wants war or that the Iranians feel backed into a corner and will themselves choose war over reason.

So let's stop talking about warmongering. Let's instead fixate on the final deal which, in my view, cannot and should not rely simply on trust but on real, honest, verifiable dismantlement of Iran's capability to produce even one nuclear bomb.

The ball is in the administration's court, not in Congress's. In fact, the agreement specifically states—there has been a lot of talk about how we should not consider any new sanctions, even if they are prospective, which the legislation says nothing would happen until up to 1 year, unless Iran violates the interim agreement or fails to conclude an agreement in 1 year. But if we read the Joint Plan of Action, what does it say? It says:

> The U.S. Administration, acting consistent with the respective roles of the President and the Congress, will refrain from imposing new nuclear-related sanctions.

It does not say the United States of America. It does not say the Congress. It says the ''Administration, acting consistent with the respective roles of the President and the Congress, will refrain from imposing new nuclear-related sanctions.''

That is because the agreement acknowledges that the administration, not Congress, will refrain from imposing new sanctions. The administration knew it could not bind Congress to refrain from imposing new sanctions because Congress is a separate coequal branch of government.

So let's focus on what was agreed to by those at the table rather than attributing blame to those who were not. We will not be the scapegoats for a bad deal if it does not take the nuclear weapons option off the table by insisting on dismantling existing capability, not simply mothballing it.

So let me say I want diplomacy to work. That is why we worked so hard to get to the opportunity. I wanted to produce the results we all hoped for and have worked for.

But at a minimum, we need to send a message to Iran that our patience is not unlimited and that we are skeptical of their intentions and a message to the international community that the sanctions regime has not weakened, that this is not an opportunity to reengage with Tehran. I would urge everyone to look at the legislation I have drafted with my colleague from Illinois and Members of both caucuses as a win for the administration. They succeeded in convincing us—the administration succeeded in convincing us to provide up to a 1-year window to negotiate.

That is not the way the legislation was originally intended. But they convinced us they needed an opportunity to negotiate and, hence, the legislation was worked in such a way to create that opportunity. I believe that is significant and generous, given Iran's history of treachery and deceit. If Iran steps away from the negotiations or does not live up to its agreement, it will be because they are not serious about reaching a comprehensive deal.

I have heard the concerns of the administration. I know we share the same goals. We have taken steps in the Foreign Relations Committee in pursuit of those goals. We have worked with the administration to pass legislation to help reform the Organization of American States. We have moved 129—more now with the last week of nominees—that the administration has put forward. We worked through Labor Day in a bipartisan effort to quickly pass a resolution authorizing the use of military force in Syria, which gave the President—there are those who are critical of that as well—but that authorization gave the President the ability to go to Russia and get a deal to end the use of chemical weapons in Syria.

We passed and the President signed PEPFAR into law, the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief. We have worked with the administration on embassy security after Benghazi. We have worked with countless administration officials and held two hearings on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. In all of those actions and much more, I have worked closely with the administration. My intention now is to assist the administration again in its negotiations by keeping the pressure on Iran, which has always proven an unreliable negotiating partner at best.

In my view, it is time to put Iranian rhetoric to the test. If we are to take President Ruhani at his word, when he said in Davos last week that Iran does not seek nuclear weapons, if that is true, then the Iranian Government should not have any problems with the obvious followup to that claim, starting with the verifiable dismantling of its illicit nuclear infrastructure. That is all the sanctions legislation does. I do not think we should settle for anything less.

So let's be clear. I do not come to this floor in opposition, I come in comity and in the spirit of unity that has always dictated our foreign policy. But the Senate has an obligation to challenge assumptions in a free and open debate. That is what is most extraordinary about our government, and it echoes in the many debates we have held in this Chamber on war and peace, on justice and freedom and civil rights.

At the end of the day, we have an obligation to speak our minds on what we believe is in the best interests of this Nation. It is in that spirit that I come to the floor today. As GEN George Marshall said, ''Go right straight down the road, to do what is best, and do it frankly without evasion.'' Today I am advocating for what I believe is in our national interests and to do so as frankly and comprehensively as I can.

As John Kennedy said about having differences of opinion, ''Let us not be blind to [them], but let us also direct our attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved.'' The administration and the Senate have a common interest to prevent a nuclear weapons-capable Iran. We have differences as to how to achieve it. We have an obligation to debate those differences and concerns.

But I will not yield on a principled difference. It is our obligation to debate the issues, express our differences and outcomes, and come to the floor to work together to resolve them. At the end of the day, my hope, as someone who has been working on this for 20 years, can see the fruition of a successful negotiation by the President and the administration so Iran will never have a nuclear weapons capability.

But by the same token, I think we need to be poised to ensure that we use the last elements of peaceful diplomacy, which is to ensure there are sanctions that create consequences to the regime so they can put that in their equation as to it is better to strike a deal and end our illicit nuclear program than it is to pursue a course that creates nuclear weapons. Because, if not, I fear, if we continue down this path and our sanctions erode and all we do is limit and have safeguard notices, warning signs, we will get the warning signs, but the sanctions will be gone and the only options left to a future American President will be do you accept a nuclear-armed Iran or do you have a military option. Those are not desirable options.

It is our effort to avoid that being the ultimate question. That is what we embody in the sanctions legislation that has passed this Chamber and has been signed by the President and that we believe, prospectively, can increase the pressure on Iran to come to that peaceful conclusion, so that option of either accepting a nuclear-armed Iran or having to have a military option to prevent it from doing so is not the option for our country and for any future American President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. 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. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RUSSIAN RELATIONS

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I come today because tomorrow is the formal start of the Winter Olympics in Sochi, Russia. We certainly wish all of our athletes well. We have a few from Florida. Believe it or not, the Sunshine State has contributed a number of athletes to the Winter Olympic efforts of our country. We wish them all the best.

We pray for their safety. We have all read media reports of the potential for attacks. We pray that does not happen. Of course, our government has tried to be as cooperative as possible with the Russian Government in providing some level of security assistance. They have been less than open about that. So we hope and pray things will go well there. Let me just say at the outset, Olympics should never be politicized. I hope these are not either. So my comments are not about the Olympics per se, but I do think it is an important time, given where they are occurring, to take a moment to reflect on the nature of and our Nation's relationship with the host country, with Russia, because they are going to be in the news a lot over the next few days.

We have all heard the debates about some of the more extreme examples of intolerance that exist within Russia, particularly as a result of President Vladimir Putin and his government.

I want to take a moment to describe where I think the relations between Russia and the United States stand and particularly how Russia views itself—the government, I should say—in the world.

At the outset let me begin by saying that when I talk about governments, when I talk about countries such as Russia or China, for instance, we are talking about the government leaders, not the people. In fact, we know that in both of those countries—especially in Russia, in China, as well as in many other countries—there are people who do not like the direction their political leadership is taking them.

In fact, I would say that in countries such as China and Russia it might be the majority of people who strongly disagree with the direction that its so-called leaders are taking. What we talk about is our relationship with their governments—and in this case our relationship with Vladimir Putin and the decisions that he has made.

The best way to understand the situation with Russia is that there is primarily a president who has nationalistic tendencies in Putin, and he wants Russia to somehow reclaim what he views as its glory days of world prominence. He believes and has concluded that the best way to do that is to be antagonistic and outright hostile to the United States. Part of that plan is an effort to create among his neighbors—particularly those republics that used to be part of the Soviet Union—to bring them under Russia's sphere of influence.

We have two stunning examples of that over the past few years. The first is the Republic of Georgia, which they invaded a few years ago, and even now they occupy territory within it.

In fact, as part of these Olympics, one of the things Russia has done is it has sealed off portions of Georgian territory they claim they need for a security buffer. That is completely outrageous, but that is happening with very little attention on the international stage.

The other is to see what is happening in Ukraine and to see how they used the threat of noncooperation economically, and even subterfuge economically, to try to force Ukraine to reject a deal to integrate with the European Union and instead seek to be part of this new thing that the Russian government is trying to create.

As part of that agenda as well, they have viewed themselves with the need to be antagonistic toward the United States. But in the process of doing that, not only have they been antagonistic toward the United States, they have been antagonistic toward the cause of human rights and of world peace.

There are some stunning examples.

Certainly within Russia we have seen the targeting and the oppression of everything from a rock band to journalists. We know the story of Sergei Magnitsky, who was doing nothing more than investigating rampant official corruption. We saw how what happened with him.

We have seen it line up on the international stage. For example, they are—perhaps other than Iran, and perhaps equal with Iran—the most important supporter of Assad and of what he is doing in Syria—the slaughter of innocent civilians. There are over 100,000 people dead and hundreds of thousands of others now living in refugee camps, displaced from their homes. This is who the Russian President and the Russian government have lined up with.

Beyond that, we should see the attitude they have taken toward Iran. They have not been, despite the administration's assertions, productive in dealing with Iran's nuclear ambitions. On the contrary, they have been supportive or at a minimum have been a roadblock to progress being made with regard to preventing a nuclear Iran.

On issue after issue we see this Russian government lining itself up diametrically opposed not only to the interests of the United States but to the interests of the cause of world peace. I understand that the situation in Syria is complicated, but how could one possibly find himself to be such a strong and blind ally of a killer, a murderer, a criminal like Assad?

There are problems in those rebel groups too. There are some terrorists involved in that. Unfortunately, it appears they have grown in prominence among the rebellion. It is not an easy issue to confront, but at a minimum one would expect that a country that believes in human rights and the dignity of all the people would at a minimum add their voice in condemnation of what is happening in Syria, and to the conduct of the Assad government.

Instead, they have been involved in trying to pursue ridiculous conspiracy theories, such as the notion that somehow the chemical attacks that occurred there were not conducted by Assad and his regime.

Beyond those things and what they have done at home and abroad, what have they done directly toward the United States? Let's talk about what they have done toward their neighbors and the constant threats to their neighbors—and in some instances a willingness to carry it out by invading the Republic of Georgia.

Then, of course, we turn to their relationship with us. What have they done? A couple of actions bear watching.

The first is what they have done with their weapons systems. They continue to invest an extraordinary amount of money—for a country that is going through the economic challenges that they are confronting—to build up their conventional weapons capabilities. They are again sending naval forces to different parts of the world, trying to flex some muscle.

It is not as powerful as the Soviet Union, but they are trying to project power in that way. Usually they find places to project power that they know would somehow challenge the strategic interests of the United States. Last week we read in the New York Times that there is evidence they may be in violation of an arms control agreement.

In the face of all of this, the initial attitude of this administration was that we need to reset policy toward Russia and understand what was behind that idea. What was behind that idea was the notion that the reason we didn't have a good relationship with Putin and with Russia and the Russian government was because the U.S.—the previous President, George W. Bush—was too abrasive. This is not only for Russia, but this is a theory they applied all over the world. If we could only reset that relationship, if we could just be more cooperative with them, and if we could show them that we were more willing to talk and be open-minded, somehow that would affect their behavior.

What did Putin and their government do? They did what any good former

KGB agent would do. They took what we offered them and kept doing what they wanted. They took whatever concessions we were putting on the table, and they kept doing whatever they wanted.

What is stunning to me is not only the administration's unwillingness to acknowledge that the reset policy has not worked, but in some instances their desire to double down on us. The President continues to talk about additional reductions in strategic weapons vis-a-vis the Russians.

Yet last week we heard, as I said a moment ago, that they are probably already in violation of an existing agreement. We have allowed them to convince us not to pursue anti-missile technologies or advanced and additional anti-missile technologies and defense systems in Eastern Europe.

Our allies, by the way, look at us and say: What is going on? It adds to this air of instability. It adds to the questions that now exist, and it adds to the notion that we have now become an unreliable ally in the world. Other countries are watching this as well, and they are taking note. This is the situation that we face. Because the Olympics are in Russia, the whole world is about to see it.

For example, we can't say for sure that this had anything to do with the government, but last night—I read a report today in the Wall Street Journal that said that for one of its reporters, in the middle of the night someone opened the door to their room and tried to walk in for a moment.

Again, do we know if that was the Russian government? No, we don't know that for sure, but that seems to be a recurring issue there—the sort of surveillance state where opposition is oppressed and the people are watched, where political opponents could be arrested, jailed or exiled.

The Russian government is starting to look more and more every day, in its attitude, like the former Soviet Union—and in its behavior. I think we have the right to be concerned about it.

When I come to the floor and talk about these issues, and other colleagues do, this is not because we want confrontation. On the contrary. We hope to avoid all of these things.

We have plenty of issues to focus on in this country, but we cannot be naive. We must never forget the lessons of history that teach us that when behavior such as this and attitudes like this go unaddressed, when your potential adversary shows weakness, insecurity, and indecisiveness, it invites them to be even more aggressive, and it invites them to miscalculate.

While I do believe that the Olympics are an issue that should not be politicized, our relationship with Russia is one that deserves serious attention in this body. This idea that somehow this is a relic of Cold War issues and that we shouldn't be focused on it in the same way is naive.

They still have an enormous nuclear arsenal. They still have a significant conventional military capability, and they have someone running their government who is not an ally or a friend of the United States.

On the contrary. He has come to believe that what is bad for the United States is good for Russia. We should not be naive about that in our dealings, and we should not, under any circumstances, betray, undermine or abandon our commitment to our allies in the region and to the countries that are Russia's neighbors for the sake of seeking to improve the relationship with the Russian government because they will continue to do what they have already done. They will take our concessions, and they will keep doing whatever they want.

I hope that as a part of this week and the next couple of weeks in these Olympics we—as policymakers, with all of the issues happening in our country, and all of the challenges we face around the world—will take more time to truly examine the nature of this government in Russia and what our relationship should be toward them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

ENSURING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. COONS. I come to the floor once again to talk about manufacturing jobs and their importance for rebuilding the American middle class, their importance for our economy, and their importance for our future.

Last week President Obama delivered his State of the Union Address before a joint session of this Congress, and he talked about what we can and should do together to invest in America's workers, to spur job creation, and to expand economic opportunity. He said:

> What I believe unites the people of this nation . . . is the simple, profound belief in opportunity for all—the notion that if you work hard and take responsibility, you can and should get ahead. . . . Opportunity is who we are. And the defining project of our generation is to restore that trust.

I couldn't agree more. At a basic level, one thing we need to do is to put up a floor under the struggling workers in America who are continuing to seek work and to come together to extend emergency unemployment insurance for these long-term job seekers.

While jobs remain, sadly, more scarce than they should be in our economy and as we continue in recovery, we can't let Americans fall through the cracks as they continue to seek work.

But since the extended unemployment insurance benefits expired last December, 1.7 million Americans, including more than 4,000 Delawareans, have lost the unemployment insurance that is critical to their families, to keeping food on the table and a roof over their heads.

Emergency unemployment insurance, which this body once again today failed to extend, is a critical lifeline to Americans out of work through no fault of their own and who are doing everything they can to get back to work. While they are searching for jobs, we should make sure they can put food on their tables and keep their families sound.

One Delawarean I have heard from who relies on this lifeline is Raymond from Newark. Raymond was laid off last April from his job at the EVRAZ steel mill in Claymont. He is not sitting at home based on these unemployment benefits. He is not showing dependency, as some have suggested here. He has averaged more than 30 job applications each and every week. He has four children depending on him—one in college with tuition payments.

He wrote to me saying: ''My job search is more than finding a job; it is searching to make an honest living.''

Raymond, to you, and to the more than the 1 million Americans who rely on decent work to give meaning to their lives, to give support to their families, and to give purpose and opportunity to their children and their future, we can and should do more—not only by extending the unemployment insurance, not only by increasing the minimum wage, but by building the middle class of this country to work together.

Folks such as Raymond have worked hard and paid their taxes. They have earned the opportunity when they really need it to get unemployment insurance. That is why they paid into it for so many years. But we need to do more beyond just extending unemployment insurance.

We need to invest in Raymond's future. We need to invest in the skills that will help Americans like him transition from his job in a steel mill to a plant that is open and has a job that needs to be filled.

Throughout our history broad-based job growth and job creation have ensured economic opportunity that was there for millions of millions of Americans across several generations. Anyone who was able and willing to work in this country for a long time was able to find a decent job and a ladder into the middle class. By investing in our Nation's workforce, our people, through public education, through the GI bill, and through access to higher education, we have been a country where anyone who was willing to work could make it if they combined their work ethic and talents with the skills they needed.

During World War II, in the postwar boom, manufacturing was an economic backbone. Our country was the pathway to the middle class that made all of this possible. American manufacturing was the sturdy manifestation of that central American idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can provide for your family today so your children can get access to higher education, a brighter future, and you can have a secure retirement tomorrow. That is the essence of the American middle class.

The basic opportunity that manufacturing provided—those strong and stable rungs by which Americans could pull themselves up the ladder of opportunity—was the heart of America's economic engine, it was the glue that held communities together, but over the past few decades it has changed dramatically. As the world has changed, as billions of competitors have entered global markets, from China to India to Russia, so has the nature of manufacturing, as technology has advanced and the playing field on which we compete globally has changed fundamentally. The critical impact of low wages abroad and of trade deals that were not effectively enforced has been well documented. But too often people draw the wrong conclusion about the future of manufacturing based on its recent past. I have heard many arguing that manufacturing is no longer an industry, a sector where America can compete because this global playing field is tilted and there will always be workers in some country who will work for less, and so we are relegated to inevitably lose what is left of our manufacturing in a race to the bottom. The suggestion has been made in some sectors that we should thrive with service and high-skilled research and development and financial services but not manufacturing. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In my view, only if we continue to be a country where we invent things, grow things, and make things will we continue to be a leading economy where there is real opportunity for all Americans. Why? Because manufacturing jobs are high-quality jobs both for those who work in them, who get higher wages and higher benefits, but also for the local economy, where manufacturing jobs provide more of a compounding benefit than any other sector.

Some suggest we just can't compete because our labor standards, our environmental protections, and our wages are too high. But look to Germany and Europe, and you can see this isn't true. They have higher labor standards and higher environmental protections than we do, and yet more than double the percentage of their economy, the percentage of their GDP is manufacturing because their government, their education sector, and their private sector work in close harmony to do what we need to do.

Since manufacturers invest the most in private sector R&D, where there is manufacturing, there is also a wealth of high-skilled research work. That is one of the other benefits of manufacturing. Tech development works the best when research centers are close to where products are made. Over the long term it is hard to have one without the other. So as our manufacturing base has moved offshore, we have been at risk of losing our research base. But just in the last few years there has been a dynamic that is encouraging of jobs coming back to this country. As our productivity continues to grow, as our energy costs go down, and as that wage gap closes, we have actually been regaining ground in manufacturing.

I am convinced that if we want to rebuild an economy that is dynamic and that grows, one that provides opportunities to the middle class, manufacturing must be at the center—in fact, must be the foundation.

What is true is that because the global economy has shifted so dramatically, we need to shift our strategy and our approach. The manufacturing that America excels at today is more advanced and requires higher skilled workers than ever before. Rather than repeating the same tasks over and over, workers today in manufacturing have to be able to carry out complex and varying tasks; to be able to see what is not going right and fix it as a collaborative team; to understand the manufacturing process and to innovate continuously. They have to have critical thinking and problem-solving skills. The sorts of things workers weren't expected to do 30 years ago are a minimum requirement today. They need to understand manufacturing, and they need to be able to program and to improve the caliber and productivity of the machines that do most of the repetitive simple labor of manufacturing today.

We can train Americans for these jobs, but our schools and our institutions of higher learning, our community colleges and universities have to be tightly integrated into a skill-training system that is demand-driven rather than giving people training and praying that somehow they will find their way to an appropriate employer.

That is why I was so encouraged when President Obama placed such an emphasis on workplace skills training and manufacturing in his State of the Union speech. By modernizing our education system and building real and enduring partnerships between schools and businesses, we can ensure our workers have the skills that employers actually need today and tomorrow; so when a guy like Raymond from a steel mill in Claymont is laid off, he can have the opportunity to improve his skills, to retool his abilities, and to move right into an open and available manufacturing job. A recent study showed there were more than 600,000 manufacturing jobs—high-skilled, high-wage, high-benefit jobs—in America today unfilled because of this skills gap.

While I understand and even appreciate President Obama's commitment to making some progress in the coming year through Executive orders, he should not give up on working with Congress. It is just February. It is too early in this year for us to give up on the possibility of passing bipartisan legislation together.

I think more than ever, because of the message it sends domestically and internationally, we have to find a way to work together to make progress on the critical issue of manufacturing skills and to do what we can together to grow our economy and rebuild our middle class. That is why I have been working so hard with my colleagues on the Manufacturing Jobs for America campaign here in the Senate. Manufacturing Jobs for America is a campaign to build support for good manufacturing legislation on which Democrats and Republicans can agree. So far we have had 26 Democratic Senators introduce 32 bills. Almost half of them have Republican cosponsors already, and we are seeking more each and every week.

Our bills focus on four areas that, if we were to enact them, could have a real and substantial impact on manufacturing and opportunity in our country: strengthening America's modern workforce skills, as I have spoken to; fighting for a more level global playing field and opening export markets to America's manufacturers of all sizes. Medium and small businesses have been growing their exports, but we could grow so much more, and that would sustain the growth in manufacturing; third, making it easier for manufacturers to access capital and invest in the R&D I spoke to a moment ago; and fourth, ensuring a coordinated government-wide effort in support of a national manufacturing strategy. All of our competitors have them. We alone don't, and we need a national manufacturing strategy to make sure that skills, access to exports, and access to capital all happen.

Madam President, adapting our economy to the realities of a new era is a challenge we have struggled with for more than a generation. Yet figuring out how to realize an economy where growth is both strong and more equitable—one that is dynamic and creative and globally competitive and also has a broad middle class, provides security for working families, and leaves no one behind; an economy that invests in the dreams and aspirations of our children—building that economy is the central challenge we face. Manufacturing can and should be the foundation of that economy.

If we want America to be as strong in the 21st century as it was in the 20th, we need American manufacturing. Let's work together and get this done.

I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their partnership, their interest, and their work. I so much look forward to working together in the weeks ahead to prove to the American people that we can make bipartisan progress on manufacturing.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, it was fascinating to watch the headlines change over the course of the day after the CBO report on the status of the implementation of health care was released. At first, the headlines flashed that the CBO report said the health care reform law was going to cost 2½

million jobs, and Republicans ran to the cable networks to trumpet that number. In fact, many mainstream newspapers actually ran initial headlines suggesting the same. But then, as people actually started to read the CBO report, they discovered the truth. They discovered the fact that the CBO report actually says the economy is going to grow because of the health care law. And to the extent there are reductions in the hours people work, it is going to be because individuals are now no longer required to work simply because they need to get health care. They can now make decisions about what they want to do with their life, the kind of work they want to do and the amount of time they want to devote to it, not simply because they are job-locked due to health care insecurity.

So I wanted to come to the floor today, as some of my colleagues have, to set the record straight on what the implementation of the health care law really means for the economy and to specifically focus on this issue of what it means to individuals who for decades have been forced to make decisions about their labor connected only to the kind of job that would provide for health care for them and their families.

I think back to a day not long after we passed the bill, a day that I was taking my little then-2-year-old son to our community pool in Cheshire, CT. I was in the pool splashing around with my son, and a guy not more than a few years older than I came across the pool and tapped me on the shoulder.

He said: I am really sorry to interrupt, but I just wanted to say thank you.

I said: That is nice. ''Thank you'' for what?

He said: I wanted to say thank you for passing the health care reform law because I have a little son too, and he has a congenital heart defect. We spend a lot of money trying to take care of his illness. First, the health care bill is going to save us a lot of money, but that is not really why I am so thankful for what you did. What I am truly thankful for is the fact that I can rest easily at night now knowing that my son's life and that his career won't be dictated by his illness; that my son can now live out his dreams, do whatever he wants to do with his life rather than spending his life searching for a job that will cover his illness and worrying about whether a small gap in employment will forever take him off the rolls of the insured forever.

That has been the reality in our country for too long. If you had a chronic illness or a genetic illness or a condition that was on the list of preexisting illnesses at America's insurance companies, A, you had a hard time finding a job because a lot of people didn't want to hire somebody who came with those high insurance costs, and then once you found the job, you could never leave because you couldn't risk losing the insurance that was paying your bills.

The health care reform law unlocks economic possibilities for millions of people all across this country who haven't gone out and started that business they knew could grow, they knew could result in dozens of employees being hired, because they couldn't leave their existing job and the insurance it provided for them and for their families.

That is what the CBO report says. The CBO report says that to the extent there are going to be less hours worked, it is because individuals will no longer be tied to their jobs because of their need to get health care benefits. That is the real story of the CBO report. In fact, the CBO report says this: Expanded Federal subsidies for health insurance will stimulate demand for goods and services, and that effect will mostly occur over the next few years. That increase in demand will induce some employers to hire more workers or to increase their employees' hours during that period.

That is economic growth. That is not economic contraction.

Now, this is a really simple chart. I am not going to claim that the numbers in it are a reflection simply of the legislation we passed. But for all my Republican colleagues who rushed down to either the floor or to the cable news networks to decry the CBO report and who in general have continued to make the case that the health care law is hurting the economy, this is about as simple a chart as you need.

In the decades before we passed the Affordable Care Act this economy lost 3.8 million jobs, and in the 45 months since we passed the Affordable Care Act this economy has created 8.1 million jobs.

Nobody is satisfied with the pace of job growth, but nobody can say the passage of the Affordable Care Act has hurt jobs. Anecdotally, anybody can bring one or two stories to the floor suggesting an individual businessperson decided to not hire someone because of the Affordable Care Act. But the CBO report also says this: In CBO's judgment, there is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA. That is a specific talking point that opponent of the ACA after opponent of the ACA brings out into the public debate, that what is going to happen is that because there is a requirement to provide insurance for full-time employees and not part-time employees, we are going to see millions of full-time jobs eliminated and put into part-time employment. CBO says, in CBO's judgment, there is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA. They say the effect of the Affordable Care Act will increase demand and induce some employers to hire more workers or to increase their employees' hours during that period.

But the news is even better because we are also getting definitive results on the amount of money we are spending as taxpayers when it comes to our health care budget.

Here is a simple chart that tells us what the current law projection was with respect to health care spending in this country. This builds out the trendline all the way to 2085. I will concede it is probably not worthwhile to necessarily predict what health care expenditures will be in 2085, but we don't even have to go there to see that pretty quickly the actual average of annual growth rate of health care is going to come in way lower than what the current law projection is. In fact, it is going to come in at such a lower rate because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we are going to be saving on average $250 billion a year. Not wholly because of the health care law but in large part because of the implementation of the health care law, we are going to be saving $250 billion a year just in Medicare spending because we are starting to build a health care system which focuses on prevention—every Medicare participant now gets free wellness visits—and a system which rewards outcomes rather than volume, which rewards quality health care rather than just lots of health care.

So it is time that we start talking about the true economic impact of the Affordable Care Act. For all of the political and rhetorical bluster, CBO tells us that the economy will grow because of the act and that full-time employment will not turn into part-time employment.

To the extent there are less hours worked in this country, as the CBO report clearly says, it is because individuals are finally going to be empowered to make decisions for themselves about what the proper work schedule for them and their family is, not based on whether they can get health care.

I will share one story that illustrates the decisions being made out there right now today when it comes to the economic benefit that can accrue from the Affordable Care Act.

A small business owner in Enfield, CT, just wrote this:

> I am a small business owner in Enfield who struggled for the last 26 years with finding affordable, quality health insurance coverage. For the last three years, I've been paying our current carrier . . . $1,552.00 a month to cover myself and my 17-year-old son. My son was injured in the fall while playing high school football and required surgery on his shoulder. My deductible for the surgery was $3,000.
>
> Paying for health insurance and medical bills has been a constant struggle. That's why I decided a week ago to check out Access Health CT to see if I could get help going forward. After I entered my information on the website, I discovered that my son and I could stay with [that same carrier] with a better package including eye exams and glasses coverage for only $328 a month and a $500 deductible. I signed up the same day. My new insurance starts March 1st.
>
> This is far better than I ever thought it would be. I was worried that health insurance would put me out of business after all those years, but now I feel I can keep my business going. I may even hire a new employee. I want to say thank you to everyone

from the state to the federal level that has made Access Health CT a reality. Don't believe the rumors—check it out yourself. I am so glad I did.

Don't believe the quick snap headlines that get written when a complicated economic report comes out, as it did yesterday, because if we read beyond the headlines, we will find that the economic evidence—the budget evidence is saying over and over that the Affordable Care Act is going to create jobs; that the Affordable Care Act is creating jobs; that the Affordable Care Act will save taxpayers billions of dollars; that the Affordable Care Act is saving taxpayers billions of dollars.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LUGER NOMINATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise again today to urge a vote in the Senate to confirm Andrew Luger to be Minnesota's U.S. attorney.

For 2½ years—or 890 days—Minnesota has not had a full-time U.S. attorney. During those years, from August 2011 to August 2013, Todd Jones was responsible for doing two jobs—as the Minnesota U.S. attorney and then also as Acting Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. Over the summer, the Senate confirmed Todd Jones as Director of the ATF, leaving the Minnesota U.S. attorney's position open.

Even before the confirmation of Todd Jones this summer, Senator FRANKEN and I—upon the recommendation of our bipartisan U.S. attorney advisory committee—had already recommended Andrew Luger, a respected litigator and former assistant U.S. attorney, to fill the position. This was 199 days ago. In November President Obama nominated Andrew Luger to become the new U.S. attorney, and the Judiciary Committee approved his nomination unanimously on January 9.

It is time we do what is right by quickly confirming Andrew Luger to make sure Minnesota has its highest law enforcement officer in place.

I also note that there is an opening in the Iowa U.S. Attorney's Office. The Judiciary Committee also unanimously approved the President's nomination for that position, and that person is also awaiting confirmation. In fact, I learned today he is in one city and his family is in another city in Iowa, and they would like to be united. That nomination is also pending.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY, who has supported our nominee, as I have supported his in Iowa. I think Senator GRASSLEY is also aware of some of the issues with the Minnesota U.S. Attorney's Office due to the fact that we have not had a full-time attorney for 888 days. He has been supportive of our efforts to quickly move Mr. Luger's nomination.

The position of U.S. attorney is a law enforcement post that the Founders regarded as so vital that they created it during the very first Congress in the Judiciary Act of 1789. This is the same act which created the Attorney General and the structure of the Supreme Court and lower courts.

According to the act, each judicial district would be provided with ''a person learned in the law to act as attorney for the United States . . . whose duty it shall be to prosecute in each district all delinquents for crimes and offenses cognizable under the authority of the United States, and all civil actions in which the United States shall be concerned.''

The U.S. attorney is a position so necessary that President Zachary Taylor appointed Henry Moss—a name somewhat lost in history—to the post within 2 days of Minnesota becoming a State. Now Minnesota has been waiting for a full-time U.S. attorney for 2½ years.

I know my colleagues understand the importance of their own U.S. attorneys. Some of my esteemed colleagues have a very deep understanding of the position, having served as U.S. attorneys prior to joining the Senate. Senator SESSIONS was appointed by President Reagan and served as U.S. attorney in Alabama for 12 years. Senator WHITEHOUSE was U.S. attorney for Rhode Island, appointed by President Bill Clinton. And Senator BLUMENTHAL was appointed to be U.S. attorney for Connecticut by President Carter.

Other colleagues have been assistant U.S. attorneys, and my guess is that when they were assistant U.S. attorneys, they had a full-time U.S. attorney in their office. Assistant U.S. attorneys included in the Senate are Senator LEE of Utah and Senator TOM UDALL of New Mexico. They know firsthand how crucial it is for these offices to have a U.S. attorney and other top leadership in place. I think they would agree with me that 890 days without a full time U.S. attorney in Minnesota is far too long.

Since 1849 the District of Minnesota's 31 U.S. attorneys have upheld the rule of law, the Constitution, and the rights of our State's citizens, and tirelessly pursued justice on their behalf.

Over the past 48 years, for the past half century, more than half of the U.S. attorneys for Minnesota, appointed by Republican and Democrats alike, were confirmed within a day of when they passed out of the Judiciary Committee. One-fourth were confirmed the very same day. During this timeframe, they were confirmed within an average of 28 days of being passed out of committee.

It has now been 28 days since Mr. Luger was approved by the Judiciary Committee. Compare that to Thomas Heffelfinger, who was nominated by President George W. Bush to be U.S. attorney for Minnesota on September 4, 2001; he was confirmed on September 13. His entire confirmation process took only 11 days. Mr. Luger was nominated 77 days ago; that is seven times longer. In 1998 the Senate confirmed Todd Jones within 2 weeks of his nomination by President Clinton.

The Senate has a history of filling this important position quickly. Nominees have not been used as pawns in some kind of a disagreement over issues. They have simply been confirmed. We have simply gotten it done.

The quick action by President Taylor and the speed with which the Senate has confirmed the past U.S. attorneys for Minnesota show how much our government has historically valued this position, how much we have wanted to keep politics out of the way of this position.

The over 100 employees who work for the U.S. attorney in Minnesota don't run as Democrats or Republicans. We don't even know what their political parties are. They deserve a boss in their office to take this position, which has been historically filled almost immediately after it gets through the Judiciary Committee. They deserve a boss in their office.

With each day that passes we are doing an injustice not only to the Founding Fathers who emphasized the position's importance and the Presidents who have acted quickly to fill it but also to the more than 100 people who work in that office.

The men and women in the Minnesota U.S. Attorneys Office exemplify the professionalism, high ethical standards, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law and public safety that we expect of prosecutors. They work to protect the public safety by focusing on offenders who harm our community—terrorists, the worst of the worst, violent criminals, drug traffickers, and major financial fraudsters.

They also work closely with local law enforcement to ensure that local and Federal resources are used efficiently and effectively to prevent crime and lock up criminals. For example, the office recently won a conviction in a $3.65 billion Ponzi case—the second biggest Ponzi scheme in U.S. history. The biggest was the Madoff case. The second came out of the District of Minnesota, $3.65 billion. Of course, that case was initiated when we had a full-time U.S. attorney. That case was prosecuted mainly when we had a full-time U.S. attorney.

What else does the office have? It has an ongoing terrorist investigation that has led to charges against 18 people for aiding the terrorist organization al-Shabaab. If you asked anyone over at the FBI—including the FBI Director who was recently quoted in a story in the Los Angeles Times about the importance of this investigation—they would tell you it would be pretty nice to have a full-time U.S. attorney in that office. Eight of the people who

have already been charged have been convicted. Some received sentences up to 20 years in prison.

Other major work from the office includes Operation Highlife, a major drug trafficking investigation involving more than 100 local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers, resulting in 26 indictments, 25 guilty pleas, and sentences up to 200 months in prison.

I would note that right now we are experiencing—as they are in many places around the country—a heroin epidemic in Minnesota. Over 50 people in Hennepin County died last year from heroin overdoses. That is what we are talking about.

We have a heroin epidemic, and then we have to go home and tell the people of our State that the Senate has not yet confirmed a U.S. attorney.

He went through the committee unanimously—not one objection. The committee he was voted out of includes a very diverse group of Senators, including Senator CRUZ, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CORNYN, and Senator WHITEHOUSE.

I recommended Andrew Luger to the President, and he was nominated. He has the support of our Republican Congressmen near the Twin Cities. Andrew Luger went through that committee without objection and deserves to be voted on by this Senate.

Operation Brother's Keeper is another example of a successful investigation and prosecution of a RICO case involving a regional 200-member gang which took 22 dangerous criminals off the street.

Operation Malverde received national attention and had a prosecution of 27 defendants associated with the Mexican drug cartel—including the apprehension of the cartel's regional leader—with sentences as high as 20 years in prison.

The office also recently prosecuted a case involving a major synthetic drug seller in Duluth, MN. This head shop was a huge problem and a scourge in the community. They went after it, prosecuted the owner, and found $700,000 in plastic bags hidden in his bathroom, and they won that case.

These are just a few of the major cases this office has worked on over the last few years. It has been 890 days since we had a full-time boss, which was due, in part, to the delay in filling the position of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. It took nearly 1 year for this body to act on that nomination because this body had not confirmed anyone for that full-time job for 7 years.

After Operation Fast and Furious, and the disaster with that case, it was finally decided that we need a full-time, confirmed Director at the ATF. Our U.S. attorney agreed to work at both jobs for 2 years and was finally confirmed. We finally have a nominee, and that person is now waiting. That is how we get to 890 days without a full-time boss.

The Senate has always served the people of Minnesota well in making sure that our State has a U.S. attorney. I think we need to continue that tradition and honor the value our Founding Fathers entrusted in this position.

It is time we vote on Mr. Luger's nomination. He is a dedicated public servant whose breadth of experience and strength of character and commitment to justice makes him a well-qualified candidate.

No one has questioned or shed any doubt on his qualifications; that is not the issue. Oftentimes that is an issue with nominees, but that is not the issue in this case. The issue is that we simply—as we have in the past—allowed a voice vote on these nominations. It has taken an average of 8 days after coming out of the committee for the District of Minnesota. The first U.S. attorney for Minnesota took 2 days. We have now waited 890 days.

It is time to get this done.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER).

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPEALING SECTION 403 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to S. 1963 is now pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 298, S. 1963, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

Harry Reid, Mark L. Pryor, Mark Begich, Kay R. Hagan, Jeanne Shaheen, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Christopher A. Coons, Angus S. King, Jr., Bill Nelson, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived and the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to this matter occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 10.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK CHEATHAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an accomplished educator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Dr. Frank Cheatham is the senior vice president for academic affairs and professor of math and computer science at Campbellsville University. His impending retirement in December will conclude a career of over 40 years devoted to Christian higher education. Campbellsville University is an acclaimed university in central Kentucky with more than 3,600 students that prepares them as Christian servant leaders for lifelong learning, continued scholarship, and active participation in a diverse, global society.

No more than 20 miles of country road separates Frank's birthplace of Merrimac, KY, from the campus on which he has spent the majority of his life as both a student and a professor. Dr. Cheatham was born on February 3, 1943, to Gladys and the late Jeff Cheatham. Of his eight siblings, four went on to become teachers, including his brother, Don, who also teaches at Campbellsville.

Dr. Cheatham wields an impressive arsenal of post-secondary degrees. After completing his undergraduate studies at Campbellsville in 1965, he continued to earn a master of science from Tennessee Technological University, his Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of Kentucky, and a second master of science in computer science education from the University of Evansville.

Dr. Cheatham began his career teaching math and biology at Taylor County High School in 1965. He then served as a teaching assistant at Tennessee Tech and the University of Kentucky and as an assistant professor at Campbell College in North Carolina before landing at Campbellsville University in August of 1973. Ever since then, save for a single year of leave during which he taught at Western Kentucky University, Dr. Cheatham has taught math and computer science at Campbellsville. In 1999, he was offered and accepted the position of senior vice president for academic affairs. The university's president, Dr. Michael V. Carter, recalls that it was ''the very first decision I made after becoming president.''

Dr. Cheatham's excellence as an educator needs no validation aside from the many successes and accomplishments of his students. Nevertheless, he has been honored for his service at Campbellsville University time and

time again. He has twice been named Campbellsville/Taylor County Chamber of Commerce Educator of the Year, in 1992 and 2000. He was awarded the Sears-Roebuck Foundation Teaching Excellence and Campus Leadership Award in 1989 and the Campbellsville University Student Government Association Challenger Award a year later. In 1996, he received the Board of Advisors Academic Excellence Distinguished Professor award, and in 2002, he became a Campbellsville University Distinguished Alumnus.

Despite his tireless devotion to teaching, Dr. Cheatham has also found time to pursue his passions outside the classroom. Among his many extra-curricular pursuits, he led the discussion on bringing the internet to Campbellsville University in 1994, and served as president for the Consortium for Computing in Small Colleges. He also served as the national president of Sigma Zeta, the science and math honor society, and is on the board of directors at Taylor Regional Hospital.

Those who have crossed paths with Dr. Cheatham—whether as one of his students, as a colleague, as a fellow member of Frank's Campbellsville Baptist Church, or as a friend—know just how much he will be missed at Campbellsville University. His lifelong commitment to education and his devotion to bettering the lives of his students deserve the praise of this body.

Thus, I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in commending Dr. Cheatham for an exemplary career and wishing him nothing but the best as he enjoys retirement with his wife, Shirley, his daughter, Tammy, and his grandson—a junior at Campbellsville University—Drew.

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, after more than a year of debate, negotiation and compromise, the farm bill has finally been approved. This legislation is a win for the family farmers and rural economy that is at the heart of Upstate New York. While the final product does not include everything that we fought for, the farm bill's passage was of the utmost importance to New York. It maintains or grows scores of programs for our dairies, fruit and vegetable farmers, maple syrup producers, rural development projects and iconic New York companies like Hickey Freeman in Rochester, NY.

The farm bill is unique in that it touches the lives of all Americans by ensuring the health of our nation's food supply. It does that by supporting our hard working farmers. The bill supports innovative agricultural research that helps make our farms some of the most productive on the planet. I am proud that this will include the Acer Access and Development Program or Maple Tap Act, which will provide grants to promote maple tapping and research across New York. This bill makes common sense reforms like eliminating direct payments and expanding opportunities for crop insurance and even linking crop insurance with conservation compliance. This bill does this all while providing a safety net for our farms that often face unpredictable natural disasters.

However, this bill is more than just an agriculture bill; it is the bedrock of our food and agriculture policy for the next 5 years. The Farm Bill will drive our rural economy into the 21st Century by making investments not only in our farms, but in water, broadband, and energy infrastructure. This bill provides opportunities to grow small business in rural communities, such as helping a rural entrepreneur turn grandma's award winning jam into a commercial product ready to be sold on store shelves across the great state of New York and across the country. This farm bill pulls our rural and urban communities ever closer, as it expands opportunities for farmers markets and food hubs to communities that for so long have lacked access to local fresh food.

Another very important provision in this bill that I would like to highlight is extension of the Wool Trust Fund. For more than a decade we have had in place this successful program to protect the workers at American manufacturers of men's suits from an unfair trade anomaly. While we allow finished suits to be imported into this country duty-free from many countries, we impose a 25% duty on the fabrics that our domestic suit manufacturers must import. This anomaly has acted as a huge tax on companies that wanted to stay and manufacture here in the United States. Therefore, more than a decade ago, we enacted the Wool Trust Fund program to provide both duty refunds and licenses to import limited quantities of suiting fabrics at reduced duties. The combination of these steps helped to level the playing field and keep manufacturing jobs from moving abroad.

The Farm Bill will extend and modify this program. For example, it will consolidate the duty refunds and duty reductions with the intention of maintaining the same amount of benefits for the same manufacturers as would have been achieved under the current program. While the program has been modified it continues its central purpose—providing a mechanism to reduce the tariff burden of companies that stay in the United States to manufacture apparel without harming the domestic textile industry.

I am proud to say that one company that benefits from this program today, and that will continue benefiting, is Hickey Freeman and its 410 employees in Rochester, New York. I am proud to be a customer of this iconic brand. I am also proud to have stood up for these workers by helping establish this program more than a decade ago and extending it through the years. I am certain that the provisions of this bill will be implemented as intended so that Hickey Freeman and its employees—along with many other companies in New York and across the country—will continue to benefit fully from this program in the same way that it has benefited for more than a decade.

From suit manufacturing in Rochester to maple taps in the Adirondacks, from dairies in the Central part of my state, to apple, pear, cherry and berry growers in the Hudson valley, from the wineries at end of Long Island to those near Niagara Falls, the industries that bring life to our rural communities will be better because we passed this Farm Bill. Their crops will grow fuller and stronger, and so will our economy.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Farm bill policies touch the lives of all Americans, not just those who work in the agricultural sector. In addition to reauthorizing farm programs, this legislation deals with domestic and international food aid, conservation and the environment, trade, rural development, renewable energy, forestry, and financial markets, among other issues. This year's reauthorization presented an opportunity to enact significant reforms in these areas. While some progress was made, I believe the bill falls short of its potential, and ultimately I could not support it.

The farm bill takes an important step toward reform by ending the longstanding practice of giving direct payments to farmers of certain commodity crops regardless of whether they experienced losses or even planted a crop. It also tightens limits on the amount of farm payments an individual can receive, expands crop insurance opportunities for specialty and organic crops, establishes conservation compliance as a requirement for receiving premium insurance subsidies, and invests in rural broadband.

In spite of these successes, however, the farm bill does not do enough for Rhode Island families.

Of greatest concern to me, it cuts $8.6 billion over 10 years from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, also known as food stamps. These cuts could reduce food stamp benefits for as many as 850,000 households across the country, including tens of thousands in Rhode Island. SNAP is our Nation's most important antihunger program. In this challenging economic climate, it is wrong to cut critical food-assistance funding.

In addition, this farm bill, like its predecessors, fails to provide adequate support for our fishermen in Rhode Island and nationwide. Farm bill programs provide billions of dollars in subsidies and technical assistance to farmers every year. In comparison, fishermen have little access to similar kinds of Federal assistance. Despite attempts to correct this inequity, fishermen remain second-class citizens when it comes to Federal support.

Finally, American agriculture springs from the richness of our land

and natural resources, and the farm bill has long supported programs to conserve and protect those resources. As the harmful effects of climate change become more prevalent, our agricultural policy should reflect the threat posed to farming and food production by these changes. In this farm bill, ''climate change'' and ''extreme weather'' are hardly mentioned. Congress can start by opening the Regional Conservation Partnership Program to climate change adaptation and mitigation projects.

The farm bill is important and wide-ranging legislation. Unfortunately, the conference report leaves out essential protections for low-income Americans, hard-hit fisheries, and precious natural resources.

THE USS FORRESTAL

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today marks the last voyage of the Ex-USS *Forrestal*, the world's first supercarrier. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize the ship and all who sailed on her in service to a grateful nation. Launched almost 60 years ago in Newport News, VA, she was named after former Navy Secretary and first Secretary of Defense James Forrestal.

Forrestal represented American ingenuity and shipbuilding excellence, integrating operational needs, and engineering insight that created the first steam catapult, angled flight deck, and use of optical landing systems.

During her 38 years of active service, *Forrestal* and its attached air wings were involved in missions around the globe. At the beginning of her sea life, she was sent to the eastern Mediterranean during the Suez and Lebanon Crises and over the course of her service life was involved in dozens of NATO operations, overseas deployments, patrol missions, and strategic port visits around the Atlantic and Sixth Fleets. She was ''home'' to thousands of the Nation's finest sailors and aviators this country has ever known.

Forrestal's contributions to the war effort in Vietnam are well documented. Unfortunately, so is the terrible fire that engulfed the flight deck on July 29, 1967, killing 134 shipmates, injuring 161 more, and destroying more than 20 aircraft. I will never forget when that Zuni rocket hit my A–4 Skyhawk after it was accidentally fired from across the flight deck, rupturing the fuel tank and setting that horrific, costly fire.

I will always remember and honor my brave comrades who died in the *Forrestal* fire. Although the ship is being towed to Brownsville, TX, to be physically dismembered, her legacy, the bonds forged, and memories created among shipmates will live forever. I bid her a final ''fair winds and following seas.''

HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, earlier this week I spoke to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A few weeks ago, the National Conference of State Legislators gave me an award—for defending the 10th Amendment. It's the first time in ten years they were able to give that award. There hasn't been much protection of the 10th Amendment going on in Washington. As grateful as I am for both awards, the award that I am working even harder to earn is one for deregulating and simplifying the federal role in higher education.

If I were to earn that, it would be the first time in American history that honor had been bestowed. Truth is, for a long time it wasn't needed.

The federal government didn't begin to focus on colleges and universities—almost all of them private at the time—until 1862 when President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act. That Act provided each state with 30,000 acres of federal land for each member in their congressional delegation. States were then required to sell the land and use the proceeds to fund public colleges that focused on agriculture, engineering, and military science. States were expected to contribute to the maintenance of its land-grant institution as well as to provide its buildings. But Congress was otherwise sparse on advice for how to establish these institutions and there was little federal intervention.

The federal government didn't focus much more on higher education again until 1944, when Congress passed the G.I. Bill. This included federal financial assistance to help any veteran who served at least 90 days between December 1941 and 1946 pay for college or vocational training programs at the public or private institution of their choice. This even included high schools. The big news here was not just the new federal money, but the way it was spent. Instead of establishing a Washington program for colleges serving the needs of veterans, the federal money followed veterans to the college of their choice.

Not all of the independent private colleges thought this was such a good idea. The president of the University of Chicago said the G.I. Bill would turn universities into an ''educational hobo jungle.''

The only limitation on choice of institution for those using the G.I. Bill was that it had to be approved by the appropriate state educational agency or by the Administrator of the Veterans Administration.

So you see, the dreaded ''voucher,'' which raises the hackles of the K–12 establishment, was the very foundation of federal funding for colleges and universities for seventy years.

Last week I introduced a bill to give federal money to elementary and secondary students in the same way we do with the G.I. Bill, Pell Grants and student loans—let the money follow students to the schools they choose. If you just take 41 percent of the federal dollars we are already spending on K–12 education, you can turn that into $2,100 scholarships for 21 million low-income children.

But as you can imagine, these Pell Grants for Kids created an uproar from the K–12 establishment. My response was, if vouchers helped created the best system of colleges in the world, why don't we try it for our schools?

But back to the history of federal involvement in higher education.

After the G.I. Bill, the number of Americans enrolled in college more than doubled in just six years between 1943 and 1949.

Then came the Korean G.I. Bill in 1952.

And this brought more federal regulation. The Korean G.I. Bill specified that institutions of higher education needed to be accredited by a federally recognized accreditor in order for a veteran student to use their benefits.

Still it was not much regulation. Only a single page of paper.

By the way, in 1952, roughly 35 percent of students were graduating from high school and only 6 percent were completing college.

Now move ahead to Sputnik in the late 1950s. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act that created the first federal loan program in order for students to attend college. Between 1952 and 1965, college enrollment increased from more than 2.1 million to nearly 6 million (almost 30 percent of the 18–24-year-old population).

Still, after 100 years of federal involvement, there were not many rules and regulations.

This brings us to 1965 and the passage of the Higher Education Act.

Now here is the problem. Congress has reauthorized the Higher Education Act eight times since 1965. With each reauthorization came many well-intentioned good ideas and another stack of additional regulations. The laws and regulations have piled so high since 1965 that I voted against the 2008 reauthorization because the stack of regulations was as tall as I was then and I believed that a new bill would eventually double that stack.

Here is a concrete example of unnecessary complication in the higher education system: the application for federal aid.

It is a ten-page document that asks more than 100 questions and is accompanied by a 72-page instruction booklet.

This is considered a victory in Washington. I know that when I came here 11 years ago, I was determined to simplify this application

form. So were many other senators. And this is the result.

Despite well-meaning intentions over the years, our system has become too complicated and burdensome. It wastes time and dollars that ought to be spent helping students.

So today, I am here to ask for your help. I want to reverse this trend of piling on layer after layer.

To begin with, I have asked my staff to consider drafting a new Higher Education Act from scratch. Start all over. Include everything that needs to be included and consider new regulations that need to be written. This is not an ideological exercise. It is an effort to clean out the clutter. Call it a long-delayed spring cleaning.

The Senate education committee has begun to hold hearings on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Chairman HARKIN and I have worked closely together on these hearings and the chairman has been very thoughtful in how we are approaching them.

At a recent financial aid hearing, here is what the witnesses told us and they all told us the same thing:

o The application for a Pell Grant could be reduced to a post-card by collecting only income and family size

o The federal aid system should consist of one grant, one loan, and one tax credit

o Students should know how much the federal government will invest in them in their junior year of high school

o We can use social media to reach those in middle school about potential aid opportunities

We were told that these four big ideas would:

o Save money

o Reduce regulation

o Increase access for low-income, disadvantaged students

To take these ideas and others and put them into law, I have created a Task Force on Government Regulation of Higher Education.

I am joined in this by Senator Mikulski, Senator Burr, and Senator Bennet; Brit Kirwan of the University of Maryland System and Nick Zeppos of Vanderbilt University have agreed to co-chair this task force. And 14 other college presidents, university system heads, and other leaders representing all sectors in higher education will work with the American Council on Education to:

o Identify duplicative or unnecessary regulations

o Determine the cost of complying with federal regulation

o And offer suggestions for improving the current structure of regulating.

Other members of NAICU serving on this panel include:

o Hartwick College (which has done tremendous work in this area already)

o Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association

o Colorado Christian University

o American University

o Hiram College.

In addition, Congress has provided $1 million to the National Research Council to conduct a study on overregulation of higher education funding for which I have fought since the last reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 2008.

So we have a bipartisan group of senators and a task force which has its first meeting next week and a National Research Council $1 million study to help us doour job.

But we need one more thing: your help.

Ronald Reagan once said that the eight most dangerous words were: ''I'm from Washington and I'm here to help.''

Well, I'm from Tennessee. So, while I may be here in Washington, I am here instead to ask for YOUR help.

The task force needs to hear specific examples of rules and regulations that are no longer needed, overly burdensome, costly, and confusing.

I would suggest that you do it in the easiest, most specific and practical way. Start with the easiest thing that will make the most difference and save the most money and time that would be better spent on students, and make that first. And the next one, second. In every case, make it as specific as possible. You're the experts. You know what's happening at your institutions.

Send your specific recommendations to this organization (NAICU), my staff, and directly to Chancellor Zeppos.

But I would also like to recommend that you share these with your home state senators and representatives.

Now sometimes I've said that you don't need to come to Washington, and sometimes I get in trouble for saying that, but it's true. In fact, it's better if you see them at home. Think about it. Here they've all flown to Washington, they think the plane flight somehow made them smarter, they're away from their grounding, and they're busy. They have lots to do here.

Now, you all have flown up here and spent a lot of money to get here, and you're doing the right thing—that's a good thing, it's helpful, it's appreciated, it's important.

But let me tell you something that's more important. Take ten people from your congressional district and ask to see your congressman or congresswoman at his or her district office. Or go see your senator in his state office. You'll have more to say, it will cost you a lot less to travel, they'll have more time to hear you, and it will make a much bigger difference.

Visit them at home!

Tell them that you are forwarding a list of duplicative, unnecessary rules and regulations affecting higher education that you have identified for elimination.

Explain to them the importance on institutional autonomy, the accreditation process and the marketplace that produces competition allowing students to choose schools and why this has helped to create the best system of higher education in the world.

They will have questions, and they are entitled to have questions. Last year Congress appropriated $33 billion in taxpayer dollars for Pell Grants, more than $100 billion in loans and $38 billion for university-sponsored research.

We'll need allies to make progress, and if you tell your elected representatives what you are doing and exactly how to deregulate higher education, I bet they will listen.

Let me give you an example of why this is worth your time, the story behind the America COMPETES legislation.

In 2005, I was sitting at a Senate Budget Committee hearing and I was worried about how all the Medicaid and Medicare spending was going to squeeze out investments in education. So, that afternoon, I walked over to the National Academy of Sciences and said, ''I believe if you'll tell Congress 10 things in priority order that Congress would need to do in order to help make us more competitive in the world, I believe Congress would do it.''

The Academy created a very good group led by Norm Augustine of Lockheed Martin and produced a report called ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' It had 20 specific suggestions in priority order—Congress enacted about 2/3 of them, and within 4 to 5 years, funded most of them.

In other words, the point I'm trying to get across here is that most ideas in Washington fail for lack of the specific idea.

You'll be surprised that the more specific you are, the more likely things are to get done.

Now, I am among the converted.

I believe we have the best system of colleges and universities in the world.

Despite that, you will hear me urging you to focus on worker training, to stop this business of shutting down such valuable assets during the summer, and to confront disturbing political correctness.

In the history of the world, universities have changed less than any other institution. But in the Internet age, they will need to change more. You need to learn from the same lesson that applied to the American automobile companies in the 1960s and 1970s which nearly led to their demise.

So my mission today is to deregulate and simplify the federal role in higher education. To do this, I need your help. First, to suggest concrete examples of overregulation. Second, to remind your elected representatives of the importance of autonomy and the marketplace that has created the best higher education system in the world.

And if all of that effort earns the award for deregulation and simplification of higher education, I will gladly share it with each of you.

RECOGNIZING JEANNE HULIT

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jeanne Hulit, who is

leaving her position as Acting Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration tomorrow. Ms. Hulit is returning to the private sector after more than 4 years of service to her country at SBA. She stepped up last year when former Administrator Karen Mills stepped down, staying on for longer than anticipated to ensure that the government agency responsible for helping America's nearly 28 million small businesses had the leadership it needed. We should thank her for honoring her commitment to America's entrepreneurs.

Prior to assuming the role of Acting Administrator, Ms. Hulit served as Associate Administrator for SBA's Office of Capital Access since February 2012, where she was responsible for advising SBA Administrator Karen Mills and overseeing the agency's loan programs. During her tenure at SBA, the agency saw its two highest years of small business lending on record.

Ms. Hulit's service at SBA began in 2009 when she was appointed to serve as SBA's New England Regional Administrator. As Regional Administrator, she was responsible for carrying out SBA's core mission of assisting small businesses with the ''three C's''—capital, contracting and counseling—in six New England States.

Prior to joining SBA, Ms. Hulit spent 18 years in banking, serving as senior vice president for commercial lending at Citizens Bank, vice president and middle market lender at KeyBank, and manager of KeyBank's International Banking Division. Prior to that, she served as deputy director of the International Division at the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development. Ms. Hulit has also held a number of civic and economic leadership roles, including her tenure as a founder and chair of the Maine International Trade Center and her service as chair for the University of Southern Maine Board of Visitors.

Ms. Hulit's experience in both the public and private sector and her expertise in lending gave her unique insight into the importance of getting capital into the hands of entrepreneurs. This came across clearly in her success at SBA. During her time at SBA, the agency supported more than $126 billion in lending to more than 260,000 small businesses and entrepreneurs. This includes two record years of delivering more than $30 billion annually in loans in fiscal year 2011 and fiscal year 2012 and more than $29 billion in 2013.

Later this month, Ms. Hulit will be moving back home to Maine and taking a job at Northeast Bank. While it is tough to see the SBA lose such a talented and loyal public servant and America's small businesses lose a tireless advocate, I am happy to see her get to return home to pursue this great opportunity. I wish her all the best in this and future endeavors, and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking her for her loyal and dedicated service at SBA.

HONORING MAINE VETERANS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the men and women who have defended America with their service and to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the many outstanding ways in which citizens of Maine are honoring those who served and, in some cases, gave their lives for our country.

U.S. Marine Corps Maj. David Cote, a Maine native, recently established the Summit Project, a living tribute to remember and memorialize each Maine servicemember who has been killed in the line of duty since September 11, 2001.

As part of this living memorial, Major Cote has traveled across Maine to visit with the families of the fallen. He has asked each family to search for a stone to represent their loved one who gave his or her life so we could live in peace. From backyards and fishing holes to national forests and lakeside camps, these stones have been handpicked from across Maine to represent each fallen hero.

Beginning this Memorial Day and annually thereafter, Major Cote will lead commemorative tribute hikes, in which volunteers will each carry a stone in honor of a specific fallen servicemember. During these hiking expeditions, the memories of the fallen, recounted by widows, mothers, fathers, and friends, will be shared with the hikers embarking on their journey to the summit of mountains in Maine. The Summit Project was launched to help the families who have suffered such painful losses truly heal, and to ensure that the experiences of these heroes inspire a new generation of patriots. It will honor the heroism and patriotism of those who gave all for our country since 9/11 and will ensure that their stories and sacrifices are added to Maine's proud history of duty to country.

In another unique effort, which started 23 years ago in Maine and which has now spread to include the entire United States and beyond, thousands of volunteers each year have the opportunity to recognize the ultimate sacrifice made by our brave servicemembers by participating in Wreaths Across America. This annual effort, which provides holiday wreaths to mark the graves of fallen servicemembers, was begun by Morrill and Karen Worcester of Harrington, ME.

On December 14, 2013, approximately one dozen tractor-trailer trucks laden with 143,000 ''remembrance wreaths,'' all proudly made in Maine, were escorted to Arlington National Cemetery by the Maine State Police and Patriot Guard Riders. Numerous volunteers spent the morning placing the wreaths on the headstones of deceased veterans and reflecting on their courage, selflessness, and sacrifice. All told, Wreaths Across America shipped more than 470,000 wreaths to adorn veterans' graves in all 50 States and around the world.

The mission of Wreaths Across America is to ''Remember, Honor, Teach.'' In addition to honoring America's fallen, the group seeks to promote awareness of the sacrifices made by servicemembers through various veterans' events and wreath laying ceremonies at State Houses and the U.S. Capitol. These solemn ceremonies allow us the opportunity to pause and remember the many men and women who have died to preserve our freedoms, and they encourage us to instruct younger generations so that those sacrifices are never forgotten.

For those veterans who have returned home from war, our Nation must ensure that we facilitate their transition to life as civilians. In many cases, these veterans have suffered severe injuries and need further assistance. The third effort I highlight today focuses on one veteran's effort to encourage other veterans.

U.S. Army SSG Travis Mills was on his third tour of duty in Afghanistan when he was critically injured by an improvised explosive device while on patrol. As a result, Travis lost portions of both legs and both arms. He is one of just five quadruple-amputees from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to survive their injuries.

While Travis recovered at Walter Reed Medical Center, he dreamed of providing a camp in Maine as a recreation center for disabled veterans and their families—an affordable place which would provide much-needed quality time for families to spend together. Through the assistance of Dean Lachance, executive director of the Bread of Life Ministries, Travis was connected with Joel and Crista Lavenson, co-owners of Kennebec Camp's Maine Golf & Tennis Academy. Together, they transformed their vision into a reality, creating the National Veterans Family Center, where wounded veterans and their families can enjoy much needed rest and relaxation while participating in outdoor activities that include fishing, boating, and archery.

We must never forget the sacrifices that have been made by all generations of veterans, as well as those who still serve. I am proud that Maine has a long history of great patriots who have died in the service of their country. Low on ammunition and men, Joshua Chamberlain courageously led the charge at Little Round Top at the Battle of Gettysburg. MSG Gary Gordon demonstrated great bravery during the Battle of Mogadishu in 1992, which led to his receiving the Medal of Honor. The brave Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom are no longer with us, but through efforts like The Summit Project, Wreaths Across America, and the National Veterans Family Center, we can honor their sacrifice and ensure that their legacies live on.

2014 OLYMPIANS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Vermonters who will be representing the United States in the Olympic Winter Games in Sochi, Russia. Vermont has a long tradition of excellence in winter sports that we owe partly to our State's cold climate and mountainous terrain, but also to an outdoor spirit that dates back generations. I would like to acknowledge these athletes individually and wish them the best of luck in pursuing the gold.

Sophie Caldwell, from Peru, VT, will be competing for the United States in cross-country skiing. Sophie was a five-time All-American at Dartmouth College, and received a degree in psychology and plans to go back to school to pursue a career in either psychology or education.

Hannah Dreissigacker, from Morrisville, VT, is a member of the Craftsbury Green Racing Project, a group of elite athletes who are committed to pursuing an environmentally conscious lifestyle. Hannah will be competing in the biathlon in Sochi.

Kelly Clark, from West Dover, VT, is one of the most successful snowboarders to ever compete. She won a gold medal in the halfpipe event at the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, and a bronze medal at the 2010 games in Vancouver. In addition to her success on the slopes, Kelly has given back to her community by starting a foundation that provides scholarships to athletes from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Susan Dunklee, from Craftsbury, VT, will be competing for the United States in the biathlon. Susan placed fifth in the World Championship's Individual race in Ruhpolding, Germany, and tied for the best score of those U.S. female biathletes competing. Susan, like Ms. Dreissigacker, is also a member of the Craftsbury Green Racing Project, which promotes sustainability and endurance sports.

Lindsey Jacobellis, from Stratton, VT, started competing in snowboard cross competitions when she was 11 and has risen to become a dominant force in the sport. Lindsay won a silver medal at the 2006 Winter Olympics in Turin, and is an eight-time champion in snowboardcross at the Winter X Games.

Hannah Kearney, from Norwich, VT, is one of the top freestyle mogul competitors in the world, having won a gold medal at the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver. I wish her the best of luck in defending her Olympic title.

Devin Logan, from West Dover, VT, is a freeskier who will be competing in the slopestyle and halfpipe events. During her rookie season, she finished second in the halfpipe event at the U.S. Championships and earned her first U.S. halfpipe skiing title at the age of 15.

Andy Newell, from Shaftsbury, VT, is a cross-country skier who has been racing since the age of five. He placed 16th in freestyle sprint during the 2006 Winter Olympics and finished off the 2012–2013 season ranked as the fifth fastest sprinter in the world. Outside of training for this year's Winter Olympics, Andy works with kids at the New England Nordic Ski Association to introduce the sport to a new audience.

Hannah Teter, from Belmont, VT, won a gold medal in the halfpipe event at the 2006 Winter Olympics and a silver medal in 2010 in Vancouver. In true Vermont fashion, Hannah is very active in her community and charitable causes, combining her prize money with proceeds from maple syrup sales to start a charity called ''Hannah's Gold'' which builds schools and fresh water infrastructure in a village in rural Kenya.

Ida Sargent, from Barton, VT, is a cross-country skier who is also a member of the Craftsbury Green Racing Project. After finishing her cross-country skiing career, Ida hopes to become a physical therapist.

Liz Stephen, from East Montpelier, VT, switched from alpine to cross-country skiing midway through her tenure at Burke Mountain Academy. Liz took first place in two events at the 2008 U.S. National Championships. Since her last trip to the Winter Olympics in 2010, she finished atop the podium at the Swiss National Championship in 2012 and finished fifth in the 10k freestyle at the 2013 World Ski Championships. Liz enjoys mountain biking and takes classes at Westminster College.

Mikaela Shiffrin, from East Burke, VT, will compete for the United States in alpine skiing. Mikaela is an eight-time World Cup slalom medalist. Mikaela is the first non-European to win four World Cup slalom races in one season. When she isn't competing, she also enjoys playing tennis and soccer.

Ty Walker, from Stowe, VT, has made a significant impact on women's slopestyle snowboarding. Ty has won the Burton European Open Junior Jam three times in a row from 2009–2011. In 2013, when she was just 16, she finished fifth at the FIS World Snowboarding Championship. Off the snow, Ty is a straight-A student and loves to jump on trampolines.

Alex Deibold, from Manchester, VT, will compete in his first Olympics as a snowboardcross competitor. Alex finished second in the 2013 World Cup championship in Sochi, Russia. Alex also made finals at four out of five World Cup starts in 2013. When he is off the slopes, Alex enjoys rock climbing, surfing, and mountain biking.

Jacqueline Hernandez, from Londonderry, VT will compete for the United States in snowboardcross. Jacqueline is a seven-time World Cup top-10 finisher. In her spare time, she enjoys riding motorcycles, swimming, and boating.

Nolan Kasper, from Warren, VT, will compete for the United States in alpine skiing. Nolan competed in the 2010 Winter Olympic Games and placed 24th in men's slalom. In addition, Nolan enjoys ice skating and playing soccer.

Mr. President, Vermont is very proud of the athletes who will be competing in Sochi, and I would like to join the citizens of my state to wish them the best of luck at the 2014 Olympic Winter Games. Bring home the gold!

OLYMPIANS

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I join with citizens across the Granite State in saying ''good luck'' to the outstanding New Hampshire athletes who will be among those representing the United States in the 2014 Winter Olympic Games in Sochi, Russia, which begin this week. It is an impressive group that brings great pride to our State.

Nick Alexander of Lebanon is competing in ski jumping. After his impressive performance at the Continental Cup Competitions, we look forward to seeing him soar through the air in Sochi.

At age 18, Center Conway native Sean Doherty is the youngest member of the 2014 U.S. Olympic biathlon team.

Nick Fairall of New London grew up enjoying skiing, lacrosse, soccer and many other sports, but his true passion is ski jumping. This year we will get to watch him jump for the gold in Sochi.

Andover's Kris Freeman is a veteran Olympian having competed in the 2002, 2006 and 2010 Winter Olympics. This year, we will cheer him on again as he competes in the cross-country skiing event.

Competing in slopestyle snowboarding is 2012 world champion Chas Guldemond from Laconia. This will be his first time competing on the Olympic stage.

Sixteen-year-old Hanover native Julia Krass grew up skiing at the recently reopened Whaleback Mountain in Enfield. We wish her the best of luck as she competes in Sochi's inaugural slopestyle skiing event, the newest kind of freestyle skiing.

World renowned alpine skier Bode Miller of Franconia will be competing in his fifth Winter Olympic Games the sixth American athlete to do so. This year, the decorated Olympian will go for his sixth alpine skiing Olympic medal.

North Conway resident Leanne Smith, who competed in the 2010 Olympics in Vancouver, is returning to the Olympics to compete in several alpine skiing events, including downhill, slalom, giant slalom, super G, and super combined.

The University of New Hampshire's head hockey coach, Katey Stone, will make history in Sochi as the first woman to lead a U.S. Olympic hockey team. We will be rooting for her to lead her players to victory.

D.J. Montigny, who grew up in Dover, will coach three U.S. athletes in women's slopestyle skiing. Good luck to D.J. as he advises members of Team USA before they head down the slopes to compete.

Additionally, several athletes from around the U.S. who have been educated and trained in New Hampshire

have been selected to compete for Team USA in various events. Congratulations to hockey players Gillian Apps, Kacey Bellamy and James Van Riemsdy; alpine skiers David Chodounsky, Julia Ford, Nolan Kasper, Mikaela Shiffrin and Andrew Weibrecht; cross country skiers Ida Sargent and Sophie Caldwell; freestyle skier Hannah Kearney; and Hannah Dreissigacker, Susan Dunklee and Sara Studebaker, who will compete in the biathlon.

Each of these world-class athletes and coaches has made it to Sochi as a result of hours of dedication, perseverance and hard work. They have put in long hours at the gym, on the slopes or the ice, hoping that one day their Olympic dreams come true.

I know all Granite Staters are so incredibly proud of this talented group of athletes and I look forward to cheering them on as they go for the gold in Sochi.

REMEMBERING STEPHEN MACHCINSKI AND JAMES DICKERMAN

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the service and the memory of two Ohio firefighters, Private Stephen A. Machcinski and Private James Dickman of the Toledo Fire Department. Like so many of the men and women who serve as first responders in our country, these two men knew that every day, they were putting their lives on the line to keep their community—their friends and neighbors—safe. When things were at their worst, they were at their best. When others needed help, they were there to give it. When others ran out, they ran in.

Tragically, Private Machcinski and Private Dickman gave their lives in the line of duty, doing the job they loved, the one they were trained and prepared to do, while fighting an apartment complex fire in Toledo, OH, on January 26, 2014. But although they are gone, we will not forget them. Today, we honor their sacrifice and remember these fallen heroes who put themselves in harm's way for the good of their family, their friends, their neighbors, and the entire Toledo community.

Mr. President, for their commitment to saving lives, protecting the public, and willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice, I would like to recognize Private Stephen A. Machcinski and Private James Dickman. We will continue to keep these two men and their families in our thoughts and prayers.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING ARTHUR ''ART'' ORTENBERG

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I wish to remember the life of a dear friend of mine, and Montana's, Art Ortenberg.

Art grew up in Newark, NJ, the son of a Russian upholsterer father and a Polish seamstress mother. As a boy, Art lived across the street from a public library, where he spent countless hours devouring its offerings. The local library was a second home to Art. It gave him the chance to expand his horizons and dream of opportunities and lives that he had never before imagined.

Art, with his wife of almost 50 years, Liz Claiborne, built a Fortune 500 fashion empire—the first to be headed by a woman. Art was utterly devoted to Liz. They were deeply in love and they were inseparable. Together, they made high fashion affordable and revolutionized the fashion industry. While Art and Liz may be known for their exploits in the fashion world, Montanans know, and love, them for their unassuming generosity and deep sense of community.

Art and Liz first came to Montana seeking a respite from the rigors of the business world in Montana's wide-open spaces. Once there, they made Montana their home.

Art and Liz loved Montana as deeply as any Montanan. And, as John Steinbeck famously recognized, it's difficult to analyze love when you are in it. To Art, the slow, switchbacking country highway on the way to his Triple 8 Ranch was ''a glorious, intoxicating drive,'' the road ''traversing [the] landscape in serpentine coils.''

I don't think anyone has so lovingly described Route 279's slow crawl over the Continental Divide, and it shows the depth of Art's affection for Montana.

But Art's deep love for Montana didn't stop at mere admiration for our outdoors—it spawned action. Indeed, Art and Liz were philanthropists in the true sense of the word: They loved the people and communities of Montana. They adopted Montana as their home, and they gave generously of their time, their energy, and their resources.

Art and Liz wanted to open doors for young Montanans in the way that the local library did for Art. Together, they started preschools and music programs in small mountain towns, saved local libraries from closure, and loaned money to a local timber mill so that it could make downpayments on new equipment. They encouraged our young people to take pride in their hometowns through the Montana Heritage Project, fostering a sense of community in a generation of students.

Art and Liz recognized the importance of providing our young people with an opportunity to dream and grow, just like that Newark library had done for Art.

Art and Liz also cared deeply about conservation, funding projects to restore the Blackfoot River, reintroduce endangered species, and conserve valuable habitat and public lands. They recognized that Montana's public lands are our greatest assets and the importance of preserving our outdoor heritage for future generations.

As Art once said, ''What we do here matters.'' He knew that few are as fortunate as he and Liz had been. Art and Liz gave to Montana's communities generously and quietly. They sought to leave the world a better place than they found it, and they pursued this goal without pretension. In fact, Art and Liz could often be found down at the Windbag Saloon in Helena, quietly eating cheeseburgers in an old frontier brothel.

Liz is buried at the Triple 8 Ranch in Montana, in an unmarked gravesite in a ''Liz Red'' urn. Art planned to be buried next to her, returning to rest in the State where they both gave so much to so many. I know he will be missed.•

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Arthur ''Art'' Ortenberg, an apparel manufacturer and conservationist, who passed away yesterday in New York City.

Art and his late wife, designer Liz Claiborne, founded Liz Claiborne in 1976. After incredible early success, the company went public and soon appeared on the Fortune 500 list of America's biggest industrial firms.

Fourteen years after the creation of Liz Claiborne, Art and Liz retired from day-to-day management of their fashion company and chose to start a foundation dedicated to conservation. The Liz Claiborne and Art Ortenberg Foundation supports projects in the United States, Europe, and Central and South America, but their main focus is on Africa. To this day, the foundation continues to support efforts to save the jaguar, the tiger, and the African elephant.

Art also had a particular passion for the American West, spending much of his time over the past 25 years on his ranch in Condon, MT. Art and Liz provided assistance to the Seeley Lake Elementary School, helped Pyramid Lumber in Seeley Lake convert to a more efficient mill operation, and supported public radio, Humanities Montana, the Canyon Creek Fire Department, the Helena Public Library, and the Montana Wildlife Federation.

As we bid farewell to Art, we recognize that he was a true pioneer for the fashion industry and a leader in the conservation community.

My thoughts and prayers are with Art's partner, Cathy Horyn; his son, Neil; daughter, Nancy; stepson, Alexander Schultz; and all of his family and many friends.•

TRIBUTE TO JEFF NELSON

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Jeff Nelson on his well-earned retirement after nearly 40 years of service at East River Electric Cooperative in Madison, SD, including 23 years as General Manager.

Jeff's wealth of knowledge and friendly demeanor have helped him develop close relationships with his colleagues and with community leaders

throughout our State. He has been a tireless advocate for the population served by East River, and deeply engaged in discussions of energy and economic development policy for decades. As he has worked with me and my staff over the years, his input has always been appreciated and valued. He leaves behind an undeniable legacy of thoughtful and progressive leadership.

Jeff's work has left a mark on many facets of energy policy. Under his tenure as General Manager, East River has received national recognition, being named the 2013 Wind Energy Cooperative of the Year by the Energy Department. He undertook the daunting task of establishing a load-management system, the largest in the world at the time of its implementation. He also looked out for the unique interests of rural South Dakota in discussions of hydropower access and in helping the ethanol industry gain a foothold.

It is also important to note the vital economic development work Jeff has been involved in through the Rural Electric Economic Development, REED, Fund. The REED Fund has been crucial for the establishment or expansion of many South Dakota businesses and his work in this area has facilitated an improved rural economy.

He has been active in public service in his personal time, as well, using his expertise to make continued contributions to his community and our state. This service includes serving as Chair of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's Power and Water Resources Committee and Board President of the South Dakota Wind Energy Association, among other commitments.

Beyond his commendable career, I also take this opportunity to thank Jeff, and his wife Trudi for their years of friendship to me and Barbara. It was also a pleasure having Jeff and Trudi's son, Erik, serve as a valuable member of my staff for many years.

Though he will be missed at East River, I know that Jeff will continue to be engaged in policymaking and service projects. Once again, I am pleased to recognize Jeff for his many years of service to the people of South Dakota and applaud him for his exemplary career.●

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FOREIGN STUDY

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important accomplishment achieved by the American Institute For Foreign Study, AIFS, based in Stamford, CT. In 2014, AIFS will be celebrating its 50th year of providing unique cultural and educational opportunities to young people around the globe through its mission—''we bring the world together''. Through its study and travel abroad, high school exchange, camp counselor, au pair, and gifted education programs, young people from diverse backgrounds have interacted with others from different cultures, gaining a better understanding of their values and ideas.

Since its inception, AIFS has provided this educational opportunity to over 1.5 million people. In fact, over 800,000 American high school or college aged students have broadened their horizons by traveling abroad in structured educational programs. Whether it is through faculty-led educational travel programs or college semester/summer study abroad programs, young Americans have gained unique insights into a world that is rapidly shrinking.

Mr. President, I congratulate the leadership of AIFS for its tireless pursuit of its goal of achieving a greater global understanding. Working closely with the U.S. Department of State, AIFS' programs have positively changed the way their participants view the world as well as their place within it.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3590. An act to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3964. An act to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1996. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 3590. An act to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3964. An act to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes.

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–4560. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to competitions initiated or conducted in fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4561. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (IPERIA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4562. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4563. A communication from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Foundation's fiscal year 2013 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4564. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled, ''Audit of the Office of the People's Counsel Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2009,'' ''Audit of the Office of the People's Counsel Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2010,'' ''Audit of the Office of the People's Counsel Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2011,'' and ''Audit of the Office of the People's Counsel Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4565. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Railroad Retirement Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4566. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–266, ''Closing of a Portion of the Public Alley in Square 5452, S.O. 12–03541, Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4567. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–267, ''Microstamping Implementation Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4568. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–272, ''Public Charter School Historic Preservation Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4569. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–265, ''Minimum Wage Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4570. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4571. A communication from the Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4572. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Railroad Retirement Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2013, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4573. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Performance and Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4574. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4575. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Justice's activities regarding pre-1970 racially motivated homicides, as required by the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4576. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Annual Privacy Report for the period January 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4577. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges and Transit: Conditions and Performance''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4578. 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: Editorial Clean-up of References to Foreign Trade Regulations'' (RIN0694–AF97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 31, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4579. A communication from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting draft legislation entitled ''Antarctic Nongovernmental Activity Preparedness Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4580. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 31, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4581. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2014 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts'' (RIN0648–XD058) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4582. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; Amendment 99'' (RIN0648–BC73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4583. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Operation of Offshore Oil and Gas Facilities in the U.S. Beaufort Sea'' (RIN0648–AY63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4584. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2014 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts'' (RIN0648–XD060) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4585. A communication from the Acting Deputy 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; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' (RIN0648–XC811) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4586. 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; Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1069)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4587. A communication from the Chair of the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Panel's annual report for 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4588. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Adoption of American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code Section XII and the National Board Inspection Code'' (RIN2137–AE58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4589. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ehrenberg, First Mesa, Kachina Village, Munds Park, Wickenburg, and Williams, Arizona)'' (MB Docket No. 11–207) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4590. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rural Call Completion'' ((RIN3060–AJ89) (FCC 13–135)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Finance:

Report to accompany S. 1870, An original bill to reauthorize and restructure adoption incentive payments, to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, to increase the reliability of child support for children, and for other purposes (Rept . No. 113–137).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

*Katherine M. O'Regan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

*Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Rhea Sun Suh, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

*Roy K. J. Williams, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

*Richard J. Engler, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

*Thomas A. Burke, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. BAUCUS for the Committee on Finance.

*Karen Dynan, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Indira Talwani, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

James D. Peterson, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin.

Nancy J. Rosenstengel, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

John P. Carlin, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Debo P. Adegbile, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

*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. BAUCUS:

S. 1997. A bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1998. A bill to amend the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act to reserve funds for American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, and Tribal College or University adult education and literacy; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 1999. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to require the consent of parties to contracts for the use of arbitration to resolve controversies arising under the contracts and subject to provisions of such Act and to preserve the rights of servicemembers to bring class actions under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2000. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2001. A bill to require that textile and apparel articles acquired for use by executive agencies be manufactured from articles, materials, or supplies entirely grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2002. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a motor and motor-driven systems market assessment and public awareness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2003. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for certain property under construction; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2004. A bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 2005. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the reporting of certain hospital payment data under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2006. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Rare Earth Refinery Cooperative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 345. A resolution strongly supporting the restoration and protection of State authority and flexibility in establishing and defining challenging student academic standards and assessments, and strongly denouncing the President's coercion of States into adopting the Common Core State Standards by conferring preferences in Federal grants and flexibility waivers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 346. A resolution congratulating the athletes from the State of Washington and across the United States who are set to participate in the 2014 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games in Sochi, Russia; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 347. A resolution providing for completion of the accelerated transition of United States combat and military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 348. A resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 349. A resolution celebrating the 30th Anniversary of the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 350. A resolution designating February 14, 2014, as National Solidarity Day for Compassionate Patient Care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 351. A resolution requiring that legislation considered by the Senate be confined to a single issue; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 352. A resolution commemorating the success of Team USA in the past 22 Olympic Winter Games and supporting Team USA in the 2014 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 257

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes.

S. 279

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1061, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to designate certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs as health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1391

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1391, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1507

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1587

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1587, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1688

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), collectively, in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

S. 1702

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1702, a bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1737

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1799

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1799, a bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S. 1826

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1826, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1845

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, relating to an annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62.

S. 1895

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1895, a bill to establish a commission to examine the United States monetary policy, evaluate alternative monetary regimes, and recommend a course for monetary policy going forward.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1902, a bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1925

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1925, a bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1933, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 1963

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1963, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to provide for the restoration of the economic and ecological health of National Forest System land and rural communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to provide for USA Retirement Funds, to reform the pension system, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1984

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1984, a bill to enhance penalties for computer crimes, and for other purposes.

S. 1991

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1991, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster and to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed in a disaster.

S. RES. 270

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 270, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

S. RES. 333

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator

from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 333, a resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 333, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2603

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2603 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2712

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2712 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 1999. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to require the consent of parties to contracts for the use of arbitration to resolve controversies arising under the contracts and subject to provisions of such Act and to preserve the rights of servicemembers to bring class actions under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, our Nation has a strong tradition of ensuring that our service members are protected while they serve To keep us safe. As the challenges facing our service members change, we must work to ensure that our laws continue to keep pace. In this regard, I have worked with my colleagues over the years to strengthen the protections for service members and their families under the Servicemember Civil Relief Act, SCRA.

One such effort, the Servicemember Housing Protection Act, which I authored and was recently reported out of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, would enhance protections relating to the housing needs of our service members. I am pleased that these provisions have also been included in legislation the Senate will hopefully soon take up, Senator SANDERS's Comprehensive Veterans Health and Benefits and Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act, which I have cosponsored. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Today, I am joining Senator GRAHAM in introducing on a bipartisan basis legislation to further enhance SCRA protections. The SCRA Rights Protection Act seeks to protect service members from being forced to accept mandatory arbitration clauses as part of everyday transactions, such as those relating to mortgage origination, automobile leases, and student loans. Often service members sign contracts that include arbitration clauses buried in the fine print, and this eliminates their access to the courts, which can limit their ability to assert their rights and reach a fair resolution. In disputes involving SCRA rights, this bill would make arbitration clauses unenforceable unless all parties consent to arbitration after the dispute arises, and would also ensure that service members retain their right to join with other service members to file a case together as a class.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting these improvements to the SCRA that will better protect our military families while the men and women of our Armed Forces protect our Nation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 345—STRONGLY SUPPORTING THE RESTORATION AND PROTECTION OF STATE AUTHORITY AND FLEXIBILITY IN ESTABLISHING AND DEFINING CHALLENGING STUDENT ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS, AND STRONGLY DENOUNCING THE PRESIDENT'S COERCION OF STATES INTO ADOPTING THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS BY CONFERRING PREFERENCES IN FEDERAL GRANTS AND FLEXIBILITY WAIVERS

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 345

Whereas education belongs in the hands of our parents, local officials, local educational agencies, and States;

Whereas the development of the common education standards known as the Common Core State Standards was originally led by national organizations, but has transformed into an incentives-based mandate from the Federal Government;

Whereas, in 2009, the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), both of which are private trade associations, began developing common education standards for kindergarten through grade 12 (referred to in this preamble as the ''Common Core State Standards'');

Whereas, sections 9527, 9529, 9530, and 9531 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7907, 7909, 7910, and 7911) prohibit the establishment of a national curriculum, national testing, mandatory national teacher certification, and a national student database;

Whereas Federal law makes clear that the Department of Education may not be involved in setting specific content standards or determining the content of State assessments in elementary and secondary education;

Whereas President Barack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan announced competitive grants through the Race to the Top program under sections 14005 and 14006 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 282) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Race to the Top program'') in July 2009;

Whereas, on July 24, 2009, Secretary Duncan stated, ''The $4,350,000,000 Race to the Top program that we are unveiling today is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the Federal Government to create incentives for far-reaching improvement in our Nation's schools.'';

Whereas, on July 24, 2009, Secretary Duncan also stated, ''But I want to be clear that Race to the Top is also a reform competition, one where States can increase or decrease their odds of winning Federal support.'';

Whereas, under the Race to the Top program guidelines, States seeking funds were pressed to implement 4 core, interconnected reforms, and the first of these reforms was to adopt ''internationally benchmarked standards and assessments that prepare students for success in college and the workplace'';

Whereas, on July 24, 2009, President Obama outlined the connection between common education standards and Race to the Top program funds, stating, ''I am issuing a challenge to our [N]ation's governors and school boards, principals and teachers, businesses and non-profits, parents and students: if you set and enforce rigorous and challenging standards and assessments; if you put outstanding teachers at the front of the classroom; if you turn around failing schools—your State can win a Race to the Top grant that will not only help students outcompete workers around the world, but let them fulfill their God-given potential.'';

Whereas the selection criteria designed by the Department of Education for the Race to the Top program provided that for a State to have any chance to compete for funding, it must commit to adopting a ''common set of K–12 standards'';

Whereas Common Core State Standards establish a single set of education standards for kindergarten through grade 12 in English language arts and mathematics that States adopt;

Whereas Common Core State Standards were, during the initial application period for the Race to the Top program, and remain, as of the date of the adoption of this resolution, the only common set of kindergarten through grade 12 standards in the United States;

Whereas, on July 24, 2009, Secretary Duncan stated, ''To speed this process, the Race to the Top program is going to set aside $350,000,000 to competitively fund the development of rigorous, common State assessments.'';

Whereas, since the Race to the Top program's inception, States have been incentivized by Federal money to adopt common education standards;

Whereas States began adopting Common Core State Standards in 2010;

Whereas States that adopted Common Core State Standards before August 2, 2010, were awarded 40 additional points out of 500 points for their Race to the Top program applications;

Whereas 45 States have adopted Common Core State Standards;

Whereas 31 States, of the 45 total, adopted Common Core State Standards before August 2, 2010;

Whereas States that have adopted Common Core State Standards are given preference in the application process for the waivers issued under the authority of section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7861) that provide flexibility with respect to certain requirements of such Act;

Whereas States that have adopted Common Core State Standards are currently collaborating to develop common assessments that will be aligned to the Common Core State Standards and replace existing end-of-the-year State assessments;

Whereas these assessments will be available in the 2014–2015 school year;

Whereas 2 consortia of States are developing common assessments: the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC);

Whereas national standards lead to national assessments and national assessments lead to a national curriculum;

Whereas education standards help teachers ensure their students have the skills and knowledge they need to be successful by providing clear goals for student learning;

Whereas challenging academic standards are vital to ensuring students are college and career ready;

Whereas blanket education standards should not be a prerequisite for Federal funding;

Whereas States are incentivized to adopt Common Core State Standards by the explicit correlation between the adoption of the Common Core State Standards by the State and the preference provided to such States through the Race to the Top program and the flexibility waivers issued under the authority of section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7861);

Whereas the Secretary of Education has created a system of grants and waivers that influence, incentivize, and coerce State educational agencies, commissions, and boards into implementing common elementary and secondary school standards and assessments endorsed by the Secretary;

Whereas when Federal funds are linked to the adoption of common education standards, the end result is increased Federal control over education and a decreased ability of schools to meet the individual needs of the students in their schools;

Whereas the implementation of Common Core State Standards will eventually impact home school and private school students when institutions of higher education are pressured to align their admission and readiness standards with curricula based on the Common Core State Standards;

Whereas the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States reads, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people''; and

Whereas, throughout the course of United States history, States have maintained the responsibility of education based on the 10th amendment because the explicit power of educating children was not delegated to the United States by the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) States and local educational agencies should maintain the right and responsibility of determining educational curricula, programs of instruction, and assessments for elementary and secondary education;

(2) the Federal Government should not incentivize the adoption of common education standards or the creation of a national assessment to align with such standards; and

(3) no application process for any Federal grant funds, or for waivers issued by the Secretary under the authority of section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7861), that occurs after the date of adoption of this resolution should award any additional points, or provide any preference, for the adoption of the Common Core State Standards or any other national common education standards.

SENATE RESOLUTION 346—CONGRATULATING THE ATHLETES FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND ACROSS THE UNITED STATES WHO ARE SET TO PARTICIPATE IN THE 2014 WINTER OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES IN SOCHI, RUSSIA

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 346

Whereas the 2014 United States Olympic and Paralympic Team, also known as Team USA, is the largest delegation ever sent to a Winter Olympic Games by the United States;

Whereas the 230 members of Team USA represent the diversity of their Nation and will perform, with skill and grace, to the best of their ability;

Whereas diversity among national Olympic teams fosters greater understanding and peace among nations by upholding the values of the Olympic movement;

Whereas the members of Team USA will represent the spirit of the Olympic and Paralympic Games and fulfill the principles of modern Olympism as outlined in the Olympic Charter as modified by the International Olympic Committee on September 9, 2013;

Whereas on February 11, 2014, women will compete in ski jumping for the first time in Olympic history;

Whereas members of Team USA will compete in all 15 disciplines in the 2014 Winter Olympic Games across 7 sports, and in 94 of 98 medal events;

Whereas Team USA features 106 returning Olympians, including 13 Olympic gold medalists;

Whereas the members of Team USA from the great State of Washington who will proudly represent their Nation are—

(1) Erik Bjornsen of Winthrop, Washington, who will compete in cross-country skiing;

(2) Sadie Bjornsen of Winthrop, Washington, who will compete in cross-country skiing;

(3) J.R. Celski of Federal Way, Washington, who will compete in the 500 meter, 1,000 meter, 1,500 meter, and 5,000 meter relay events in short track speedskating;

(4) Patrick Deneen of Cle Elum, Washington, who will compete in the moguls event in freestyle skiing;

(5) Brian Gregg of Winthrop, Washington, who will compete in cross-country skiing;

(6) Torin Koos of Leavenworth, Washington, who will compete in cross-country skiing;

(7) Christian Niccum of Woodinville, Washington, who will compete in luge; and

(8) Angeli VanLaanen of Bellingham, Washington, who will compete in the halfpipe event in freestyle skiing; and

Whereas all of the athletes of Team USA should be commended and honored for their contributions to sport, our country, and the Olympic movement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the dedication of the United States Olympic Committee, the national governing bodies of each sport that is an event at the 2014 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the administrators, coaches, families, and all others who support the athletes participating in the Olympic and Paralympic Games; and

(2) congratulates the members of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and wishes them success at the 2014 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games in Sochi, Russia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 347—PROVIDING FOR COMPLETION OF THE ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 347

Whereas, in June 2013, the Government of Afghanistan assumed the lead for combat operations in all regions of Afghanistan consistent with the schedule agreed to by President Barack Obama and President of Afghanistan Hamid Karzai: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) that, in coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, the President shall complete the accelerated transition of United States military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan and redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan (including operations involving military and security-related contractors) by not later than December 31, 2014; and

(2) to pursue diplomatic efforts leading to a political settlement and reconciliation of the internal conflict in Afghanistan.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, should the President determine the necessity to maintain United States troops in Afghanistan to carry out missions after December 31, 2014, any such presence and missions should be authorized by a separate vote of Congress not later than June 1, 2014.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prohibiting any authority of the President to—

(1) modify the military strategy, tactics, and operations of United States Armed Forces as such Armed Forces redeploy from Afghanistan;

(2) attack al Qaeda forces wherever such forces are located;

(3) provide financial support and equipment to the Government of Afghanistan for the training and supply of Afghanistan military and security forces;

(4) gather, provide, and share intelligence with United States allies operating in Afghanistan and Pakistan; or

(5) provide security after December 31, 2014, to United States facilities or diplomatic personnel located in Afghanistan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 348—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNAL REBUILDING, RESETTLEMENT, AND RECONCILIATION WITHIN SRI LANKA THAT ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE A LASTING PEACE

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 348

Whereas May 19, 2013, marks the four-year anniversary of the end of the 26-year conflict between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and the Government of Sri Lanka;

Whereas the people of Sri Lanka suffered greatly as a result of this conflict, the impact and aftermath of which has been felt especially by women, children, and families;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka established a ''Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission'' (LLRC) to report whether any person, group, or institution directly or indirectly bears responsibility for incidents that occurred between February 2002 and May 2009 and to recommend measures to prevent the recurrence of such incidents in the future and promote further national unity and reconciliation among all communities;

Whereas the LLRC report was presented to the Sri Lankan Parliament on December 16, 2011, and officially translated into Sinhala and Tamil on August 16, 2012;

Whereas the LLRC report acknowledges important events and grievances that have contributed to decades of political violence and war in Sri Lanka and makes constructive recommendations on a wide range of issues, including the need to credibly investigate widespread allegations of extrajudicial killings; enforced disappearances; intentional targeting of civilians and noncombatants; demilitarizing the north and the country as a whole; reaching a political settlement with minority communities on the meaningful decentralization of power; and promoting and protecting the right to freedom of expression for all through the enactment of a right to information law and additional rule of law reforms;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka developed the National Plan of Action to implement just 82 of the 285 recommendations of the LLRC in August 2011, and although the Government of Sri Lanka has made some progress on rehabilitation, resettlement of displaced persons, and improvements of infrastructure in the North and East, there are still many issues of major concern;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka has yet to reasonably address issues of reconciliation and accountability through internal processes;

Whereas the Department of State's 2012 Human Rights Report on Sri Lanka outlines ongoing concerns regarding landownership and property restitution, particularly in the Jaffna Peninsula, where large numbers of persons have not received restitution for land that remains part of government high security zones, and while citizens generally were able to travel almost anywhere in the island, there continues to be police and military checkpoints in the north, and defacto high-security zones and other areas remained off limits to citizens;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka has not taken tangible steps toward demilitarization of civilian functions, particularly in the North and East, and continued military presence on private lands in the North is preventing the resettlement of internally displaced persons who desire a return to peaceful life;

Whereas the Department of State's 2012 Human Rights Report on Sri Lanka also includes reports of serious human rights violations such as unlawful killings by security forces and government-allied paramilitary groups, often in predominantly Tamil areas; torture and abuse of detainees by police and security forces; and arbitrary arrest and detention by authorities;

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) resolution supported by the United States and adopted by the UNHRC on March 21, 2013, expresses concern at the continuing reports of violations of human rights in Sri Lanka, including enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killings, torture, and violations of the rights to freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly, as well as intimidation of and reprisals against human rights defenders, members of civil society and journalists, threats to judicial independence and the rule of law, and discrimination on the basis of religion or belief;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka expressed its commitment to addressing the needs of all ethnic groups and has recognized, in the past, the necessity of a political settlement and reconciliation for a peaceful and just society; and

Whereas tangible progress on domestic and international investigations into reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other human rights violations during and after the conflict and promoting reconciliation would facilitate enhanced United States engagement and investment in Sri Lanka: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the representatives of the United States on their leadership on United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution (UNHRC) 22/1, adopted by the UNHRC on March 21, 2013, which promotes reconciliation and accountability in Sri Lanka;

(2) calls on the United States and the international community to establish an independent international accountability mechanism to evaluate reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other human rights violations committed by both sides during and after the war in Sri Lanka;

(3) urges the Government of Sri Lanka to allow unimpeded access for media, international aid agencies, and human rights groups into all regions of the country, as well as to detention sites that may hold political and war prisoners;

(4) urges the Government of Sri Lanka to end its media restrictions, including the obstacles to the flow of information in the North and East, and bring to justice those responsible for attacks on journalists and newspaper offices; and

(5) calls upon the President to develop a comprehensive policy towards Sri Lanka that reflects United States interests, including respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law, economic interests, and security interests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 349—CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WALLA WALLA VALLEY AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREA

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 349

Whereas the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area was designated an American Viticultural Area on February 6, 1984;

Whereas the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area is considered one of the most awarded and recognized of the American Viticultural Areas in the United States;

Whereas in 2013, 4 Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area wines were selected by 3 leading wine publications as among the top 100 wines in the world;

Whereas the wine industry contributes over $500 million annually to the economy of Walla Walla County;

Whereas jobs in the wine industry are steadily growing in Walla Walla County and are expected to account for 20 percent of jobs in Walla Walla County by 2020;

Whereas the number of wineries in the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area has grown from 4 in 1984 to approximately 130 today;

Whereas agricultural land devoted to growing wine grapes in the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area has grown from 30 acres in 1984 to 1,800 acres in 2013; and

Whereas Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area wines are consistently rated highly by critics and enjoyed by wine connoisseurs around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area on the occasion of its 30 year anniversary;

(2) recognizes the Walla Walla Valley American Viticultural Area as a pioneer in the wine industry of Washington; and

(3) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display to the Walla Walla Valley Wine Alliance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 350—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 14, 2014, AS NATIONAL SOLIDARITY DAY FOR COMPASSIONATE PATIENT CARE

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 350

Whereas National Solidarity Day for Compassionate Patient Care promotes national awareness of the importance of compassionate and respectful relationships between health care professionals and their patients as reflected in attitudes that are sensitive to the values, autonomy, and cultural and ethnic backgrounds of patients and their families;

Whereas on February 14 of each year, medical professionals and students stand in solidarity to support compassion in health care as expressed by Dr. Randall Friese, triage physician at the University of Arizona Medical Center, who stated that the most important treatment he provided to Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords after she was shot on January 8, 2011, was to hold her hand and reassure her that she was in the hospital and would be cared for;

Whereas physicians, nurses, and all other health care professionals are charged with practicing medicine as both an art and a science;

Whereas an awareness of the importance of compassion in health care encourages health care professionals to be mindful of the need to treat the patient rather than the disease;

Whereas scientific research reveals that when health care professionals practice

humanistically and demonstrate the qualities of integrity, compassion, altruism, respect, empathy, and service, their patients have better medical outcomes; and

Whereas February 14th would be an appropriate day to designate as National Solidarity Day for Compassionate Patient Care and for health care students and professionals to celebrate by performing humanistic acts of compassion and kindness toward patients, families of patients, and health care colleagues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 14, 2014, as National Solidarity Day for Compassionate Patient Care;

(2) recognizes the importance and value of a respectful relationship between health care professionals and their patients as a means of promoting better health outcomes; and

(3) encourages all health care professionals to be mindful of the important roles in medicine of humanism and compassion, as well as technical expertise.

SENATE RESOLUTION 351—REQUIRING THAT LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE BE CONFINED TO A SINGLE ISSUE

Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 351

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SINGLE-ISSUE REQUIREMENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or resolution that is not confined to a single subject.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, 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.

SENATE RESOLUTION 352—COMMEMORATING THE SUCCESS OF TEAM USA IN THE PAST 22 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND SUPPORTING TEAM USA IN THE 2014 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 352

Whereas for over 100 years, the Olympic Movement has built a more peaceful and better world by educating young people through amateur athletics, bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition, and forging new relationships bound by friendship, solidarity, and fair play;

Whereas the 2014 Olympic Winter Games will take place in Sochi, Russia from February 7, 2014, to February 23, 2014, and the 2014 Paralympic Winter Games will take place in Sochi, Russia from March 7, 2014, to March 16, 2014;

Whereas at the 2014 Olympic Winter Games, more than 85 nations will compete in 15 sports disciplines, and Team USA will compete in all 15 sports disciplines;

Whereas at the 2014 Olympic Winter Games, more than 85 nations will compete in 7 sports, and Team USA will compete in all 7 sports;

Whereas 230 Olympians and more than 75 Paralympians will compete on behalf of Team USA in Sochi, Russia;

Whereas Team USA has won 87 gold medals, 95 silver medals, and 72 bronze medals, totaling 254 medals in the past 22 Olympic Winter Games;

Whereas the people of the United States stand united in respect and admiration for the members of the United States Winter Olympic and Winter Paralympic teams and the athletic accomplishments, sportsmanship, and dedication to excellence of the teams;

Whereas the many accomplishments of the United States Winter Olympic and Winter Paralympic teams would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of many individuals, including individuals on the United States Olympic Committee and the many administrators, coaches, and family members who provided critical support to the athletes;

Whereas the United States takes great pride in the qualities of commitment to excellence, grace under pressure, and good will toward other competitors that the athletes of Team USA exhibit; and

Whereas the Olympic Movement celebrates competition, fair play, and the pursuit of dreams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) applauds all athletes and coaches of Team USA and the families of such athletes and coaches who support them;

(2) supports the athletes of Team USA in their endeavors at the 2014 Olympic Winter and Paralympic Winter Games in Sochi, Russia;

(3) thanks all members of the United States Olympic Committee for their unwavering support of the athletes of Team USA; and

(4) supports the goals and ideals of the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2719. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2720. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2721. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2722. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2723. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2724. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2725. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2726. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2727. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOEVEN, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2728. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2729. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.

SA 2730. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, supra.

SA 2731. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2719. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PERMANENT REPATRIATION OF FOREIGN EARNINGS TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REPATRIATION SUBJECT TO 5 PERCENT TAX RATE.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''85.7 percent''.

(b) PERMANENT EXTENSION TO ELECT REPATRIATION.—Subsection (f) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ELECTION.—The taxpayer may elect to apply this section to any taxable year only if made on or before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for such taxable year.''.

(c) REPATRIATION INCLUDES CURRENT AND ACCUMULATED FOREIGN EARNINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 965(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of dividends taken into account under subsection (a) shall not exceed the sum of the current and accumulated earnings and profits described in section 959(c)(3) for the year a deduction is claimed under subsection (a), without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the election year, for all controlled foreign corporations of the United States shareholder.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 965(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (4) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(B) Section 965(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(C) Paragraph (3) of section 965(c) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (B), is amended to read as follows:

''(3) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—All United States shareholders which are members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return under section 1501 shall be treated as one United States shareholder.''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''**TEMPORARY**''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart F of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking ''Temporary dividends'' and inserting ''Dividends''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2720. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13 of the amendment, add after line 6 the following:

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED PAY AND RETAINER PAY AMOUNTS FOR RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER AGE 62.

(a) REPEALS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENT OF RETIREMENT PAY.—Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title X of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76) is hereby repealed.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of such Code is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2721. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. ___. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING FEDERAL DISABILITY PAYMENTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to make payments of unemployment compensation (including such compensation under the Federal-State Extended Compensation Act of 1970 and the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008) for a week to an individual who is receiving disability payments for such week under section 223 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423).

(b) COMPLIANCE.—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify that the individual is not receiving disability payments under such section 223.

(c) AUDITS.—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the Social Security Administration, the U.S. Department of Labor, or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) STATUS OF APPLICANTS.—It is the duty of the states to verify the residency, employment, legal, and disability payment status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining an individual's eligibility under this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2722. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH ELECTRONIC VERIFICATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act''.

(b) PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking ''Unless the Congress otherwise provides, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall terminate a pilot program on September 30, 2015.''.

(c) MANDATORY USE OF E-VERIFY.—Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each department and agency of the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', that conducts hiring in a State'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.'';

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

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) UNITED STATES CONTRACTORS.—Any person, employer, or other entity that enters into a contract with the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.

''(3) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(A) conduct an assessment of employers that are critical to the homeland security or national security needs of the United States;

''(B) designate and publish a list of employers and classes of employers that are deemed to be critical pursuant to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) require that critical employers designated pursuant to subparagraph (B) participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section not later than 30 days after the Secretary makes such designation.'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) MANDATORY PARTICIPATION IN E-VERIFY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), all employers in the United States shall participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act.

''(2) USE OF CONTRACT LABOR.—Any employer who uses a contract, subcontract, or exchange to obtain the labor of an individual in the United States shall certify in such contract, subcontract, or exchange that the employer uses E-Verify. If such certification is not included in a contract, subcontract, or exchange, the employer shall be deemed to have violated paragraph (1).

''(3) INTERIM MANDATORY PARTICIPATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the date set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require any employer or class of employers to participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that the employer is or has been engaged in a material violation of section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 14 days before an employer or class of employers is required to begin participating in E-Verify pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide such employer or class of employers with—

''(i) written notification of such requirement; and

''(ii) appropriate training materials to facilitate compliance with such requirement.''.

(d) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(e)(5) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1)(B), is amended to read as follows:

''(5) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—If a person or other entity that is required to participate in E-Verify fails to

comply with the requirements under this title with respect to an individual—

''(A) such failure shall be treated as a violation of section 274A(a)(1)(B) with respect to such individual; and

''(B) a rebuttable presumption is created that the person or entity has violated section 274A(a)(1)(A).''.

(2) PENALTIES.—Section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (4)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', subject to paragraph (10),'' after ''in an amount'';

(II) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''not less than $250 and not more than $2,000'' and inserting ''not less than $2,500 and not more than $5,000'';

(III) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000'' and inserting ''not less than $5,000 and not more than $10,000'';

(IV) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''not less than $3,000 and not more than $10,000'' and inserting ''not less than $10,000 and not more than $25,000''; and

(V) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) may require the person or entity to take such other remedial action as is appropriate.'';

(ii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting '', subject to paragraphs (10) through (12),'' after ''in an amount'';

(II) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$1,000'';

(III) by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$25,000'';

(IV) by striking ''the size of the business of the employer being charged, the good faith of the employer'' and inserting ''the good faith of the employer being charged''; and

(V) by adding at the end the following: ''Failure by a person or entity to utilize the employment eligibility verification system as required by law, or providing information to the system that the person or entity knows or reasonably believes to be false, shall be treated as a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A).''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) EXEMPTION FROM PENALTY.—In the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (4)(A) with respect to a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A) or (a)(2) for hiring or continuation of employment or recruitment or referral by person or entity and in the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (5) for a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) for hiring or recruitment or referral by a person or entity, the penalty otherwise imposed may be waived or reduced if the violator establishes that the violator acted in good faith.

''(11) AUTHORITY TO DEBAR EMPLOYERS FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a person or entity is determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be a repeat violator of paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of subsection (a), or is convicted of a crime under this section, such person or entity may be considered for debarment from the receipt of Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements in accordance with the debarment standards and pursuant to the debarment procedures set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(B) DOES NOT HAVE CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and such an person or entity does not hold a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall refer the matter to the Administrator of General Services to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

''(C) HAS CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and such person or entity holds a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall advise all agencies or departments holding a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with the person or entity of the Government's interest in having the person or entity considered for debarment, and after soliciting and considering the views of all such agencies and departments, the Secretary or Attorney General may waive the operation of this paragraph or refer the matter to any appropriate lead agency to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

''(D) REVIEW.—Any decision to debar a person or entity under in accordance with this paragraph shall be reviewable pursuant to part 9.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.''; and

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person or entity which engages in a pattern or practice of violations of subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be fined not more than $15,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to which such a violation occurs, imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, or both, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Federal law relating to fine levels.''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Attorney General'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

(e) PREEMPTION; LIABILITY.—Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) LIMITATION ON STATE AUTHORITY.—

''(1) PREEMPTION.—A State or local government may not prohibit a person or other entity from verifying the employment authorization of new hires or current employees through E-Verify.

''(2) LIABILITY.—A person or other entity that participates in E-Verify may not be held liable under any Federal, State, or local law for any employment-related action taken with respect to the wrongful termination of an individual in good faith reliance on information provided through E-Verify.''.

(f) EXPANDED USE OF E-VERIFY.—Section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) BEFORE HIRING.—The person or other entity may verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify before the individual is hired, recruited, or referred if the individual consents to such verification. If an employer receives a tentative nonconfirmation for an individual, the employer shall comply with procedures prescribed by the Secretary, including—

''(I) providing the individual employees with private, written notification of the finding and written referral instructions;

''(II) allowing the individual to contest the finding; and

''(III) not taking adverse action against the individual if the individual chooses to contest the finding.

''(ii) AFTER EMPLOYMENT OFFER.—The person or other entity shall verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify not later than 3 days after the date of the hiring, recruitment, or referral, as the case may be.

''(iii) EXISTING EMPLOYEES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Secretary shall require all employers to use E-Verify to verify the identity and employment eligibility of any individual who has not been previously verified by the employer through E-Verify.''.

(g) REVERIFICATION.—Section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REVERIFICATION.—Each person or other entity participating in E-Verify shall use the E-Verify confirmation system to reverify the work authorization of any individual not later than 3 days after the date on which such individual's employment authorization is scheduled to expire (as indicated by the Secretary or the documents provided to the employer pursuant to section 274A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(b))), in accordance with the procedures set forth in this subsection and section 402.''.

(h) HOLDING EMPLOYERS ACCOUNTABLE.—

(1) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—Section 403(a)(4)(C) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—

''(i) TERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—If the person or other entity receives a final nonconfirmation regarding an individual, the employer shall immediately—

''(I) terminate the employment, recruitment, or referral of the individual; and

''(II) submit to the Secretary any information relating to the individual that the Secretary determines would assist the Secretary in enforcing or administering United States immigration laws.

''(ii) CONSEQUENCE OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.—If the person or other entity continues to employ, recruit, or refer the individual after receiving final nonconfirmation, a rebuttable presumption is created that the employer has violated section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).''.

(2) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—Section 405 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall submit a weekly report to the Assistant Secretary of Immigration and Customs Enforcement that includes, for each individual who receives final nonconfirmation through E-Verify—

''(A) the name of such individual;

''(B) his or her Social Security number or alien file number;

''(C) the name and contact information for his or her current employer; and

''(D) any other critical information that the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(2) USE OF WEEKLY REPORT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall use information provided under paragraph (1) to enforce compliance of the United States immigration laws.''.

(i) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly establish a program to share information among such agencies that may or could lead to the identification of unauthorized aliens (as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act), including any no-match letter and any information in the earnings suspense file.

(j) FORM I–9 PROCESS.—Not later than 9 months after date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that contains recommendations for—

(1) modifying and simplifying the process by which employers are required to complete and retain a Form I–9 for each employee pursuant to section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a); and

(2) eliminating the process described in paragraph (1).

(k) ALGORITHM.—Section 404(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF SYSTEM.—E-Verify shall be designed and operated—

''(1) to maximize its reliability and ease of use by employers;

''(2) to insulate and protect the privacy and security of the underlying information;

''(3) to maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information;

''(4) to respond accurately to all inquiries made by employers on whether individuals are authorized to be employed;

''(5) to register any times when E-Verify is unable to receive inquiries;

''(6) to allow for auditing use of the system to detect fraud and identify theft;

''(7) to preserve the security of the information in all of the system by—

''(A) developing and using algorithms to detect potential identity theft, such as multiple uses of the same identifying information or documents;

''(B) developing and using algorithms to detect misuse of the system by employers and employees;

''(C) developing capabilities to detect anomalies in the use of the system that may indicate potential fraud or misuse of the system; and

''(D) auditing documents and information submitted by potential employees to employers, including authority to conduct interviews with employers and employees;

''(8) to confirm identity and work authorization through verification of records maintained by the Secretary, other Federal departments, States, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or an outlying possession of the United States, as determined necessary by the Secretary, including—

''(A) records maintained by the Social Security Administration;

''(B) birth and death records maintained by vital statistics agencies of any State or other jurisdiction in the United States;

''(C) passport and visa records (including photographs) maintained by the Department of State; and

''(D) State driver's license or identity card information (including photographs) maintained by State department of motor vehicles;

''(9) to electronically confirm the issuance of the employment authorization or identity document; and

''(10) to display the digital photograph that the issuer placed on the document so that the employer can compare the photograph displayed to the photograph on the document presented by the employee or, in exceptional cases, if a photograph is not available from the issuer, to provide for a temporary alternative procedure, specified by the Secretary, for confirming the authenticity of the document.''.

(l) IDENTITY THEFT.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by striking ''of another person'' and inserting ''that is not his or her own''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) to facilitate or assist in harboring or hiring unauthorized workers in violation of section 274, 274A, or 274C of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324, 1324a, and 1324c).''.

(m) SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall establish a demonstration program that assists small businesses in rural areas or areas without internet capabilities to verify the employment eligibility of newly hired employees solely through the use of publicly accessible internet terminals.''.

SA 2723. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT THAT INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A SYSTEMATIC AND SUSTAINED EFFORT TO OBTAIN SUITABLE WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(h) ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(4), payment of emergency unemployment compensation shall not be made to any individual for any week of unemployment—

''(A) during which the individual fails to accept any offer of suitable work (as defined in paragraph (3)) or fails to apply for any suitable work to which the individual was referred by the State agency; or

''(B) during which the individual fails to actively engage in seeking work, unless such individual is not actively engaged in seeking work because such individual is, as determined in accordance with State law—

''(i) before any court of the United States or any State pursuant to a lawfully issued summons to appear for jury duty (as such term may be defined by the Secretary); or

''(ii) hospitalized for treatment of an emergency or a life-threatening condition (as such term may be defined by the Secretary),

if such exemptions in clauses (i) and (ii) apply to recipients of regular benefits, and the State chooses to apply such exemptions for recipients of emergency unemployment benefits.

''(2) PERIOD OF INELIGIBILITY.—If any individual is ineligible for emergency unemployment compensation for any week by reason of a failure described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), the individual shall be ineligible to receive emergency unemployment compensation for any week which begins during a period which—

''(A) begins with the week following the week in which such failure occurs; and

''(B) does not end until such individual has been employed during at least 4 weeks which begin after such failure and the total of the remuneration earned by the individual for being so employed is not less than the product of 4 multiplied by the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the individual's benefit year.

''(3) SUITABLE WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'suitable work' means, with respect to any individual, any work which is within such individual's capabilities, except that, if the individual furnishes evidence satisfactory to the State agency that such individual's prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation within a reasonably short period are good, the determination of whether any work is suitable work with respect to such individual shall be made in accordance with the applicable State law.

''(4) EXCEPTION.—Extended compensation shall not be denied under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) to any individual for any week by reason of a failure to accept an offer of, or apply for, suitable work—

''(A) if the gross average weekly remuneration payable to such individual for the position does not exceed the sum of—

''(i) the individual's average weekly benefit amount for his benefit year, plus

''(ii) the amount (if any) of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits (as defined in section 501(c)(17)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) payable to such individual for such week;

''(B) if the position was not offered to such individual in writing and was not listed with the State employment service;

''(C) if such failure would not result in a denial of compensation under the provisions of the applicable State law to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (5); or

''(D) if the position pays wages less than the higher of—

''(i) the minimum wage provided by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, without regard to any exemption; or

''(ii) any applicable State or local minimum wage.

''(5) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SEEKING WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be treated as actively engaged in seeking work during any week if—

''(A) the individual has engaged in a systematic and sustained effort to obtain work during such week, and

''(B) the individual provides tangible evidence to the State agency that he has engaged in such an effort during such week.

''(6) REFERRAL.—The State agency shall provide for referring applicants for emergency unemployment benefits to any suitable work to which paragraph (4) would not apply.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2724. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for

the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

(a) REPEALS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENT OF RETIREMENT PAY.—Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title X of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76) is hereby repealed.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(e) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no credit shall be allowed under this section to a taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.

''(2) REFUNDABLE PORTION.—Subsection (d)(1) shall not apply to any taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and social security number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct TIN under section 24(e)(1) (relating to child tax credit) or a correct Social Security number required under section 24(e)(2) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2725. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

(a) REPEALS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENT OF RETIREMENT PAY.—Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title X of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76) is hereby repealed.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(e) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no credit shall be allowed under this section to a taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.

''(2) REFUNDABLE PORTION.—Subsection (d)(1) shall not apply to any taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and social security number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct TIN under section 24(e)(1) (relating to child tax credit) or a correct Social Security number required under section 24(e)(2) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2726. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITING FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO COSTS FOR OFFICE FURNISHINGS AND MURALS, PORTRAITS, AND OTHER ARTWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) No portion of the cost of office furnishings or murals, portraits, or other artwork shall be treated as being a cost for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation law.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to costs incurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2727. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOEVEN, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension 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. Extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program.
Sec. 3. Temporary extension of extended benefit provisions.
Sec. 4. Extension of funding for reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities.
Sec. 5. Additional extended unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.
Sec. 6. Flexibility for unemployment program agreements.
Sec. 7. Repeal of reductions made by Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.
Sec. 8. Reduction in benefits based on receipt of unemployment compensation.
Sec. 9. Reduction of nonMedicare, nondefense direct spending.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''April 1, 2014''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO WEEKS OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN FIRST TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by inserting '', AND WEEKS ENDING BEFORE DECEMBER 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', and before December 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ESTABLISHED IN AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), in the case of any account established as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '80 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '20 times'.''.

(2) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN SECOND TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ADDED TO AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), if augmentation under this subsection occurs as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '54 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '14 times'.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(b) EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act

of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(c) EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4004(c)(2)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''through fiscal year 2014'' and inserting ''through the first quarter of fiscal year 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''; and

(2) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Railroad Retirement Board $62,500 for administrative expenses associated with the payment of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before December 1, 2013, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

(b) PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.—Nothing in title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67) is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

SEC. 8. REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following new section:

''REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

''SEC. 224A (a)(1) If for any month prior to the month in which an individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))—

''(A) such individual is entitled to benefits under section 223, and

''(B) such individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation,

the total of the individual's benefits under section 223 for such month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the total amount of unemployment compensation received by such individual for such month.

''(2) The reduction of benefits under paragraph (1) shall also apply to any past-due benefits under section 223 for any month in which the individual was entitled to—

''(A) benefits under such section, and

''(B) unemployment compensation.

''(3) The reduction of benefits under paragraph (1) shall not apply to any benefits under section 223 for any month, or any benefits under section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income for such month, if the individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation following a period of trial work (as described in section 222(c)(1), participation in the Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program established under section 1148, or participation in any other program that is designed to encourage an individual entitled to benefits under section 223 or 202 to work.

''(b) If any unemployment compensation is payable to an individual on other than a monthly basis (including a benefit payable as a lump sum to the extent that it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, such periodic compensation), the reduction under this section shall be made at such time or times and in such amounts as the Commissioner of Social Security (referred to in this section as the 'Commissioner') determines will approximate as nearly as practicable the reduction prescribed by subsection (a).

''(c) Reduction of benefits under this section shall be made after any applicable reductions under section 203(a) and section 224, but before any other applicable deductions under section 203.

''(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), if the Commissioner determines that an individual may be eligible for unemployment compensation which would give rise to a reduction of benefits under this section, the Commissioner may require, as a condition of certification for payment of any benefits under section 223 to any individual for any month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on such individual's wages and self-employment income, that such individual certify—

''(A) whether the individual has filed or intends to file any claim for unemployment compensation, and

''(B) if the individual has filed a claim, whether there has been a decision on such claim.

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the Commissioner may, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, rely upon a certification by the individual that the individual has not filed and does not intend to file such a claim, or that the individual has so filed and no final decision thereon has been made, in certifying benefits for payment pursuant to section 205(i).

''(e) Whenever a reduction in total benefits based on an individual's wages and self-employment income is made under this section for any month, each benefit, except the disability insurance benefit, shall first be proportionately decreased, and any excess of such reduction over the sum of all such benefits other than the disability insurance benefit shall then be applied to such disability insurance benefit.

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any Federal agency shall provide such information within its possession as the Commissioner may require for purposes of making a timely determination of the amount of the reduction, if any, required by this section in benefits payable under this title, or verifying other information necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

''(2) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and other organizations that administer unemployment compensation, in order to obtain such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(g) For purposes of this section, the term 'unemployment compensation' has the meaning given that term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the total amount of unemployment compensation to which an individual is entitled shall be determined prior to any applicable reduction under State law based on the receipt of benefits under section 202 or 223.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 224(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 424a(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the age of 65'' and inserting ''retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to benefits payable for months beginning on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 9. REDUCTION OF NONMEDICARE, NONDEFENSE DIRECT SPENDING.

Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF NONMEDICARE, NONDEFENSE DIRECT SPENDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2023, in addition to the reduction in direct spending under paragraph (6), on the date specified in paragraph (2), OMB shall prepare and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, reducing the spending described in subparagraph (B) by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce such spending for the fiscal year by $1,333,000,000.

''(B) SPENDING COVERED.—The spending described in this subparagraph is spending that is—

''(i) nonexempt direct spending;

''(ii) not spending for the Medicare programs specified in section 256(d); and

''(iii) within the revised nonsecurity category.''.

SA 2728. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

to amendment SA 2714 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

SEC. 8. TREATMENT OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS MANAGED AND CONTROLLED IN THE UNITED STATES AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (p) as subsection (q) and by inserting after subsection (o) the following new subsection:

''(p) CERTAIN CORPORATIONS MANAGED AND CONTROLLED IN THE UNITED STATES TREATED AS DOMESTIC FOR INCOME TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), in the case of a corporation described in paragraph (2) if—

''(A) the corporation would not otherwise be treated as a domestic corporation for purposes of this title, but

''(B) the management and control of the corporation occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States,

then, solely for purposes of chapter 1 (and any other provision of this title relating to chapter 1), the corporation shall be treated as a domestic corporation.

''(2) CORPORATION DESCRIBED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A corporation is described in this paragraph if—

''(i) the stock of such corporation is regularly traded on an established securities market, or

''(ii) the aggregate gross assets of such corporation (or any predecessor thereof), including assets under management for investors, whether held directly or indirectly, at any time during the taxable year or any preceding taxable year is $50,000,000 or more.

''(B) GENERAL EXCEPTION.—A corporation shall not be treated as described in this paragraph if—

''(i) such corporation was treated as a corporation described in this paragraph in a preceding taxable year,

''(ii) such corporation—

''(I) is not regularly traded on an established securities market, and

''(II) has, and is reasonably expected to continue to have, aggregate gross assets (including assets under management for investors, whether held directly or indirectly) of less than $50,000,000, and

''(iii) the Secretary grants a waiver to such corporation under this subparagraph.

''(3) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of a corporation is to be treated as occurring primarily within the United States.

''(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that—

''(i) the management and control of a corporation shall be treated as occurring primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the corporation who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the corporation are located primarily within the United States, and

''(ii) individuals who are not executive officers and senior management of the corporation (including individuals who are officers or employees of other corporations in the same chain of corporations as the corporation) shall be treated as executive officers and senior management if such individuals exercise the day-to-day responsibilities of the corporation described in clause (i).

''(C) CORPORATIONS PRIMARILY HOLDING INVESTMENT ASSETS.—Such regulations shall also provide that the management and control of a corporation shall be treated as occurring primarily within the United States if—

''(i) the assets of such corporation (directly or indirectly) consist primarily of assets being managed on behalf of investors, and

''(ii) decisions about how to invest the assets are made in the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning on or after the date which is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether or not regulations are issued under section 7701(p)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

SA 2729. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams; as follows:

Strike paragraphs (1) and (2) of the resolving clause and insert the following:

(1) official sponsor support is critical to the success of Team USA at all international competitions; and

(2) ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and their ability to attract and retain corporate sponsorships.

SA 2730. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams; as follows:

In the fifth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''assure that the United States has the best Olympic teams'' and insert ''ensure that the United States has the best Olympic and Paralympic teams''.

In the sixth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''in ambush marketing as a marketing strategy, affiliating themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming sponsors of Team USA'' and insert ''in marketing strategies that appear to affiliate themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming official sponsors of Team USA''.

In the seventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''ambush marketing harms the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams, undermines sponsorship activities, and gives ambush marketers an unfair and unethical advantage over entities that officially sponsor and provide funding for the elite athletes of the United States'' and insert ''any ambush marketing in violation of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) undermines sponsorship activities and creates consumer confusion around official Olympic and Paralympic sponsors''.

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''efforts to prevent ambush marketing have enjoyed limited success as the strategies used by ambush marketers continue to multiply'' and insert ''ambush marketing impedes the goals of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.) to fund the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams through official sponsorships''.

SA 2731. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 289, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''Expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Energy of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to consider lessons for federal policy from state efficiency and renewable programs.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Danielle_Deraney@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Kevin Rennert at (202) 224–7826 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224–1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of Financial Stability and Data Security.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. SHAHEEN. 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 February 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Supporting Children and Families through Investments in High-Quality Early Education.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.,

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two legislative fellows on my staff, Errol Robinson and Brandon Elsner, be granted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of this Congress.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD POLIO DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 302, S. Res. 270.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 270

Whereas October 24th of each year is recognized internationally as World Polio Day;

Whereas polio is a highly infectious disease that primarily affects children and for which there is no known cure;

Whereas polio can leave survivors permanently disabled from muscle paralysis of the limbs and occasionally leads to a particularly difficult death through paralysis of respiratory muscles;

Whereas polio was once one of the most dreaded diseases in the United States, killing thousands of people annually in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and leaving thousands more with permanent disabilities, including the 32nd President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt;

Whereas severe polio outbreaks in the 1940s and 1950s caused panic in the United States, as parents kept children indoors, public health officials quarantined infected individuals, and the Federal Government restricted commerce and travel;

Whereas 1952 was the peak of the polio epidemic in the United States, with more than 57,000 people affected, 21,000 of whom were paralyzed and 3,000 of whom died;

Whereas safe and effective polio vaccines, including the inactivated polio vaccine (commonly known as ''IPV''), developed in 1952 by Jonas Salk, and the oral polio vaccine (commonly known as ''OPV''), developed in 1957 by Albert Sabin, rendered polio preventable and contributed to the rapid decline of the incidence of polio in the United States;

Whereas, although the United States has been free from polio since 1979, this preventable disease still needlessly lays victim to children and adults in several countries where challenges, such as active conflict and lack of infrastructure, impede access to vaccines;

Whereas the Federal Government is the leading public sector donor to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative and provides technical and operational leadership to this global effort through the work of the Centers for Disease Control and the United States Agency for International Development;

Whereas the eradication of polio is the highest priority of Rotary International, a global association founded in 1905 in Chicago, Illinois, that is now headquartered in Evanston, Illinois, and has more than 1,200,000 members in more than 170 countries;

Whereas Rotary International and its members (commonly known as ''Rotarians'') have contributed more than $1,000,000,000 to, and volunteered countless hours in, the global fight against polio;

Whereas Rotary International, the World Health Organization, the United States Government, the United Nations Children's Fund (commonly known as ''UNICEF''), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the United Nations Foundation have joined together with national governments to successfully reduce cases of polio by more than 99 percent since 1988, from more than 350,000 reported cases in 1988 to 223 reported cases in 2012;

Whereas polio was recently eliminated in India and is now endemic only in Nigeria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan;

Whereas terrorist and militant groups continue to target and murder health care workers who seek to save the lives of children;

Whereas the sanctity and neutrality of health care workers must be respected, as these workers deliver the most basic of life-saving interventions to children and communities;

Whereas the recent polio outbreak in the Horn of Africa, comprising Somalia, Ethiopia, and Kenya, continues to result in new cases of the disease, exacerbating the protracted humanitarian crisis in the region and highlighting the urgent need to finally eradicate polio before progress is lost;

Whereas countries around the world are placing an unprecedented emphasis on polio eradication, including by implementing Emergency Action Plans to boost vaccination coverage in Nigeria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan;

Whereas the Global Polio Eradication Initiative has developed the Polio Eradication and Endgame Strategic Plan 2013–2018 (referred to in this preamble as the ''Endgame Strategy'') to capitalize on the opportunity to eradicate all polio disease;

Whereas the Endgame Strategy also outlines a legacy planning process to ensure that lessons learned in the effort to eradicate polio, as well as the assets and infrastructure built in support of that effort, are transitioned to benefit other development goals and global health priorities, including the continued delivery of health services to the most vulnerable children in the world;

Whereas the global effort to eradicate polio is the largest internationally coordinated public health effort in history, with a network of over 20,000,000 volunteers worldwide; and

Whereas the eradication of polio is imminently achievable and will be a victory shared by all of humanity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Polio Day;

(2) commends the international community and others for their efforts in vaccinating children around the world against polio and for the tremendous strides made toward eradicating the disease;

(3) encourages and supports the international community of governments and nongovernmental organizations in remaining committed to the eradication of polio;

(4) condemns the deplorable actions of terrorist and militant groups that murder innocent health care workers who are striving to save the lives of children around the world;

(5) urges the international community of governments to strengthen the support and security protection of health care workers who risk their lives to provide polio vaccinations; and

(6) encourages continued commitment and funding by the United States Government and international donors to the global effort to rid the world of polio.

AMBUSH MARKETING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the commerce committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 289.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 289) expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and should be discouraged.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Rockefeller amendment to the resolution, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Rockefeller amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the Rockefeller title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 2729) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike paragraphs (1) and (2) of the resolving clause and insert the following:

(1) official sponsor support is critical to the success of Team USA at all international competitions; and

(2) ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and their ability to attract and retain corporate sponsorships.

The resolution (S. Res. 289), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2730) was agreed to, as follows:

In the fifth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''assure that the United States has the best Olympic teams'' and insert ''ensure that the United States has the best Olympic and Paralympic teams''.

In the sixth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''in ambush marketing as a marketing strategy, affiliating themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming sponsors of Team USA'' and insert ''in marketing strategies that appear to affiliate themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming official sponsors of Team USA''.

In the seventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''ambush marketing harms the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams, undermines sponsorship activities, and gives ambush marketers an unfair and unethical advantage over entities that officially sponsor and provide funding for the elite athletes of the United States'' and insert ''any ambush marketing in violation of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) undermines sponsorship activities and creates consumer confusion around official Olympic and Paralympic sponsors''.

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''efforts to prevent ambush marketing have enjoyed limited success as the strategies used by ambush marketers continue to multiply'' and insert ''ambush marketing impedes the goals of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.) to fund the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams through official sponsorships''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2731) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''Expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.''.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, with its title as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 289

Whereas the 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games will occur on February 7 through February 23, 2014, and March 7 through March 16, 2014, respectively, in Sochi, Russia;

Whereas more than 5,500 athletes from 80 nations will compete in 7 Olympic sports and 1,350 Paralympic athletes will compete in 5 sports;

Whereas American athletes have spent countless days, months, and years training to earn a spot on the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams;

Whereas the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.)—

(1) established the United States Olympic Committee as the coordinating body for all Olympic and Paralympic athletic activity in the United States;

(2) gave the United States Olympic Committee the exclusive right in the United States to use the words ''Olympic'', ''Olympiad'', ''Paralympic'', and ''Paralympiad'', the emblem of the United States Olympic Committee, and the symbols of the International Olympic Committee and the International Paralympic Committee; and

(3) empowered the United States Olympic Committee to authorize sponsors that contribute to the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams to use any trademark, symbol, insignia, or emblem of the International Olympic Committee, International Paralympic Committee, the Pan-American Sports Organization, or the United States Olympic Committee;

Whereas Team USA is significantly funded by 31 sponsors who ensure that the United States has the best Olympic and Paralympic teams possible;

Whereas in recent years, a number of entities in the United States have engaged in marketing strategies that appear to affiliate themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming official sponsors of Team USA;

Whereas any ambush marketing in violation of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) undermines sponsorship activities and creates consumer confusion around official Olympic and Paralympic sponsors; and

Whereas ambush marketing impedes the goals of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.) to fund the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams through official sponsorships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) official sponsor support is critical to the success of Team USA at all international competitions; and

(2) ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and their ability to attract and retain corporate sponsorships.

RECOMMENDING RETURN OF THE IRAQI JEWISH ARCHIVE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 303, S. Res. 333.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 333) strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsidered be considered made and laid on the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 333) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, January 16, 2014 under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

COMMEMORATING THE SUCCESS OF TEAM USA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 352 submitted by Senators KLOBUCHAR, HATCH, and others today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 352) commemorating the success of Team USA in the past 22 Olympic Winter Games and supporting Team USA in the 2014 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 352) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3590 AND H.R. 3964

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3964) to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading en bloc, but I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 10, 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 leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1963, the military retirement pay restoration bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next rollcall vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1963.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. 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 6:49 p.m. adjourned until Monday, February 10, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CHERYL ANN KRAUSE, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE DOLORES KORMAN SLOVITER, RETIRED.

BETH BLOOM, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, VICE DONALD L. GRAHAM, RETIRED.

PAUL G. BYRON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, VICE JAMES S. MOODY, JR., RETIRING.

DARRIN P. GAYLES, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, VICE PATRICIA A. SEITZ, RETIRED.

CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, VICE JOHN ANTOON II, RETIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C, SECTIONS 189 AND 276:

To be captain

KEVIN J. LOPES

To be commander

JOSEPH D. BROWN
THOMAS W. DENUCCI
MICHAEL J. PLUMLEY
KELLY C. SEALS

To be lieutenant commander

MARIETTE C. OGG

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. PAUL J. SELVA

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM P. ROBERTSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WILLIAM T. MONACCI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

GLENNIE Z. KERTES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHARLES A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROGER J. BELBEL

To be major

NATHANIEL S. CHARTER
YVES P. LEBLANC

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

GREGORY D. SUTTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CHAD C. SCHUMACHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JACK D. HAGAN
RICHARD S. MONTGOMERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

REINEL CASTRO
MICHAEL G. HILLEGASS III
SUEZIE KIM
DUSTIN R. WARD

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 6, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS, OF MONTANA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING BOY SCOUT TROOP 140 AS IT CELEBRATES MORE THAN 50 YEARS OF SCOUTING

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Boy Scout Troop 140 of Buffalo Grove in the northern Illinois district that I represent. These passionate young Scouts and their Scout Masters are celebrating more than 50 years of high adventure and activities.

Drawing from Buffalo Grove, Arlington Heights, Long Grove, Wheeling and more, Troop 140 is one of the largest and most active in all of the Northwest Suburban Council. These Scouts have climbed mountains, explored caves and hiked all terrain imaginable.

Under the direction of their Scout Leadership (Scout Master Tim Meinholz and Committee Chair Kathy Daloia), these young Scouts have experienced outdoor adventures far beyond the average suburban childhood. In addition to their adventures, the Scouts also have a commitment to excellence second to none.

The goal of every first-year Scout is to achieve First Class rank by the end of year one. Older Scouts focus on merit badges, and the Troop has honored more than 150 Eagle Scouts in total.

All the while, Troop 140 upholds Scout values, builds character, develops good citizens and teaches valuable, lifelong skills. Troop 140 is certainly a standout among excellence, and I am impressed and inspired by its achievements. To see so many young Scouts taking part gives me great hope for the future.

Congratulations to Boy Scout Troop 140 of Buffalo Grove on more than 50 years of excellence.

H.R. 357, THE GI TUITION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2013

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 3, 2014, I was unavoidably detained due to weather and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on House Vote No. 33, on passage of H.R. 357, the GI Tuition Fairness Act of 2013.

For over 50 years, Congress has recognized that one of the greatest sacrifices by our service members is that their military service often prevents them from attending school and attaining higher levels of education. To address this sacrifice, our country has made educational benefits a cornerstone of military service.

The GI Tuition Fairness Act of 2013 establishes in-state tuition rates for all veterans attending college on the Post 9/11 GI bill and would ensure that they are not punished for faithfully fulfilling their military service obligations away from their original state of residency. Due to the nature of military service, our veterans often have a hard time establishing residency for purposes of obtaining in-state tuition. This bill takes a stand to guarantee in-state tuition for student veterans regardless of residency status. These men and women should not be forced into more expensive college programs just because public universities do not offer the flexibility in their residency requirements. Our veterans have made incomparable sacrifices, and they deserve all the backlines of support we can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the passage of H.R. 357, and would like to set the record straight that if I were able to cast my vote, it would have been a proud "yea."

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF REV. PAMELA CAHOON

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise today and honor the Rev. Pamela Cahoon on the occasion of her retirement. The Rev. Cahoon has led for more than 30 years Christians Reaching Out to Society (C.R.O.S.) Ministries, as its executive director.

Her passion to end hunger began many years ago, when, as a child she noticed that some of her classmates did not have the benefit of a simple brown bag lunch. She persuaded her own mother to start packing extra lunches to share with classmates who had none of their own.

Today, her family and many others have joined her efforts to ensure that no one goes hungry. In one year alone, C.R.O.S. Ministries, under the Rev. Cahoon's leadership, provided emergency food to more than 40,000 individuals, more than 40 percent of whom were children; served 85,000 meals to hungry families in the ministries' kitchens; distributed 28,000 afterschool snacks to hungry kids; and sent home 16,000 brown bag lunches to ward off hunger for families during the long weekends.

C.R.O.S. Ministries also led efforts to gather food, salvaging more than 218,000 pounds of fresh produce from harvested fields, and then distributed the food to 100 nonprofit agencies across the county.

Although the Rev. Cahoon is retiring, I am sure that she will continue to be involved in local efforts to help people in need for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the Rev. Pamela Cahoon is someone with whom we can all admire and respect. I commend her for her selfless efforts to end hunger, and wish her the very best on her retirement.

HONORING ROBERT BOOKER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Robert Booker is a former Tennessee State Legislator and longtime columnist for the Knoxville News Sentinel. He is a man for whom I have very great respect.

His weekly column is usually devoted to the history of the African-American community in and around my hometown of Knoxville. Because I love history, and especially that about East Tennessee, I almost always enjoy his columns. They are interesting, informative and well-written and thoroughly researched.

His column of February 4th was one I particularly enjoyed. He wrote about three activist ministers in Knoxville, all of whom I have known and respected: Rev. Harold Middlebrook, Rev. William T. Crutcher, and Rev. Frank Gordon.

I was very proud of my late father for many reasons, but near the top to me was his leadership while Mayor of Knoxville to help peacefully integrate our City. He was good friends and worked closely with Rev. Crutcher and Rev. Gordon and in later years with Rev. Middlebrook.

When I practiced law in Knoxville, I represented Rev. Crutcher's church, Mount Olive Baptist. He was a great man, and his widow is still a wonderful, sweet woman.

Rev. Middlebrook stayed in our family home in Alexandria, Virginia, when he came to be my guest at the joint session of Congress honoring Nelson Mandela.

I am thankful that Knoxville has a man like Robert Booker who does so much to honor forgotten leaders from our past.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD Mr. Booker's recent column about activist preachers.

[From the Knoxville News Sentinel, Feb. 4, 2014]

MIDDLEBROOK IN LINE OF ACTIVIST PREACHERS

(By Robert Booker)

When my friend the Rev. Harold Middlebrook retired as senior pastor of Canaan Baptist Church of Christ, I reflected on his civic activities and compared them to those of other pastors who made a difference during the past 149 years. He has shouted for justice in a sea of silence. He has stood for equality while others just sat by. He has preached against street violence as others gave lip service. He has led the battle many times to help save Knoxville College as others failed to rally their troops.

Indeed, Middlebrook is a rare breed who talks the talk, walks the walk and gets things done. He knows how to put on a good show, but it is not just an act. He can preach up a storm, but the fallout is to irrigate, fertilize and cultivate minds and hearts to bring about man's humanity to man.

We have a number of excellent preachers today who can stir up their congregations

with great messages. Some of them successfully push pet projects, but it has not been easy for them to capture a mass following across the city as has Middlebrook.

Perhaps the first one to have that kind of influence and reverence was the Rev. George Washington LeVere, who came here as pastor of Shiloh Presbyterian Church on Feb. 9, 1866. He had been a chaplain in the 29th Regiment of the United States Colored Infantry. Having been born and educated in Brooklyn, N.Y., he came here ready to practice what he would preach.

In 1869 he organized the Shieldstown (LeVere) School on Linden Avenue, which provided the initial education for William H. Franklin, the first black graduate of Maryville College in 1880. LeVere was a charter member of the Meridian Lodge No. 4 of the Free and Accepted Masons. He served as their Grand Master. He helped organize the Colored Mechanics Association in 1871. He was pastor of Shiloh for 22 years.

Another giant in the fight for human dignity was the Rev. William T. Crutcher, who served as pastor of Mount Olive Baptist Church for 54 years. He arrived there in 1935 and served until his death in 1989. He attended the Baptist World Alliance in London, England, in 1955 and went on a month-long preaching mission to Africa in 1973.

He was a true fighter for justice here in Knoxville. In 1948 he took the lead in getting the city of Knoxville to make Chilhowee Park available to blacks one day a week instead of one day a year. He also led the effort to allow blacks to play gold at the city-owned Whittle Springs Golf Course. In the early 1960s Crutcher was a co-chair of the Associated Council for Full Citizenship, which led to the desegregation of lunch counters and movie theaters. Numerous threats were made on his life.

The Rev. Frank Gordon became pastor of Shiloh Presbyterian Church in 1952 and he, too, was a trailblazer in many activities outside his church. He taughtBible and religious history at Knoxville College from 1953 to 1956 and was a candidate for the Knoxville Board of Education on two occasions. He was a member of the Mayor's Commission on Race Relations and a member of Gov. Frank Clement's State Commission on Race.

Gordon was president of the Knoxville branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the state president of that organization, which helped integrate the school systems of all 95 Tennessee counties.

Middlebrook was not the first activist preacher in this city, but he has been one of the most successful ones in his undertakings. He has left a real legacy for those who choose to follow his lead.

H.R. 357, H.R. 3590, AND H.R. 3964

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize passage this week of three important pieces or legislation: H.R. 357, the G.I. Bill Tuition Fairness Act; H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act; and H.R. 3964, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act. Unfortunately, I was not able to vote on final passage of these important bills because of a death in my family and my attendance at the subsequent funeral.

The G.I. Bill Tuition Fairness Act is commonsense legislation for our veterans that will lead to more affordable education opportunities when our men and women in uniform return from service.

The Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act is a bipartisan package of eight individual bills that will strengthen and preserve important outdoor traditions and some of our pristine natural treasures for American sportsmen, recreational enthusiasts and future generations. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this bill.

H.R. 3964, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act seeks to address the crisis that is taking place in California that has resulted from extreme drought and other challenges. I am supportive of measures that provide much needed relief to our farmers. Having said that, as I am a strong supporter of state water rights, I could not have supported this legislation without the inclusion of provision 501 which states these dire circumstances are unique to California and should not serve as a precedent for other states.

Finally, I want to address three quick items that came up during debate on H.R. 3590. The first is H. Amdt. 541, offered by Mr. HOLT, which would have allowed the Secretary to prevent hunting and fishing on public lands based on speculative climate change studies. Any proposals to limit hunting and fishing should be made by state fish and game agencies and local communities, not Washington bureaucrats. The second item is H. Amdt. 537 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO that would have undermined the bill, lead to frivolous lawsuits and the eventual closing of public lands for hunting and fishing. Clearly, this amendment is contradictory to the intent of the bill and would have had negative consequences. The third and final issue that came up during debate on H.R. 3590 was in relation to condors and lead ammo. I would encourage legislators who opposed the bill based on this premise to visit my home state of Arizona where they have put forth a voluntary program that is having fantastic results and could serve as a model for the country on how to address this issue.

Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted in support of these three important bills with a "yea" vote on rollcall Numbers 33, 41 and 50. I would have opposed the two dangerous amendments and voted "nay" on rollcall numbers 38 and 39.

HONORING AND SUPPORTING TEAM USA AT THE XXII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Team USA, the United States Olympic Committee, and all of our Olympic and Paralympic athletes. Today, the 22nd Olympic Winter Games will begin in Sochi, Russia. They will be followed shortly afterwards by the 11th Paralympic Winter Games. Over 200 American athletes will be representing our nation at the Olympics, participating in 15 events.

Many of these athletes have worked all their lives for the honor of representing their nation at the highest level. All of them will captivate and inspire us all through friendly competition, sportsmanship, solidarity, and fair play. From the thrill of downhill skiing to the quiet Zen of curling, Olympians from across the globe will kindle the Olympic Spirit as they compete alongside other world-class athletes.

I am especially pleased that my home state of Rhode Island is represented in Pairs Figure Skating by Marissa Castelli of Cranston. It has been over a quarter century since Team USA was on the medal platform for Pairs Skating, but we have a great chance of returning this year. We are all immensely proud of her accomplishments and we look forward to cheering on Marissa, her partner Simon Shnapir, and all the other members of Team USA.

In addition to our Olympic athletes, I would like to take a moment to commend America's Paralympians. Although they might not get the same television coverage as the Olympics, the Paralympics showcases some of the finest talent this country has to offer. Some of these world-class athletes are also wounded warriors who served in our military and fought for our country with honor and distinction. I have been pleased to work with the U.S. Olympic Committee and my Congressional colleagues to provide adaptive sports programs to injured service members, helping to speed their recovery time, bolster their self-confidence, and vastly improve their quality of life.

I would also like to recognize the courage of all the LGBT athletes participating in these Olympics. While I strongly oppose Russia's anti-gay legislation, I have every confidence that our athletes will display the same grace and dignity under pressure that has served them well in their quest for Olympic glory.

The Olympic movement is a testament to the power of international competition to unite us in common spirit and a reminder to all that we can achieve our dreams with courage and determination. I wish our Athletes well in the upcoming games, and thank the U.S. Olympic Committee for their continued dedication to achieving a better world through athletics.

IN HONOR OF 'THE BLUEGRASS STORYTELLER'—MR. JAMES KING

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of 'The Bluegrass Storyteller'—Mr. James King, who was born in Martinsville, Virginia and grew up immersed in the rich musical tradition of Southwest Virginia's Carroll County. After 20 years of playing bluegrass music, Mr. King's album "Three Chords and the Truth" was nominated for the 2013 Grammy Awards in the category of Best Bluegrass Album.

Surrounded by talented musicians including his father Jim and his uncle Joe Edd, Mr. King first picked up a guitar when he was eight years old. Though he began by playing rock and roll, Mr. King returned to bluegrass as he entered his teen years.

Mr. King served our country in the Marines before moving to Delaware. He has said that the Stanley Brothers (of Dickenson County, Virginia), Dudley Connell, Jimmy Martin, and Ted Lundy (of Galax, Virginia) have been major influences in his career.

He has released numerous group and solo albums throughout the years, and his band was recognized in 1997 as Emerging Artist of the Year by the International Bluegrass Music Association (IBMA), Recorded Event of the Year by the IBMA for its self-titled 1997 debut, and was also nominated for IBMA's 1999 Song of the Year for "Bed by the Window."

On "Three Chords and the Truth," released in late September, Mr. King interprets classic country western songs like George Jones' "He Stopped Loving Her Today" into the bluegrass format so characteristic of Mr. King. I commend Mr. James King for his hard work on this fine album and congratulate him for the recognition it has received. "Three Chords and the Truth" may not have been awarded a Grammy Award, but it has won the hearts of many music fans. I am optimistic that the talented Bluegrass Storyteller and his band will one day have their day in the sun.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 50. If my vote had been counted, I would have voted "yea" on passage of H.R. 3964.

HONORING JOHN WOOD, CEO OF SALLY CORP.

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Wood, CEO of Sally Corp., who was recently honored for his life work in the creation of amusement rides by being inducted into the International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions Hall of Fame.

Sally Corp., based in Jacksonville, is a prime example of the American dream come true. Started in a garage in 1977, the Sally Corp. creates dark ride attractions, bringing to life interactive experiences that go beyond the imagination. Ron Gustafson, chairman of the Hall of Fame and Archives Committee, said that John "revolutionized the attractions industry." He was able to take the staccato rides of old and create a story that leaves riders clamoring for more.

Thanks to John's devotion, Sally Corp. has continued to grow and profit, and their reach has extended across the globe. Sally Corp. is currently working on an animated musical attraction called the "White Tiger Show" in China and they have completed projects in both India and Australia.

It is truly an honor to have John Wood and Sally Corp. in the 4th Congressional District of Florida. Small business owners are the backbone of our nation and it gives me great pleasure to commend John for his outstanding achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and Member's of the House of Representatives join me in this very special congressional salute to John Wood.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF RODNEY LEE KENDIG

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and dedicated service of Mr. Rodney Lee "Rod" Kendig. Mr. Kendig was a committed public servant and a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. All of Northwest Florida mourns his passing.

Rod Kendig was born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania and graduated from Newton High School in Newton, New Jersey. After finishing his high school studies, he received a degree from the College of Wooster and a graduate degree from the University of Maryland. In 1978, while working for the National Association of Counties in Washington, D.C., Mr. Kendig was hired as Escambia County Administrator, and he moved with his family to Pensacola, Florida.

After several successful years as Escambia County Administrator, Mr. Kendig continued his public service to the Northwest Florida community as City Manager for the City of Pensacola. The position of Pensacola City Manager was a particularly important position that helped set the agenda for the Pensacola City Council. During his nine years on the job, he oversaw a number of important local projects, including: the construction of a new airport terminal and control tower at Pensacola Airport, a large expansion of Pensacola's city limits, construction of the Vickery Community Center, and acquisition of the T.T. Wentworth Jr. Florida State Museum, amongst many other accomplishments. Mr. Kendig continued his success in the private sector, joining the local firm Baskerville-Donovan, where he was instrumental in facilitating plans to move the city's wastewater treatment plant out of downtown Pensacola.

Mr. Kendig was also committed to serving the community away from the job. Along with his wife Paula, he volunteered with the Children's Home Society, and they served as a foster family for dozens of local children. The Kendigs fell in love and adopted one of the foster babies with special needs. Mr. Kendig became a community leader and advocate for children's health and education issues, serving on the Arc Gateway Board of Directors, the State Partnership for School Readiness, and the Early Learning Coalition of Escambia County. Mr. Kendig was also an avid reader and supporter of literacy and local libraries, and he was elected to serve as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the West Florida Public Library System.

Mr. Speaker, Rod Kendig was an exceptional public servant, loving family man, and a great community leader. His impact on Northwest Florida will never be forgotten. My wife Vicki and I send our prayers and deepest condolences to his wife, Paula; mother, Jane; children, Kathy, Andrea, Adam, Christy, Chelsey, and Jacob; grandchildren; Jennifer, Melissa, Billy, Nina, Paul and AJ; great grandson, Grady; sister, Brenda; and the entire Kendig family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed roll Nos. 40 and 41. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 40 and "nay" on roll No. 41.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 41 I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 3590.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HONORING GEORGE W. KOCH

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of George W. Koch, who passed away on January 26, 2014, at the age of 87.

Mr. Koch spent more than 50 years in Washington, DC. After 6 years as manager of the Washington, DC office of Sears, Roebuck & Co., he took over as President and CEO of the Grocery Manufacturers Association (GMA) in 1966. During his 24 years with the GMA, he transformed the organization into a leading industry advocacy group. Major efforts during his tenure included the adoption of the Universal Product Code in 1974 and the development of tamper-resistant packaging in 1982. Mr. Koch became known for his passion, his work ethic and his strong sense of morality. In the late 1970s, the Washington Afro-American honored Mr. Koch for his personal efforts to combat wage-skimming at the Congressional Country Club from its minority wait staff.

After his retirement from the GMA, he became a partner at K&L Gates. He served on the Board of Directors for Borden Chemicals and Plastics, McCormick & Company, and the Watchdogs of the Treasury; the Advisory Council of the International Executive Service Corps; and the Board of Trustees for the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation. He also served as North American Counsel for the International Center for Companies of the Food Industry and as Congressional Advisor to the Transatlantic Policy Network.

In May of 2013, the Grocery Manufacturers Association chose to honor Mr. Koch with the first-ever George W. Koch Leadership in Public Policy Award, for his decades of service to the organization. This award is now given out annually to exemplary individuals.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank George W. Koch for his years of service, his tireless advocacy, and his exceptional moral character.

IN HONOR OF SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S EL SOL MAGAZINE

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Southwestern Community College student journalism publications. Southwestern College, in Chula Vista, California, is one of our region's premier journalism programs whereby students publish a newspaper and a magazine for the students and surrounding community members. With the journalism students' dedication, Southwestern College has asserted itself as one of the top college newspapers in the nation with their newspaper, The Sun. Additionally, these dedicated journalism students devoted off-time hours to design, create and publish a magazine, El Sol. They were also instrumental in finding the funding in order to publish their student magazine. Southwestern College has reason to be proud of their Journalism Department's accomplishments and the hard work and dedication of student advisor Max Branscomb, Ed.D., should also be recognized. As the recipient of the Society of Professional Journalists National Journalism Teacher of the Year award, Dr. Branscomb's dedication to the field of journalism is creating an environment whereby the results of his instruction are motivating students toward careers in journalism. In honor of Dr. Branscomb and the Southwestern College students in the Journalism Department, I do hereby recognize February 6, 2014, as the "Southwestern College Journalism Students Day" in the City of Chula Vista.

HONORING ALEXIS "LEXIE" KAMERMAN

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alexis "Lexie" Kamerman, a courageous and talented young woman who tragically lost her life in an Afghan terrorist attack on January 17th. Lexie was killed in a Kabul restaurant that was specifically targeted by the Taliban because of its popularity with westerners.

A 27-year-old Chicago native, Lexie was committed to rebuilding Afghanistan through education, particularly for young women and girls who might not otherwise have the opportunity to go to school. In her role as a Student Development Specialist at the American University of Afghanistan, Lexie worked to help the next generation of Afghan women take their place as leaders in society. Friends and family of Lexie point to her strength, fearlessness, and passion as key to her decision to serve.

Lexie grew up in Chicago, and graduated from the Latin School in 2004. She attended Knox College, where she was a fierce competitor on the water polo team. Lexie received her M.A. in Higher Education from the University of Arizona.

Sadly, the American University of Afghanistan community lost another member during the January 17th attack: political science professor Alexandros Petersen from Washington, DC. He was only 29. While both Lexie and Alexandros were far too young to be taken from us, their talent and passion for serving others, regardless of the potential dangers, are examples to which we should all aspire.

My deepest condolences go to the friends and family of Lexie Kamerman, particularly her parents, Jack and Alison.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS STEWART

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 5th on rollcall 38 for H.R. 3590 I inadvertently voted "yea" for the amendment instead of "nay." My intention was to vote against the measure.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR GENERAL CATHY LUTZ

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of Major General Cathy Lutz, the first female Major General of the Mississippi Air National Guard, who went to be with the Lord on January 18, 2014.

With over 30 years of military service, Major General Lutz broke "glass ceiling" barriers, while maintaining civility and humility. She lived her life in service to friends, family, and country and professed "military and nursing" the means in which she served God and man.

Called "one of our nation's premier advocates for better health care for . . . soldiers and servicemen," Major General Lutz coordinated retrieval efforts of wounded servicemen following the terrorist attack against the USS *Cole* and led a medical squadron based out of Saudi Arabia.

In all, Major General Lutz commanded three squadrons in the National Guard and received eight military awards, including the Legion of Merit for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services and achievements."

While serving the Mississippi Air National Guard, Major General Lutz involved herself in the Mississippi art community. She showed her work with the Mississippi Art Colony and established an art farm in Flora, MS, along with her husband, retired Major General William Lutz.

Mississippi lost a dear daughter with the death of Major General Cathy Lutz. On behalf of the United States Congress and the people of Mississippi, we recognize her life and service.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ROBERT GEORGE'S ADVOCACY FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit an excerpt from remarks made by my friend Dr. Robert George, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University and chair of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, upon receiving the John Leland Award from the Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission in December. In his statement, Dr. George succinctly spells out the different ways in which countries around the world undermine religious freedom, whether through hostility toward religions, sponsorship of radicalism, enforcement of unjust laws or failure to protect citizens against religious violence.

Today, religious freedom is in peril around the world. In his remarks, Dr. George admirably shows Americans what they can do to secure greater liberty for people of faith, and of no faith, who are in harm's way because of what they believe. We are privileged to live in a country where freedom of religion is constitutionally guaranteed—may we strive to secure this right for citizens of all countries.

ROBERT P. GEORGE, JOHN LELAND AWARD, SOUTHERN BAPTIST ETHICS AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY COMMISSION, RAYBURN GOLD ROOM, WASHINGTON, DC, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2013 [EXCERPTS]

. . . So why *does* religious freedom matter? Why should promoting and defending it abroad, no less than honoring it at home, be a high priority for our country?

The way some people see it, the reason for respecting religious freedom is purely instrumental and self-interested. If you and I disagree in matters of religion, I should tolerate your beliefs and religious practices so that you will tolerate mine. Religious freedom, on this view, is not so much a moral or human right as it is a kind of mutual nonaggression pact.

It's not difficult to see the attraction of this view or to explain why some people hold it. A world in which each community lives in fear that another will seize power and oppress its practitioners is hardly an ideal state of affairs for any of them—except, of course, the group that happens to come out on top. But that is exactly what happens where there is little or no religious freedom protection. Everyone fears what will happen to their own group. And so the answer to the problem is clear. Each group tolerates the other groups so that it, too, will be tolerated.

But there's a problem with this view. The problem is not that it's in any way inaccurate or untrue. Instead, the problem is that it doesn't go far enough. It ignores the fact that at its core, religious freedom means something far deeper and more profound than people grudgingly tolerating each another in a kind of *modus vivendi*.

It means the right to be who we truly are as human beings. The fact is that as human beings, we are drawn to ponder life's deepest questions and seek meaningful, truthful answers. Where do we come from? What is our destiny? Is there a transcendent source of meaning and value? Is there a "higher law" that pulls us above personal interest in order to "do unto others as we would have them do unto us?"

No matter how these questions are answered, one thing is indisputable: Human beings can't stop asking them, and would be diminished precisely as human beings if they were to try to do so. And that suggests that the religious quest is a constitutive part of our humanity—an aspect of our flourishing as the kind of creatures we are, namely, rational, intelligent, and free actors.

And this, in turn, suggests that we must cherish and honor, preserve and protect, the right of persons to ask and answer these questions as best they can, and, within the broadest limits, to lead their lives with authenticity and integrity in line with their best judgments of conscience.

And so, both as individuals and together with others in community, religious freedom means the right to ponder life's origins, meaning and purpose; to explore the deepest questions about human nature, dignity, and destiny; to decide what is to be believed and not to be believed; and, within the limits of justice for all, to comply with what one conscientiously judges to be one's religious obligations—openly, peacefully, and without fear.

John Henry Newman once observed that ''conscience has rights because it has duties.'' We honor the rights of conscience in matters of faith because people must be free to lead lives of authenticity and integrity by fulfilling what they believe to be their solemn duties.

But authenticity and integrity are directly threatened whenever there is coercion or compulsion in matters of faith or belief. Indeed, coercion does not produce genuine conviction, but pretense and lack of authenticity. Clearly, a coerced faith is no faith at all. Compulsion may cause a person to manifest the outward signs of belief or unbelief, but it cannot produce the interior acts of intellect and will that constitute genuine faith.

Therefore, it is essential that freedom of religion or belief include the right to hold any belief or none at all, to change one's beliefs and religious affiliation, to bear witness to these beliefs in public as well as private, and corporately as well as individually, and to act on one's religiously inspired convictions about justice and the common good in carrying out the duties of citizenship. And it is vital that religious liberty's full protections be extended to those whose answers to life's deepest questions reject belief in the transcendent.

Because the right to freedom of religion or belief is so central to human personhood, we would expect that in places where it is dishonored, societies would be less happy and secure. And according to a growing number of studies, that is precisely the case across the world.

These studies show that countries that protect religious liberty are more secure and stable than those that do not, and nations that trample on this freedom provide fertile ground for war and poverty, terror and radical movements.

In other words, not only do religious freedom abuses violate the core of our humanity, they do grave harm to the well-being of societies.

They do so politically—as religious freedom abuses are highly correlated with the absence of democracy and the presence of other human rights abuses.

They do so economically—as religious persecution destabilizes communities and marginalizes the persecuted, causing their talents and abilities to go unrealized, robbing a nation of added productivity, and reducing that nation's ability to fight poverty and create abundance for its citizens.

They do so morally—since wherever religious freedom is dishonored, the benefit of religion in molding character is diminished, and with it, the self-discipline necessary to handle the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

And finally, they do so socially—since wherever religious freedom is abused, peace and security become ever more elusive.

For the United States, all of this has a direct bearing on our own security.

For example, of the four countries that hosted Osama bin Laden during his notorious life—Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Pakistan—each is an incubator of terrorism in the form of violent religious extremism, and all have perpetrated or tolerated repeated religious freedom violations.

And as we all know, the 9/11 attacks on our country were plotted in Afghanistan, which was run by the Taliban which originated in Pakistan, with 15 of the 19 attackers coming from Saudi Arabia.

In December of last year, the Institute for Economics and Peace, an Australian think tank, released a ranking of nations based on the number of terrorist attacks launched between 2002 and 2011. At the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, we consider seven of these countries—Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, India, Somalia, Nigeria, and Russia—to be serious violators of religious liberty. . . .

Clearly, religious freedom matters greatly. And sadly, according to a recent Pew study, 75 percent of the world's people—more than 5 billion human beings—live in countries with governments that significantly restrict this fundamental right. Such restrictions range from burdensome rules and regulations on building houses of worship to detention and imprisonment, torture and murder.

. . . All of these abuses violate not just American standards of religious freedom, but international human rights standards and covenants as well.

The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, in Article 18, that:

''Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.''

Since 1966, the governments of 167 countries have signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a binding treaty with protections similar to Article 18.

Nations around the world also affirmed the 1981 Declaration on Religious Intolerance, and other regional bodies, such as the OSCE, the Council of Europe, the Organization of American States, also confirm religious freedom as a fundamental liberty. . . .

As an independent, bipartisan, U.S. federal government advisory body, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom is firmly committed to the human rights standards found in these documents.

As a key part of its mandate, USCIRF monitors religious freedom worldwide and makes policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State, and to Congress.

Based on our monitoring of religious freedom conditions, we have seen a number of discernible patterns to religious persecution.

First, we have seen the following categories of religious freedom violations engaged in or tolerated by governments: state hostility; state sponsorship; state enforcement; and state failure.

The second pattern we have seen is that in every one of these categories, Christians are among the persecuted.

And a third pattern we've noted is the stubborn persistence of anti-Semitism worldwide, including in the nations of Western Europe, where it again appears to be on the rise.

As to the categories of religious freedom abuses I just mentioned, state hostility involves the government actively persecuting people or groups on account of their beliefs.

State sponsorship refers to the government actively promoting—and sometimes even exporting—ideas and propaganda, often of a violent, extremist nature, that include hostility to the religious freedom of others.

State enforcement refers to the government applying laws and statutes such as anti-blasphemy codes to individuals, often members of religious minorities, thus violating freedom of expression as well as freedom of religion or belief.

And state failure means that the government is neglecting to take action to protect those whom others are targeting due to their beliefs, creating a climate of impunity in which religious minorities or dissenters are threatened, intimidated, or even attacked and killed.

When it comes to state hostility toward religions, one of the worst persecutors is Iran's theocratic regime. The Iranian government has executed people for ''waging war against God,'' while relentlessly targeting reformers among the Shi'a Muslim majority, as well as religious minorities, including Sunni and Sufi Muslims, Bahai's, and Christians. The Iranian regime has also stirred up anti-Semitism and promoted Holocaust denial.

Regarding state sponsorship of radical ideology which targets the religious freedom of others, Saudi Arabia continues to export its own extremist interpretation of Sunni Islam through textbooks and other literature which teach hatred and even violence toward other religious groups.

Regarding state enforcement of laws and statutes that repress freedom of expression and religion, Egypt and Pakistan enforce anti-blasphemy or anti-defamation codes, with religious minorities bearing the brunt of the enforcement.

Regarding state failure to protect religious freedom, the actions of the governments of Egypt and Pakistan exemplify those of nations which do not protect their citizens against religion-related violence. Ironically, both nations' enforcement of blasphemy codes fuels some of the worst violence by encouraging vigilantes to target perceived transgressors.

. . . In Egypt, since the fall of Hosni Mubarak, including the periods of time before, during, and after President Morsi's rule, the government has tolerated widespread abuses against religious minorities, including Coptic Orthodox and other Christians, and Bahai's, Shi'a Muslims, and dissident Sunni Muslims.

It has failed to make serious efforts to bring the perpetrators of violence to justice or to respond to virulent anti-Semitism in state-controlled media.

In Pakistan, the government's longtime failure to protect religious freedom was on brutal display in 2011 with the assassinations of Salmaan Taseer, a Muslim who was Governor of Punjab province, and Shahbaz Bhatti, a Christian who was Pakistan's Minister for Minority Affairs and a valiant religious freedom advocate.

Both officials were killed for opposing Pakistan's blasphemy law, which is used as a weapon of repression against Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

This year was clearly one of the worst for both Shi'a Muslims and for Christians in Pakistan, as attacks by extremists on these communities accelerated with impunity.

Clearly, impunity remains one of the world's most serious and growing religious freedom concerns and challenges. Across much of the world, there have been incidents of religiously-related violence which are not being addressed by investigations, trials, or punishments.

. . . And so, let me conclude by saying that for those of us who care about religious freedom, we have a job to do.

First and foremost, each of us as citizens needs to make the case to our fellow Americans on behalf of supporting religious freedom abroad. We need to explain why this matters for our country and for our world.

We must tell others the story about what is happening to victims of religious persecution around the world. We must not let them be forgotten or let their plight be ignored.

And then, as we increase our numbers on the ground, we can move Washington to do the right thing by supporting religious freedom. We must make it clear to those in public office that we expect them to honor religious freedom both at home and abroad, and that we intend to hold them electorally accountable if they fail to do that. We must insist that religious freedom be given the priority it is due under the International Religious Freedom Act in the conduct of our international diplomacy and foreign policy. Trade considerations are important; geopolitical strategic considerations are important; but religious freedom is important, too. It is not a second-class concern—at least not since IRFA became the law of the land. . . .

I have not spoken much today about domestic religious freedom issues. I do not want to close, however, without saying this: The first and most important way in which the President of the United States can promote religious freedom abroad is by honoring religious freedom here at home. Again, speaking for myself, and not on this occasion as Chairman of USCIRF, I call on President Obama to withdraw the HHS mandates that threaten religious freedom in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act—and to do so before being compelled to withdraw those mandates by the Supreme Court in the lawsuits now pending. Indeed, the administration should—across the board, at home and abroad—embrace a robust view of religious liberty, one going beyond the mere ''freedom of worship''—one that respects the right of religious believers and religious institutions to honor the requirements of their consciences without governmental interference, except in those circumstances—mercifully rare in our own country—where restrictions on religious freedom are necessary to protect the religious freedom of others or to prevent violence or other intolerable harms. . . .

HONORING BEURT SERVAAS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Beurt SerVaas, a dedicated community leader and former president of the Indianapolis City-County Council.

Beurt SerVaas was an accomplished businessman and a devoted public servant who spent the better part of his life serving the people of Indianapolis. Dr. SerVaas was first elected to the Marion County Council in the early 1960s and became a chief architect of the Uni-Gov changes that consolidated parts of city and county government. Dr. SerVaas' distinguished business career included bringing the Saturday Evening Post to Indiana and rescuing several struggling businesses ranging from engine rebuilders to makers of cleaning products.

The state of Indiana and the city of Indianapolis have lost one of their most distinguished citizens and a dedicated civic leader. On a personal note, Dr. SerVaas was a friend and a supporter of mine, who could always be counted on for his gentle wisdom and smile.

Beurt SerVaas set an example to which we can all aspire. He was a visionary leader who dedicated his life to serving others and making his country and community better places to live. This included service in the United States Navy and the Central Intelligence Agency. His commitment to Indiana will be forever appreciated. I ask the residents of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping his wife Dr. Cory Jane SerVaas, daughters Joan, Amy, and Kristin, and his sons Eric and Paul, in their thoughts and prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote number 38, the DeFazio Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Acts of 2013, I was recorded as an ''aye.'' It was my intention to vote ''no'' on the amendment.

As an avid sportsman, I strongly oppose legislation that would threaten opportunities for recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting on our Nation's public lands.

IN RECOGNITION OF MERRILL BLUM

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Merrill Blum upon his retirement from the Vietnam Veterans Association of the Cape and Islands.

Following his service in the United States Army, Mr. Blum found his true calling working for numerous veterans' services programs throughout Massachusetts, and his remarkable efforts were recognized by the Department of Labor as a model for the nation. His commitment to serving veterans brought him to work with the Vietnam Veterans Association of the Cape and Islands, focusing on projects such as the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project, Homelessness Prevention Council, and on my Advisory Commission on Veteran Services. Throughout his career Mr. Blum has demonstrated his true commitment to helping soldiers improve their lives once they return home. In finding his calling in life, Mr. Blum made a lasting impact on countless American heroes within our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Merrill Blum upon his retirement. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Mr. Blum for his service and commitment to our nation's veterans.

CONGRATULATING FLIR SYSTEMS, INC.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate FLIR Systems, Inc. on the launch of FLIR ONE, the first consumer-oriented thermal imaging system. Introduced on January 7, 2014, FLIR ONE is the first product of its kind that provides thermal imaging technology to consumers using a unique smart phone accessory case. This is a tremendous step toward making infrared technology accessible and affordable to the general public.

FLIR Systems, Inc. is a global leader in the design, manufacture, and marketing of sensor systems that enhance perception and awareness. Their technological innovations have a wide range of utility including aerial and ground surveillance, environmental monitoring, navigation and transportation safety.

The work of FLIR Systems, Inc. is not only positively impacting Central Florida by providing our community with jobs; their innovations are resonating around the world. With the global debut of FLIR ONE scheduled for Spring 2014, I wish FLIR Systems, Inc. continued success.

RECOGNIZING GO TO 2040 FOR RECEIVING THE EPA SMART GROWTH ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Environmental Protection Agency recognized seven organizations from across the country that are working to ensure sustainable urban growth with the National Award for Smart Growth Achievement. I am proud to recognize the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning's GO TO 2040 initiative for receiving this honor.

GO TO 2040 focuses on sustainable prosperity—working within Chicago and around the world to cement the city's place as an economic and cultural center. By 2040 Chicago will need to accommodate up to 25 percent more residents. The plan addresses public transportation, community planning, government cooperation, and resource management to ensure that Chicago remains a vibrant and diverse city, with room for our communities to grow.

GO TO 2040 has four challenges for city and state government to consider—creating livable communities, maximizing the potential of human capital, ensuring efficient government, and promoting regional mobility. Those issues impact all major metropolitan communities, and this roadmap is an important step as we look to build a sustainable future for our cities.

GO TO 2040 is a leading example of the type of work that will preserve and improve our urban centers for generations to come. I am proud to recognize the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning's work to keep our city great.

HONORING MR. TOM KAISER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Tom Kaiser, a veteran and member of America's Greatest Generation. Tom is a resident of Delray Beach, Florida, and has helped more than 500 South Florida veterans receive government awards and medals for their military service.

Thanks to Tom's dedication, veterans who helped to liberate France in WWII regularly are presented the Legion of Honor in special ceremonies by France's Consuls General from Miami. One of the men receiving this prestigious award is a Holocaust survivor who, after making it out of France, moved to the United States and served America in the Korean War.

Aside from helping veterans, Tom has also been instrumental in getting 22 war monuments placed at Boynton Beach's Veteran's Park. There are monuments dedicated to the Tuskegee Airmen, Korean War and other famous veterans and battles. Tom chairs the Boynton Beach Veteran's Council. Together with Ray Carter, the city's Fire Chief, he recently unveiled a memorial to the victims of 9/11 at the park. Tom noted at the ceremony that, ''it makes the park a history lesson, so that anytime of the year people can come and reflect.''

A humble man, Tom would be reluctant to accept the title of hero, but that is what he is to all the veterans who have gotten the recognition they deserve due to his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the term Greatest Generation was created to describe Tom and others like him, who served our country so bravely. I am very pleased to honor him on this day.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S775–S835

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1997–2006, and S. Res. 345–352. **Page S821**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 1870, to reauthorize and restructure adoption incentive payments, to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, to increase the reliability of child support for children. (S. Rept. No. 113–137) **Page S820**

Measures Passed:

World Polio Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 270, supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio. **Pages S833–34**

Ambush Marketing: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 289, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S834**

Reid (for Rockefeller) Amendment No. 2729, to amend the resolving clause. **Page S834**

Reid (for Rockefeller) Amendment No. 2730, to amend the preamble. **Page S834**

Reid (for Rockefeller) Amendment No. 2731, to amend the title. **Page S834**

Iraqi Jewish Archive: Senate agreed to S. Res. 333, strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq. **Page S834**

Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games: Senate agreed to S. Res. 352, commemorating the success of Team USA in the past 22 Olympic Winter Games and supporting Team USA in the 2014 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games. **Page S834**

Measures Considered:

Bipartisan Budget Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1963, to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. **Pages S775–77, S812**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, February 6, 2014, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 10, 2014. **Page S812**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 2 p.m. on Monday, February 10, 2014. **Page S835**

Unemployment Benefits Extension: Senate resumed consideration of S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S777–94**

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2714, of a perfecting nature. **Page S777**

Reid Amendment No. 2715 (to Amendment No. 2714), to change the enactment date. **Page S777**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2716, to change the enactment date. **Page S777**

Reid Amendment No. 2717 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2716), of a perfecting nature. **Page S777**

Reid Amendment No. 2718 (to Amendment No. 2717), of a perfecting nature. **Page S777**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 23), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2714 (listed above). **Page S794**

Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2714. **Page S794**

By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 24), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S794**

Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the bill. **Page S794**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas, 1 responding present (Vote No. EX. 25), Max Sieben Baucus, of Montana, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. **Pages S795, S835**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Darrin P. Gayles, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Coast Guard, and Navy. **Page S835**

Messages from the House: **Page S819**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S775, S819**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S819, S834–35**

Executive Communications: **Pages S819–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S820–21**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S821–23**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S823–26**

Additional Statements: **Page S818**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S826–32**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S832**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S832–33**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S833**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—25) **Pages S794–95**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:49 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 10, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S835.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a closed hearing to examine counterterrorism policy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary for Intelligence, Michael D. Lumpkin Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, and Lieutenant General Joseph L. Votel, USA, Commander, and Lieutenant Colonel David Taylor, USA, both of the Joint Special Operations Command, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, Katherine M. O'Regan, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

FINANCIAL STABILITY AND DATA SECURITY

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine financial stability and data security, after receiving testimony from Mary J. Miller, Under Secretary, and Thomas J. Curry, Comptroller of the Currency, both of the Department of the Treasury; Daniel K. Tarullo, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Mary Jo White, Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission; and Mark P. Wetjen, Acting Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCE BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1784, to improve timber management on Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land, and S. 1966, to provide for the restoration of the economic and ecological health of National Forest System land and rural communities, after receiving testimony

from Representative DeFazio; Tomas Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Steven A. Ellis, Deputy Director for Operations, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Sid Leiken, Lane County Commissioner, and Dale Riddle, Seneca Sawmill Company, both of Eugene, Oregon; Doug Robertson, Douglas County Commissioner, Roseburg, Oregon, on behalf of the Association of O&C Counties; Jerry F. Franklin, University of Washington School of Environmental and Forest Science, Seattle; Mike Matz, The Pew Charitable Trusts, Durango, Colorado; Andrew Miller, Stimson Lumber Company, and Sean Stevens, Oregon Wild, both of Portland, Oregon; Clint Georg, Saratoga Forest Management, Saratoga, Wyoming; and Mike Dombeck, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items;

H.R. 1206, to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps;

S. 741, to extend the authorization of appropriations to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017, with an amendment;

S. 212, to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi;

S. 864, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 724, to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles;

S. 51, to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act;

S. 970, to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under the Act, with an amendment;

S. 898, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Albuquerque, New Mexico, to the Amy Biehl High School Foundation;

S. 969, to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act, with an amendment;

S. 1077, to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the reauthorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network;

S. 1865, to amend the prices set for Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps and make limited waivers of stamp requirements for certain users;

S. 1451, to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels;

S. 1080, to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship;

Proposed resolutions relating to the General Services Administration; and

The nominations of Victoria Marie Baecher Wassmer, of Illinois, to be Chief Financial Officer, Thomas A. Burke, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator, and Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, Roy K. J. Williams, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, Rhea Sun Suh, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, and Richard J. Engler, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Karen Dynan, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Luis G. Moreno, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Jamaica, John L. Estrada, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, and Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, who was introduced by Senator Bennet, all of the Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1486, to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

HIGH-QUALITY EARLY EDUCATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine supporting children and families through investments in high-quality early education, after receiving testimony from John White, Louisiana State Superintendent of Education, Baton Rouge; Danielle

Ewen, District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington; Hirokazu Yoshikawa, New York University Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development, New York; and Charlotte M. Brantley, Clayton Early Learning, Denver, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Indira Talwani, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, James D. Peterson, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin, Nancy J. Rosenstengel, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, and Debo P. Adegbile, of New York, and John P. Carlin, of New York, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 16 public bills, H.R. 4005–4020 were introduced.

Pages H1686–87

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1687**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3578, to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 113–343);

H.R. 2571, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to notify and obtain permission from consumers before collecting nonpublic personal information about such consumers, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–344);

H.R. 2446, to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with a five person Commission, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–345);

H.R. 3193, to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–346);

H.R. 3519, to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent agency, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–347); and

H.R. 2431, to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–348). **Pages H1685–86**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Hastings (WA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1661**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Monsignor Stephen Rossetti, St. Luke Institute, Washington, DC. **Page H1661**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H1661**

Authorizing Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument: The House passed H.R. 2954, to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, by a recorded vote of 220 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 54.

Pages H1662–81

Rejected the Barber motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 194 yeas to 222 nays, Roll No. 53. **Page H1680**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–35 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H1668**

Agreed to:

Lummis amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–340) that conforms with Senate changes to FLPMA, allows the Secretary to consolidate environmental reviews, clarifies the definition of current grazing management, and ensures a timely response for temporary trailing and crossing applications; **Pages H1673–74**

McClintock amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–340) that amends Title IX of the bill to allow the Forest Service added flexibility to implement a salvage logging plan on lands affected by the Rim Fire while protecting sensitive areas and maximizing revenue to fund reforestation;

Pages H1675–76

Young (AK) amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–340) that approves an Alaska Native Veterans land allotment application and conveys the land associated with the application; and

Pages H1676–77

Labrador amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–340) that requires the non-prevailing, not directly affected party in a challenge to the Secretary's final grazing decision to pay the directly affected prevailing party incurred fees and expenses, and clarifies the definition of a directly affected party (by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 198 noes, Roll No. 52). **Pages H1674–75, H1678–79**

Rejected:

Grijalva amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–340) that sought to strike the restriction on federal land acquisition (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 51).

Pages H1672–73, H1677–78

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H1681**

H. Res. 472, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2954) and (H.R. 3964), was agreed to yesterday, February 5th.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 11:15 a.m. **Page H1677**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 10th when it shall convene at 12 noon for Morning Hour Debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H1684**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1677–78, H1678–79, H1680 and H1681. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING CHALLENGES AND WASTED TAXPAYER DOLLARS IN MODERNIZING BORDER SECURITY IT SYSTEMS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled ''Examining Challenges and Wasted Taxpayer Dollars in Modernizing Border Security IT Systems''. Testimony was heard from David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; Charles Armstrong, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Information and Technology, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Thomas Michelli, Chief Information Officer, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

IRS TARGETING INVESTIGATION: WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION DOING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing entitled ''The IRS Targeting Investigation: What is the Administration Doing?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DUPLICATION, OVERLAP AND FRAGMENTATION IN FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation in Federal Financial Assistance Programs''. Testimony was heard from William B. Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; Ann Marie Mehlum, Associate Administrator, Office of Capital Access, Small Business Administration; and Lillian Salerno, Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture.

BUSINESS MEETING

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on member access requests. This was a closed meeting.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, February 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1963, Bipartisan Budget Act, with a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, February 10

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E175, E177
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E175
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E176
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E176
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E175, E181
Keating, William R., Mass., E180
Langevin, James R., R.I., E176
Messer, Luke, Ind., E180
Miller, George, Calif., E177
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E177
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E178
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E178, E180
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E175
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E177
Stewart, Chris, Utah, E178
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E177
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E177
Valadao, David G., Calif., E180
Vargas, Juan, Calif., E178
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E180
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E178

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.