



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014

No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

ALLOW A VOTE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this is my weekly reminder to House Republicans that they have only 30 legislative days before the July 4 recess. In that time they had better allow a vote for immigration reform or the President will take executive action to reform our immigration.

The chance to save the Republican Party from being a regional party and not a national one rests on what Re-

publican leaders do during the next 30 legislative days. If they deny justice, security, and dignity to our brothers and sisters with foreign hands, who work every day in American fields to plant and pick our vegetables, the Republican Party is giving up on the chance for their brothers and sisters with Republican hands to pick and plant vegetables in the White House's vegetable garden any time soon.

Tomorrow, Wednesday, the Hispanic Congressional Caucus will have a special meeting with Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson. We will present him with a memo that lays out options the Obama administration has under current law to protect more immigrants from a deportation along the lines of deferred action for DREAMers.

The important phrase here is "under current law." In February 2011, we delivered a memo to the President outlining specific actions he could take within existing law to keep families together, spare military families, and, yes, spare those who would qualify for the DREAM Act; protecting them temporarily on a case-by-case basis from deportation using tools in the law like deferred action, parole, and hardship waivers.

Our position was strengthened in April of that year by a paper called "Executive Branch Authority Regarding Implementation of Immigration Law and Policies." The report was written by Bo Cooper, who served as general counsel at the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and by Paul Virtue, who was also general counsel at the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The report said:

The executive branch, through the Secretary of Homeland Security, can exercise discretion not to prosecute a case by granting "deferred action" to an otherwise removable or deportable immigrant.

Only a month before deferred action for DREAMers was announced, a letter

signed with footnotes and citations was sent to the President from almost 100 law professors at our top law schools and universities outlining the power the President has to spare immigrants from deportation.

Legal scholars and research are not always enough to persuade my friends in the Republican Conference. Almost every single one of them voted for the King amendment defunding deferred action last year and voted this year to sue the President over immigration enforcement. They are rejecting these arguments as some kind of academic hoax.

So, as I have done in the past, I ask you not to just take my word for it, or the word of legal experts, or hundreds of law professors. I ask you to take the word of your former Judiciary chairman—three of them—when it comes to immigration and deportation.

Here is the letter from November 1999 where at least 28 Republicans and Democrats called on President Clinton to exercise prosecutorial discretion when it comes to deportation and immigration enforcement. It is in this letter:

There has been widespread agreement that some deportations were unfair and resulted in unjustifiable hardship.

The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established.

It is in the letter:

Optimally, removal proceedings should be initiated or terminated only upon specific instruction from authorized INS officials, issued in occurrence with agency guidelines.

They go on to urge that those guidelines—it is in there—they urge those guidelines should be issued from headquarters, just as the Hispanic Congressional Caucus is going to urge the President to issue guidelines for initiation and termination of deportation proceedings tomorrow.

Let's see, here is LAMAR SMITH, and JAMES SENSENBRENNER signed it, and Henry Hyde. Three Republican chairmen of the Judiciary Committee signed

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2993

this letter, stating that the President had broad discretion. Mr. Speaker, three former chairmen of the House Judiciary Committee, the legal foundation upon which this opinion rests, is as rock solid as their conservative credentials are.

Yet, to this day, the Republican Conference has not come up with an immigration bill or a series of bills of their own. The American people are still waiting for Republicans to write their own immigration bills or amend the ones that were sent to us by a two-thirds bipartisan majority in the Senate.

I am here to remind my friends in the Republican Conference that the time is running out. If you don't take action, the President will take action to permit millions upon millions of undocumented immigrants to be able to live safely in the United States of America. It is your choice.

GABRIELLA MILLER RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Washington can get things done. It may not be all the time, but over the last year we have been able to make constructive progress on an array of issues. Had it not been for Members on all sides of the aisle coming together, looking past party labels, and working on what is important, this would not have been the case.

Last week on Thursday, April 3, President Obama signed into law an important piece of legislation that represents one of those points of progress.

In December of last year, the House passed bipartisan legislation to shift \$126 million—money previously used to finance national political conventions—to the National Institutes of Health, where it will now support research into childhood cancer and other pediatric diseases, including Down syndrome, cancer, autism, and the countless other diseases that affect our children that don't yet have a cure.

In March of 2014 the Senate passed the legislation, again with bipartisan support. That bill—now law—was the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act. There have been many critical research breakthroughs over the past decade. As a result of this new law, millions of additional dollars will be put towards research in an effort to develop treatments and cures for pediatric disorders and diseases. Today, more are on the horizon, and with passage of this law, they will be upon us that much more quickly.

As most are aware, Gabriella Miller passed away from cancer, an inoperable brain tumor, in October of 2013. Gabriella, before her passing, stated: "If I go, if I lose my battle, then I'm going to want other people to carry on with the war. They are going to win this war."

Mr. Speaker, although there is much more to be done, with the passage of this act, this body took one small step in that direction. Through this new law we honor the legacy of a brave and spirited young girl who left a mark on the Nation and the world. Let us continue to fight this battle on behalf of so many boys and girls in similar positions. My prayers are with Gabriella and her family.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, April 16 marks Emancipation Day in the District of Columbia, when the slaves who lived in the District of Columbia were emancipated.

I come to the floor this week to discuss a different kind of emancipation. Today, I begin, as the Nation began, with taxes without representation. If I were to ask you who pays the highest taxes per capita in the United States of America, who would you say? What jurisdiction would you say? New York? Connecticut? Arizona? Texas?

It would be the citizens of the Nation's Capital who support the Nation without representation in the Congress of the United States, the 650,000 citizens of the Nation's Capital. That is why you see D.C. license plates that say, "Taxation Without Representation." That was not the idea of the D.C. government. It was a citizen who came forward to suggest that this should be what was on our license plates.

So, April 16—we in the District commemorate Emancipation Day every year because we have the distinction of being the first jurisdiction in the United States where the slaves were emancipated elsewhere. The irony is, we are now the last jurisdiction where citizens of every background do not enjoy equal rights. All other Americans have at least one voting Representative and two Senators. District of Columbia citizens have no vote on this House floor and no Senators.

All other Americans govern themselves without interference from the Congress. The District of Columbia must abide the nullification of local laws if the Congress sees fit. All other Americans enjoy total control of their own taxpayer funds. The District budget, approved by and raised by District officials, must be approved in this House and in the Senate by people who had nothing to do with raising those funds.

All other Americans pass any constitutional local law they see fit. All local laws of the District of Columbia must lay over here in the House to see whether somebody wants to pop up and overturn them, even if they are constitutional.

What is the difference between the people I represent and the people my

colleagues represent? We do not have statehood rights, and that is what any citizen who pays taxes and serves in the armed services for the Nation deserves. We seek statehood, the only way to achieve what we have sought and still seek: budget autonomy, legislative autonomy, freedom from interference into our lives by the Congress of the United States.

The Nation's first principle, the principle that gave rise to revolution, is taxation without representation. How would you feel if the highest per capita taxes were paid by your citizens and they didn't have the same rights as every other citizen?

District residents pay almost \$12,000 per capita; the lowest are paid, and I point them out only because they are the lowest, by Mississippi, and their taxes are the lowest. I don't go through all the States because there is not room. But what is your State? New York? \$8,737 per person. Compare that to our almost \$12,000 per D.C. resident, and New York is a large State. California ranks 10th, \$8,162 per capita compared to our \$12,000 per capita, my friends, per citizen.

In our country when England decided to impose taxation without representation, the colonies decided they would be colonies no more. They passed a resolution saying, "No taxes ever have been or can be constitutionally imposed on them" by their respective legislatures.

Look at this graph; it speaks for itself, it speaks for the residents of the District of Columbia.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING A RURAL ELECTRIC VOLUNTEER

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and to thank a power lineman from Dixon, Missouri, for facilitating the advent of safe, reliable, and affordable electricity for a community in Haiti.

His service and sacrifice will improve the lives of many people because electricity is a critical element to improving the quality of life, health care, education, clean water, and other vital services.

I would like to recognize Karl Brandt, who works for Gascoage Electric Cooperative. Volunteering his time and expertise for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation, he spent 2 weeks in the town of Caracol, providing safety training and mentoring for local Haitian linemen.

Mr. Brandt also assisted with installing power for residences located next to an industrial park in Caracol. When fully functional, this industrial park will have the capacity to employ 30,000 people. Only about 13 percent of the

people in Haiti have reliable access to electricity.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International has been working on a USAID-funded program to bring electricity to the town of Caracol and to nearby areas in northern Haiti.

Today, more than 1,200 consumers in the town of Caracol have access to reliable electricity. According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, some homes here now have antennas for TVs; small businesses, like Internet cafes, have been established; and water treatment plants are in operation.

Mr. Brandt, we thank you for your service.

TAKE MARIJUANA OUT OF THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week, Attorney General Holder said that he would be happy to work with Congress to reexamine how marijuana is scheduled under Federal statutes.

That is a thoughtful effort, but I hope the Attorney General realizes that the time for examination and re-examination has passed. It is now time for him and the administration to act.

The jury has returned its verdict on medical marijuana. More than a million patients use it in managing chemotherapy symptoms, chronic pain, PTSD in our soldiers, and epilepsy, particularly in severe epilepsy that afflicts children; 70 percent of Americans think that medical marijuana should be legal, and I honestly believe that, if the other 30 percent had a child who was subject to these severe epileptic seizures or if a loved one had unbearable chronic pain, they would come around as well.

Marijuana is currently listed as a schedule I drug. That is the same classification as heroin or as LSD. It is higher than cocaine or methamphetamines. This makes no sense whatsoever. No one dies from a marijuana overdose, and the alleged less dangerous methamphetamines have been ravaging communities, particularly in rural and smalltown America, and people do die, and people do commit violent acts.

The Attorney General has called on Congress to act, and in fact, we have. Working in a bipartisan way, we have introduced a variety of bills that do everything from creating a regulatory framework to tax marijuana, to bills to protect State marijuana laws from Federal interference, to legalizing the production of industrial hemp; but the dysfunction of Congress has kept these simple, commonsense bills from passing to this point.

What we need is for the Attorney General and those who work for him at

the DEA to at least move marijuana off the schedule I or the schedule II of controlled substances. This is something they can do under their own initiative.

Relisting or delisting marijuana could make it easier for researchers to gain access to the drug. It will allow marijuana businesses, which are perfectly legal in over 20 States, to deduct their business expenses like all other legal businesses.

It could give States more flexibility in dealing with it as a public health issue, and it would reflect what every teenager in America knows—but apparently what the DEA does not know—marijuana is not more dangerous than cocaine and methamphetamines, and to pretend otherwise means that young people and the general public will take the DEA less seriously.

I am inviting the Attorney General to visit us here on Capitol Hill, or we will go to his office to go over these points in person with a bipartisan group that has been working on these issues, whose advice and counsel should be helpful to him.

However, the easiest path forward for the Attorney General remains the same: take marijuana off the schedule I. A cab ride to Capitol Hill is not going to change that. We hope we can see some action and see it soon.

WALT RICHARDSON

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, United States Air Force, Retired, who passed away on March 29, 2014.

Walt—who built his life on three pillars of faith, hope, and love—was dedicated to his country, his community, his family, and above all, to the Lord. I am privileged to honor a truly remarkable man and an American hero.

Born and raised in Pensacola, Florida, Walt joined the Armed Forces to serve his country and help provide for his family. His career in the Armed Forces spanned 30 years and included service in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

Walt was an original member of the revered Tuskegee Airmen, training at Tuskegee Army Airfield in a variety of disciplines that would serve him well throughout his entire career. A few years ago, I had the honor of presenting Walt the Congressional Gold Medal for his service as a Tuskegee Airman.

During his time in the military, Walt was one of over 1,000 enlisted men selected to integrate the Armed Forces. Walt's unwavering commitment to service and immense leadership skills were recognized when, while stationed at Dover Air Force Base, he became the first African American to be promoted to the rank of master sergeant in the field maintenance squadron.

He retired at the highest enlisted rank in the Air Force, chief master ser-

geant, as the senior enlisted adviser to the commanding general of the 1st Special Operations Wing at Hurlburt Field in Florida.

Beyond his military service, Walt was an accomplished writer, whose personal memoir is titled, "How Great Thou Art: A Black Boy's Depression-Era Success Story," in addition to his being a dedicated member of the north-west Florida community as he served as a deacon of St. Mary Parish in Fort Walton Beach for over three decades.

Walt was known throughout the gulf coast as a kind and warmhearted man who was always helping his fellow citizens. To his family, he was a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

The legacy left by Walt Richardson and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen had a profound impact on the course of our history.

Our Nation is proud and grateful for the brave men and women like Walt Richardson, who stared into the face of racial discrimination and said: We are one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Walt led an exemplary life of courage, service, patriotism, and devotion to faith and family, and his service to God, family, and country will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am humbled to honor Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, United States Air Force, Retired.

My wife, Vicki, and I send our sincerest condolences to his wife of 60 years, Helen; to his eight children, Walter, Pat, Lillie, Carmen, Henri, Donna, William, and Carl; to their nine grandchildren; to their four great-grandchildren; and to the entire Richardson Family.

THE RYAN BUDGET: AN ATTACK ON AMERICA

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House begins deliberations on the majority's budget for fiscal year 2015, better known as the Ryan budget. Sadly, it is reminiscent of the same misguided policy proposals rejected by the American people time after time.

A budget is a moral document, a roadmap to fiscal stability, and the security of the social safety net. The majority's budget does neither. It is not a serious document, and it is not responsible.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, nearly 70 percent of the cuts included in the majority's budget come from programs serving low- and middle-income American families, programs like Pell grants, SNAP, and Medicaid; yet no cuts were made from defense funding. Instead, it received a near \$500 million increase. Most would agree that a nation's budget reflects its priorities.

The majority's budget is a clear sign that economic prosperity for all is simply not that important, that equality is not that important. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on shrinking the government at any cost—at all costs—even if it means doing so on the backs of the most vulnerable among us.

The CBC substitute budget takes a different approach by offering a plan that reduces the deficit and alleviates the harm inflicted by sequestration in a responsible and fiscally sound way.

The CBC substitute is focused on making our government work smarter and our programs operate more efficiently. It provides a plan to turn our country's economy around and to open the door of opportunity for future generations.

The CBC substitute includes initiatives that would provide immediate assistance to all Americans, like extending emergency unemployment insurance and raising the Federal minimum wage while also mapping out a long-term agenda for future economic growth.

It reinforces support for critical safety net programs, provides resources to address persistent poverty, rebuilds our transportation infrastructure, and promotes domestic manufacturing.

The CBC substitute proposes reforms to make our Tax Code more fair. Our budget eliminates a number of special tax breaks that benefit the wealthiest Americans, and it closes the international tax loopholes that move American jobs overseas. The CBC proposed tax reforms would save \$2 trillion over a 10-year period and would create jobs.

By passing the CBC substitute, Congress can stimulate the economy while expanding the middle class. To my colleagues in the House, we have a blueprint. Let's build a better America together and move closer to giving everyone a budget and a country of which we can be proud.

IN HONOR OF MILLARD AND J.J. OAKLEY

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor two beloved Tennesseans who have dedicated their lives and service to our State, Millard and Joyce Annette Oakley.

A lifelong resident of Overton County and a graduate from Tennessee Tech University, Millard Oakley is a true jack-of-all-trades. He proudly represented the Upper Cumberland for four terms in the Tennessee General Assembly, and he continued his service as a member of the Tennessee Board of Regents and as the State insurance commissioner.

Today, he ensures that small businesses in our district have the capital needed to expand their reach and hire

more workers as the director of the First National Bank of Tennessee; and he helps spread the gospel message as the director for the Thomas Nelson Publishers, the world's largest Bible publishing company.

His loving wife, Joyce, or J.J., as she is known, is a West Virginia native, but she got to Tennessee just as soon as she could and met her husband-to-be while attending the University of Tennessee law school.

While the Oakleys' accomplishments are many, they are best known for their generosity to the students and families of my district. In 2004, the Oakleys sponsored a Vince Gill concert that helped Tennessee Tech University raise more than \$140,000 for the new nursing school.

They also offered Tennessee Tech the use of their family farm and donated \$2 million to fund the school's Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Center, the largest single gift in the university's history.

Additionally, the Oakleys were instrumental in recruiting a satellite campus of Volunteer State Community College to Livingston and gave generously to causes such as the Overton County Public Library.

□ 1030

Today, the Oakleys can still be seen around my district visiting the library that bears their name or walking on the campus of Tennessee Tech and meeting students who have personally benefited from their contributions.

People like Millard and J.J. Oakley truly earn Tennessee its nickname of the "Volunteer State."

I am deeply grateful for their friendship and their example of selfless generosity. May we all aspire to live such a life.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT AWARENESS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a fair amount of time on the House floor talking about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape in the military; in fact, I have spoken 30 times about that issue. But it is apparent that we also need to spend some time talking about sexual harassment in this Chamber.

This is the Congress of the United States of America. This is the House of Representatives of the United States of America. This is not a frat house.

Regrettably, this week, another one of our colleagues was discovered engaged in inappropriate action with a member of his staff. This is not the first time. It will probably not be the last time. It happens on the Republican side. It happens on the Democratic side. That doesn't make it okay.

Almost 25 years ago, Anita Hill testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. There were six male Senators

that questioned her. They suggested that she somehow had wanted it or was lying. I was so mad. I remember watching that testimony and throwing my slipper at the television. That was in 1991.

The following year, 1992, was called the Year of the Woman in Congress. Women were mad. That year, more women were elected to Congress than ever before. In fact, in California, we elected two U.S. Senators: Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and BARBARA BOXER.

It is time for us to recognize that we have a problem. It is not okay to fondle a staff member. It is not okay to make suggestive comments to a staff member. It is not okay to have provocative pictures on your computer. It is just not okay to conduct ourselves in that manner.

Today, I am introducing a bill that I have been working on for some time that will require that every Member of this House and every staff member participate in a training on sexual harassment at least once every 2 years.

We are only asking ourselves to do what is being done by over 60 percent of the corporations in this country. In fact, in California, I carried legislation that required the posting of signage in every corporation about what sexual harassment was, the rights and responsibilities around it, and what steps you could take if it happened. We then took steps to make sure every member of the State legislature was subject to sexual harassment training at least once every 2 years.

Here in Congress, there is an Office of Compliance. Ironically, the Office of Compliance is where you might report sexual harassment, but then the Office of Compliance is responsible for protecting the office. Go figure.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to clean up our act. It is time.

DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF RYAN REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I feel compelled to talk to you today about the disastrous effects the Ryan budget would have on our country's research and development enterprise and, consequently, the disastrous effect this budget would have on America's future competitiveness.

As others have pointed out, the Republican budget cuts nondefense discretionary spending by \$1.3 trillion below the baseline 2014 spending level, adjusted for inflation. These are massive cuts on top of a budget that has already had large reductions in recent years.

The effects on research and development would be dramatic. The American Association for the Advancement of

Science estimates that the Ryan budget would cut civilian research and development by \$92 billion from the current baseline and \$112 billion below the President's budget request.

These are striking reductions. Please keep in mind that the National Science Foundation's total annual budget is just over \$7 billion. The Republican budget cuts more research and development funding every year than the entire annual budget of the National Science Foundation.

This is insanity. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have truly divorced themselves from reality if they think these cuts to research and development won't cripple our country for decades to come.

Let's talk about what the Republicans want to cut.

It is estimated that technological innovation has led to the majority of America's economic growth since World War II. Much of this innovation has been funded by the Federal Government.

Think back to the first grants that NASA gave Robert Noyce's upstart company in the 1960s. Of course, he went on to be the founder of Intel, the largest computer chip maker in the world. Or think of the NSF research grant that led to the creation of Google. The very Internet itself was initially funded as a research project by the Department of Defense and rolled out by the National Science Foundation.

You can look at virtually every aspect of our high-tech industry and the economy and find a connection to Federal research and development funding. To make dramatic and drastic cuts to R&D funding in the name of deficit reduction is truly shortsighted.

My friend and former CEO of Lockheed Martin, Norm Augustine, frequently gives the following analogy. When an airplane is overloaded and too heavy to fly, you don't cut weight by chopping off the engines. I think that is a great analogy, because that is exactly what this budget does. It cuts off the engine of American innovation.

It would be bad enough if these deep cuts only affected research and development, but the Ryan budget will also painfully cut education funding. Indexed for inflation, that budget would cut hundreds of billions of dollars from precollege and college education programs.

Let's put these education cuts in context.

In the last international student assessment, U.S. students ranked 26th in mathematics and 21st in science. We are falling behind our economic competitors in STEM education. The Republican solution to this problem is to throw in the towel. These educational cuts sell our children out, plain and simple.

Taken together, the cuts to research and education in this Ryan budget paint a dark picture of America's future. It is a picture where America no

longer leads the world in innovation. It is a picture where our children are not prepared for the rigors of a competitive 21st century global marketplace. It is a picture of America in decline.

I reject this future. I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the Ryan Republican budget that sells America short and, instead, show support for robust education and research funding and a strong American future.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Ryan Republican budget and in support of the alternative budget plan that has been submitted by the Congressional Black Caucus.

The CBC budget is an effort to take a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the GOP budget balances itself on the backs of children, college students, working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

The CBC budget would move America forward; the GOP budget would take us backward.

The CBC budget is designed to create progress for the greatest number of Americans possible; the GOP budget is designed to promote prosperity for the few.

As we engage in this budget debate, we should be here on the floor of the House of Representatives trying to find ways to promote the American Dream for the middle class and for those who aspire to be part of it. Instead, the Ryan Republican budget is a nightmare for far too many Americans.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may suggest that when we use language such as that, it is hyperbole. Let's examine what the Ryan Republican budget actually does, because I believe, when you put it to an evidence-based analysis, one can come to no other conclusion than it will result in a nightmare for far too many Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would cut more than \$125 billion in food and nutritional assistance for food-insecure Americans. In this great country of ours, the richest in the world, there are more than 50 million Americans every day who wake up hungry and food insecure. Approximately 16 million of those hungry Americans are children. Yet the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$125 billion in assistance to these Americans. That is a nightmare.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut approximately \$260 billion in funding for higher education, essentially robbing the capacity of so many younger Americans to pursue the American Dream of getting a college education.

In this country, there is already more than \$1 trillion in collective stu-

dent loan debt. That is more than \$1 trillion. That reality, Mr. Speaker, means that so many younger Americans have an inability when they graduate from college to purchase a home, to start a family, to create small businesses. We are robbing these Americans of a viable future. And \$260 billion in cuts to higher education funding, it seems to me, is a nightmare for younger Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut \$732 billion from Medicaid. Almost two-thirds of the recipients of Medicaid are actually seniors, the sick, the disabled, and the afflicted. Don't believe this caricature that people like to create as it relates to Medicaid. Seniors, the sick, the afflicted, and the disabled benefit from Medicaid, and the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$732 billion over a 10-year period from this vital social safety net program? That is a nightmare for the American people.

□ 1045

So this is not hyperbole. Unfortunately, this is reality.

I would urge my colleagues to take a real close look at the Congressional Black Caucus alternative, a fair and balanced alternative, a budget that would invest in job training and education, invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in research and development, invest in technology and innovation, invest in the American people and our future.

That is why I am urging a "no" vote on the Ryan Republican budget and a "yes" vote on the CBC alternative.

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN HURT YOU

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is said that what you don't know won't hurt you. What you don't know won't hurt you. I disagree.

What you don't know about health care can hurt you. What you don't know about a treatable condition that can harm you, possibly kill you, what you don't know about it can hurt you.

I don't believe in the idiom, the adage, what you don't know won't hurt you. I believe you should know the truth because the truth can set you free.

So let us take a moment now and look at just one aspect of what is called the Ryan budget. Let's look at health care. The Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. It repeals it without replacing it.

What you don't know can hurt you. But if you know the truth, it can liberate you. We need to get the truth to the masses so that the masses can understand the impact of repealing without replacing.

Let's reflect upon 2009, when we embarked upon the task of developing an Affordable Care Act. In 2009, we were spending \$2.5 trillion per year on

health care. \$2.5 trillion is a very large number, and it is difficult to get your mind around it. However, \$2.5 trillion is \$79,000 a second. \$79,000 a second is what we were spending.

17.6 percent of the GDP, \$100 billion being spent on persons without insurance in various venues, emergency rooms, and other places. It was projected that by 2018 we would spend \$4.4 trillion per year.

Know the truth. It can liberate you.

\$4.4 trillion is \$139,000 per second; estimated that it would be about 20.3 percent of GDP.

In 2009 we had 40 to 50 million people uninsured, depending on who is counting and how you count. In 2009 we had 45,000 people per year dying because they didn't have insurance. This is per Harvard University. One person dying every 12 minutes.

In 2009, in the State of Texas we had 6 million people uninsured, and 20 percent of the children in the State of Texas uninsured.

We had to do something about health care if, for no other reason, to simply bend the cost curve. And the cost curve is bending. It is projected that, in the first 10 years, it would bend the cost curve about \$100 billion, and in the next 10 years, \$1 trillion.

Know the truth, and the truth can liberate you, my dear friends. The truth is this: if the Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act and it is not replaced—and there is no replacement provision in that budget—seniors who are on Medicare are going to see the doughnut hole expand rather than close.

The doughnut hole is that point at which seniors have to pay more for prescription drugs, more than many can afford. What you don't know can hurt you, seniors, when the doughnut hole starts to expand.

The budget would cause those who are 26 years of age, under 26 years of age, who are on policies of their parents, to come off.

Young people are invincible until they have an accident and get hurt and need health care. They are invincible until they find out they have a condition that is curable and they need health care.

Young people, what you don't know can hurt you. But the truth can liberate you so that you can do the right thing as it relates to this budget and let people know that you are opposed to what can happen to you.

This budget will cause preexisting conditions to become an uninsurable circumstance in your life. There are people who are born with preexisting conditions. These people will not be insurable. The Affordable Care Act eliminates preexisting conditions as a reason not to ensure people.

We would go back to people being born with preexisting conditions, many of whom would have to wait until they can afford or get to Medicare before they could get insurance. Medicare is a type of insurance.

This budget would cause women to, again, have to go back to a circumstance wherein they, by virtue of their condition of being a woman, would have a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I will put a "to be continued" in this message. But what you don't know can hurt you. The truth can set you free.

God bless you.

PEARL S. BUCK INTERNATIONAL AND THE CHILDREN IN FAMILIES FIRST ACT

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer Prize-winning novelist, noted humanitarian, and longtime Bucks County, Pennsylvania, resident, Pearl S. Buck, touched many lives during her lifetime.

Her books brought readers inside the worlds of those they might have never known, and her commitment to a global community devoid of prejudice and bias solidified her place in American history.

However, it was her dedication to children of all races for which I recognize her today. Pearl S. Buck pioneered a process for international adoption that brought down the walls of interracial adoption and grew loving families, where, before, there were no options.

Her work continues today, and it continues with the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International in my district. Through the "Welcome House program" and adoption assistance, the organization carries on her critical mission of connecting children worldwide with loving families here in the United States.

I was proud to join the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International last month to highlight our mutual support for the Children in Families First Act. This bipartisan legislation streamlines our Nation's international adoption process and increases America's diplomatic mission abroad to include the well-being of children around the globe.

As a member of the Congressional Adoption Coalition and a cosponsor of the bill, I am excited to advance the Children in Families First Act as a commonsense response to the needs of families and groups like Pearl S. Buck International.

By removing roadblocks, increasing USAID opportunities, and prioritizing adoption within the State Department, we can ensure that every child, no matter where they are born, has a home.

THE POWER OF THE INTERNET

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to

the floor this morning and talk just a little bit about free speech and how we exercise that free speech in this country.

I think it is no secret that the Twitterverse and the Internet has been abuzz with a little bit of concern about what the President is planning to do about the Internet and control and governance of the Internet.

I think we all agree that the Internet has had a revolutionary impact on not only this Nation but on the world. You can take a look at what has happened with jobs, with innovation, with economic freedom, and, indeed, with social change.

You see it pronounced because the Internet allows people to participate from the bottom up, receiving information about what their governments are doing, about opportunities that are out there. They have the opportunity to get online and do a little bit of research.

So, with this open ecosystem and this decentralized nature of information, it is benefiting freedom. It is benefiting free people and free markets. We want to see that continue.

Now, like many of my colleagues, I do support a free market, multistakeholders model of Internet governance. And in a perfect world, ICANN, which is the organization with governance of domain names and of the Internet, and IANA would be fully privatized and free from any government influence or control.

However, realistically, we know that China and Russia have a very different view of what would be perfection. Their end goal is to have ICANN and IANA functions migrate to the U.N.'s ITU, which is the International Telecommunications Union. That solution is one that I do not support and one that I would never stand in favor of. I stand in opposition to it.

If the U.S. Department of Commerce is going to relinquish control of its contractual authority over the IANA contract and move control of DNS into a global, multistakeholder community, the timing and the architecture would just have to be absolutely perfect.

This is an area where you have only got one shot of getting it right, only one shot, and we have to make certain that it is a shot that is focused fully on freedom.

If this administration wants to prove to Congress and the international community that they are serious about this process, then they must immediately move to bring an end to the net neutrality movement that is alive and well at our Federal Communications Commission.

Telling Congress and the international community that they are serious about relinquishing control over the IANA contract while simultaneously having the FCC work to promote net neutrality is disingenuous.

While we know Russia has got a land grab going on, we also see the U.N. and the ITU trying to carry forth this space grab.

A lot of our colleagues come to us, Mr. Speaker, and they say, so what are we going to do about this?

I want to highlight two different pieces of legislation with you; first, H.R. 4342. This is the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act, DOTCOM Act. Congressmen SHIMKUS and ROKITA have joined me in this effort.

What we would do is to make certain that there is a prohibition against the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications Information Administration—we call it NTIA here—from turning over its domain name system oversight responsibilities pending a GAO report to Congress.

Let's put this report in front of the action. Let's have a great discussion about what taking that action of relinquishing oversight would mean to each and every person that is assembled in this great room.

How is it going to affect our constituents?

How is it going to affect American innovation?

Let's have those discussions now. Let's not make a mistake.

I also highlight H.R. 4070, a piece of legislation I have authored, the Internet Freedom Act, to bar the FCC and their actions on net neutrality.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

If long ago all people had taken Your holy Word seriously—"make justice your aim"—how different history might be. Each day would be filled with promise and hope if all of us, upon rising, would make justice our aim.

Lord, if we as a people and as a nation were to make justice our aim, how would this change our priorities? Could we change that much?

In every age, Your impelling Spirit called our ancestors beyond their wishful thinking and beyond themselves to move ever closer to our national calling of "equal justice under the law."

Send that same Spirit upon the Members of this people's House that they, who have been entrusted with ensuring this great calling, might fulfill that

great promise, and it will truly come to pass that justice would roll down like a river and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, again, to support equal pay for equal work.

Republicans and Democrats share the conviction that no one should lose wages on account of one's sex. As is so often the case in this politically polarized city, though, the broad agreement on the goal does not extend to the methods we should use to get there.

Under the guise of equal pay, our Democrat colleagues would have us pass more rules, institute more red tape, and create more grounds for lawyers to drag businessowners into court. Perhaps there is a certain logic to this "regulate everything" approach.

After all, as The New York Times reported today, the President hasn't even been able to equalize pay between men and women in his own White House.

However, this President's ongoing regulatory blitzkrieg has helped to equalize the wages of 6.7 percent of the population—the unemployed.

WATER WEEK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Water Week in order to recognize the critical need for clean water in our Nation.

In my western New York community, we understand the link between the health of the Great Lakes and the economic vitality of our region.

Studies have shown that nutrients, like phosphorus and nitrogen, are the cause of harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes. In order to fight this, I have introduced the Great Lakes Nutrient Removal Assistance Act, which would provide \$500 million in funding to upgrade wastewater treatment plants in the Great Lakes Basin with nutrient removal technology.

Madam Speaker, the Great Lakes contain 95 percent of America's freshwater, and they supply drinking water to more than 30 million people in North America. Additionally, the Great Lakes support 1.5 million jobs and \$62 billion in wages annually.

The protection of the Great Lakes is essential, and I commend local advocates, like the Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper and others, who are in Washington, D.C., this week for Water Week, as well as those who work tirelessly to protect our water resources for the well-being of our Nation.

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD MUST BE LIMITED

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, the House Education and the Workforce Committee will mark up two bills to protect all American workers by limiting the National Labor Relations Board's expansion into the workforce.

The Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act restricts the Big Business, Big Government NLRB and reaffirms the protections that workers and job creators have received by promoting a fully informed union election process.

The Employee Privacy Protection Act gives workers greater control over the disclosure of personal information and helps modernize an outdated election process by replacing current rules that leave workers at risk of intimidation and coercion.

For years, the President's Big Labor bully has threatened to destroy jobs, such as at Boeing in north Charleston, and to invade American workers' privacy and encroach upon their rights.

I am grateful to the Education and the Workforce chairman, JOHN KLINE, and to the subcommittee chairman, Dr. PHIL ROE, for their dedication in promoting the rights of every American worker and in protecting American job creators.

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

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Equal Pay Day.

Fifty-one years ago, the Equal Pay Act was signed into law. Still, women

in my home State of Hawaii, where women have traditionally been part of the workforce—like my two grandmothers who worked in the sugarcane fields—still earn 82 cents to the dollar earned by a man.

Equal pay is not just a woman's issue. It is a family and a community issue. Women are one-half of the paid workforce. Two-thirds of the women are either primary or cobreadwinners for their families, but women are two-thirds of the workforce who are earning minimum wage.

Closing the wage gap cuts poverty in half, and women and their families then benefit. Nearly half a trillion dollars is then added to our economy.

Remember, the President said, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Please bring H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to the floor.

VENEZUELA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak for those who are being violently muzzled by the autocratic Maduro regime in Venezuela.

This regime has used every arm of the state to attack its political opponents, resulting in at least 39 dead and many more imprisoned.

One of these leaders is Leopoldo Lopez, whom we can see in this poster, who has been unjustly detained in a military prison for almost 7 weeks and who now faces a 14-year prison sentence just for protesting peacefully to promote democratic principles.

The arrest of Leopoldo Lopez has nothing to do with justice and everything to do with silencing the political opposition and the Venezuelans' call for democracy; yet the Obama administration still has not taken any action against Maduro, and it has failed to hold human rights violators accountable.

This communicates a dangerous indifference that is painful not only to the Venezuelan people, but to all who care about freedom and human rights, and it further erodes the little credibility we have on the international stage.

Let's listen to the people of Venezuela.

A GOOD DAY FOR OUR NATION'S SENIORS

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of Medicare for the simple reason that our Nation's seniors deserve to keep their hard-earned health care.

That is why we have been working on a bipartisan basis to fight any potential cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

I am pleased to announce that, yesterday, the administration reversed potential cuts to these health care plans.

I would like to say a few words in Spanish:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows.)

Mr. Speaker, I always have and always will support Medicare for the simple reason that our nation's seniors deserve to keep their hard-earned health care.

That is why I have been working on a bipartisan basis to fight any potential cuts to Medicare.

I am pleased to say that the Administration stepped up yesterday and reversed potential cuts to Medicare Advantage health plans.

I'd like to say a few words in Spanish for my Spanish language constituents.

Siempre he apoyado y voy a seguir apoyando a Medicare porque creo que las personas mayores de nuestro país merecen mantener su seguro de salud que han ganado.

Por esa razón es que he colaborado con mis colegas de ambos lados para combatir los cortes potenciales de Medicare.

Me complace anunciar que la Administración escuchó nuestras preocupaciones y ayer eliminaron los posibles recortes a los planes de salud de Medicare Advantage.

Es un buen día para los mayores de nuestra nación.

It is a good day for our Nation's seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULTON-MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fulton-Montgomery Community College on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Since its founding, the number of students attending the college has grown from 350 to today's population of 2,850—remarkable growth. These students are now becoming specialists in one of 40 academic programs, including business, electrical technology, media communication, nursing, radiologic technology, and one in which I have had direct involvement, clean room science.

Under the current leadership of President Dusty Swanger—and I must add, he is a very effective leader and a much-respected leader—FMCC is the region's partner for quality, accessible higher education, economic development, and cultural and intellectual enrichment.

Although the institution officially turned 50 in September, this is truly a year of celebration as the school continues to grow and boost our communities in the greater capital region of New York.

Again, I congratulate the FMCC administration, faculty, support staff,

and students for their hard work each and every day, which makes us very proud.

NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS MUSEUM

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis was reopened. It is a spectacular display with all of the up-to-date technologies of civil rights in America, from the Middle Passage to April 4, 1968, which was the assassination of Martin Luther King at the Lorraine Motel, the site of the museum.

As I toured the fabulous museum, I thought about how far America had come and how much farther it needs to go. There are stories about the Voting Rights Act; yet I thought about the Supreme Court's striking down provisions and about the impossibility of getting sponsors here sufficient to pass a renewed Voting Rights Act, which is so necessary to America's fulfilling its purpose.

I thought about the Affordable Care Act and efforts to repeal it, to simply give health care to individuals, many of whom are poor and haven't had health care before. I thought about jobs bills because, without economic justice, you don't have social justice in full effect.

You need infrastructure bills. You need minimum wage, and you need unemployment insurance. We have a long way to go to fulfill Dr. King's dream.

I am pleased the museum reopened. It is spectacular. I urge all people to come to Memphis and visit it, and I urge all people to think about Dr. King and to try to fulfill his dream by passing those measures that are necessary.

BUDGET WEEK

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor today, actually, with three of my constituents from Lawrenceville—Keeran and Hailey and Ashley—because this is budget week. This is when we decide what our priorities are, and there is not going to be a man or a woman in this Chamber who does not believe that what we do, we do for this next generation of Americans.

The question will be: What do we do?

The rule that we are going to take up here this afternoon is going to make every single substitute amendment offered in this Chamber available for a vote on this floor, so that America can see what our priorities are and can choose among them.

Madam Speaker, this is the very best of our Republic that will be on display this week, budget week, and I am just pleased and honored to be a part of it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 8, 2014 at 8:50 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2195.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3979.

Appointments:

Joint Committee on Taxation.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 8, 2014 at 10:35 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 92.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO
CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Byrne.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

Mr. WOODALL (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H. CON. RES. 96, CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AND
PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS
DURING THE PERIOD FROM
APRIL 11, 2014, THROUGH APRIL
25, 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from April 11, 2014, through April 25, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 17, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, it is budget week. I have been trying to contain my smile all week long. I have the great pleasure of sitting on both the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee here in this House. The rule that we have before us today, House Resolution 544, does candidly what I think my friend from Massachusetts and I came here to do, and that is to have an open debate on the floor of the House about absolutely everyone's ideas.

I want to tell you what that means, Madam Speaker, because we sit on the Rules Committee, my friend from Massachusetts and I, and part of that responsibility is deciding whose voice gets heard and whose doesn't. It is a very solemn responsibility, one that neither of us takes lightly. I believe we would both say that whenever possible we should err on the side of having more voices instead of less. What we have today, Madam Speaker, is a rule that provides for absolutely every budget alternative written, drafted, and presented in this House, every one.

I want you to think about that, Madam Speaker, because this ought to be a place where we debate ideas. This ought to be a place where we talk about what tomorrow looks like, how can we make tomorrow better than today. And on this day, we will be voting on a rule that will make every single alternative idea available for robust debate on the floor of this House.

Now, the underlying bill is the bill that came out of the Budget Committee. Again, Madam Speaker, in full disclosure, I am a member of that Budget Committee. I am proud of the work that that committee put out.

Some folks call it the Paul Ryan budget. I take umbrage at that. I sit on that committee. I work shoulder to shoulder with PAUL. I am going to call it the Budget Committee budget. I hope at the end of this budget week it will be the House-passed budget, because I think it reflects the priorities of this institution, and I think it reflects the priorities of the American people.

If it does not reflect the priorities of any Member in this Chamber, they will have alternatives to vote on. One of those alternatives is written and drafted by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), that substitute amendment made in order today.

The Congressional Black Caucus, Madam Speaker, comes together to put together a list of priorities, a full substitute budget, has done that for a number of years, has done that again this year. This rule makes that Congressional Black Caucus substitute in order for a vote.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus, Madam Speaker, they have presented a budget. Now, their budget is one that raises taxes by \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. It is not going to be one that I support here on the floor of the House, but it is absolutely a legitimate list of priorities, as I talked about earlier, priorities that affect the young people of this Nation. We are going to get a vote on that budget here on the floor of this House.

The Republican Study Committee, Madam Speaker, of which I am also a member, a proud drafter of that budget document, that vote, espousing the absolute fastest path to balance that we will be hearing in this institution during budget week, Madam Speaker, will get a vote on the floor of this House.

Finally, a budget presented by Representative MULVANEY of South Carolina but intended to replicate the budget written by the President of the United States of America. It is a funny thing in constitutional government. Of course we have article I, legislative branch; article II, executive branch. Certainly, we have different responsibilities, but I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber who would say the President hasn't invested an incredible amount of time and energy presenting his budget. It wasn't here on time, but it did arrive here. It is a complete budget, and it deserves a hearing. No one on the Democrat side of the aisle picked up that budget to present it until Representative MULVANEY did. Again, I think that is part of the robust debate that we must have.

All together, we are going to have 4 hours of debate on these budget alter-

natives. That is in addition to all the regular order that has already gone on in committee, in addition to the hours that we have invested in the Rules Committee already, 4 hours here on the floor of this House.

Why is that important, Madam Speaker? Because I think what I will hear on both sides of the aisle is that these budgets represent a statement of values. Who are you going to take the money from? Who are you going to spend the money on? How are you going to invest in the future? How are you going to prevent the future from being eroded by payments on debt after debt, after debt, after debt? These are the discussions that we are going to have.

Just 10 years ago, Madam Speaker, the public debt in this country was \$7.3 trillion. Today, it is \$17.5 trillion—all of the debt that we have racked up in the history of this country through 2004 more than doubled in just the last 10 years.

Madam Speaker, there may be folks in this Chamber who say that is a debt worth making, that the investments that we are creating by borrowing this money from our children and spending it on the generations today, that that is worth doing. I say no. I say our obligation to our children tomorrow, to our grandchildren tomorrow is not to advance ourselves at their expense. I think our obligation is to pay down that debt, but that is a legitimate discussion that we are going to have over the next several days.

The \$10 trillion on the Nation's credit card in just the past 10 years, Madam Speaker, let there be no doubt that that is the gravity of the conversation that we are having today.

I remember back in 2012, Madam Speaker, President Obama said in an interview with ABC News: "We don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it's going to be in a sustainable place." In 2012, the President predicting that for the next 10 years the crisis won't come, that the crisis will be out beyond year 10. Madam Speaker, he may be right, but that was 2 years ago, and there are only two bills, two budgets that we have before us this budget week that even balance in that 10-year window.

This is a debate worthy of this Chamber; this is a debate worthy of America. And I hope that by the end of budget week, Madam Speaker, by the time we take our vote on final passage, irrespective of which substitute has passed or whether the House-passed or committee-passed budget remains, that we have a document that represents not just this institution's values but that represents our constituents' values, that represents American values, that is true to the obligation that we all have to protect the opportunities of the generations of tomorrow.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from

Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, budgets are moral documents. These annual documents are really statements of who we are as political parties and as groups and as people. They represent our values. They tell a story about what we believe in and how we would govern.

I had thought that I had come here today to say that this budget before us, the Ryan budget, is simply bad or that it is misguided. Madam Speaker, it is much worse than that.

□ 1230

This is an awful budget. It takes our country in the fundamentally wrong direction.

It seems as though every year we shake our heads wondering how the latest Ryan budget could possibly get worse than the previous year's efforts. And yet, time after time, the Ryan budget manages to pull it off.

This budget is cruel, but sadly, it is not unusual.

The gentleman from Georgia says he can't contain his smiles when he talks about this budget. I don't think there is anything to smile about.

Year after year, the Ryan budget does more and more damage to the social fabric of our Nation. Year after year, it puts the wishes of the rich ahead of the needs of the poor. And year after year, it sacrifices the reality of desperately needed investments at the altar of theoretical deficit reduction.

Let's look at the details. The Ryan budget includes deep cuts. How deep? \$791 billion below the sequester number. \$791 billion below sequester. That is amazing, Madam Speaker.

Now, I voted against sequester because of the damage it would and it did inflict on our economy. This budget would actually cut nearly \$1 trillion on top of the sequester. I thought we wanted to end sequester, not make choices that are even worse.

But that is not the end of the story. According to one estimate, 69 percent of the Ryan budget cuts come from low-income programs. It would shred the safety net. The programs that keep millions of Americans out of poverty and help provide millions of Americans with health care, that will provide millions of children with school meals and early childhood education, received the lion's share of the cuts. That is what the Ryan budget does.

In fact, according to the same estimate, \$3.3 trillion of the Ryan budget's \$4.8 trillion in non-defense cuts come from low-income safety net programs like Medicaid, SNAP, school breakfast and lunch programs, Head Start, the Supplemental Security Income program, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and Child Tax Credits.

Sixty-nine percent of the total non-defense cuts come from these life-changing, indeed, lifesaving programs.

The Ryan budget is successful at one thing: it deepens the divide between the rich and poor in this country. It successfully makes life harder for those who are already struggling to make ends meet.

If you are hungry in America, you would see food benefits cut by \$137 billion.

If you are a middle class college student in America, hopefully you can win the lottery, or have a rich uncle, because Pell grants would be cut by \$125 billion by freezing the maximum grant and cutting eligibility.

If you are a low-income working mother in America who gets health care through Medicaid, you would join at least 40 million Americans who will become uninsured by 2024 after the Ryan budget cuts at least \$2.7 trillion from Medicaid.

And if you are a middle class family with kids in America just trying to get by in this sluggish economy, you would see your taxes go up by \$2,000.

But if you are fortunate enough to be very rich in America, you lucked out. It is time to pop the champagne because you make out like a bandit. The oil companies keep their tax breaks. Businesses can keep putting money in overseas accounts just to avoid paying taxes here in America.

And if you are a millionaire?

Get ready for a big fat check from Uncle Sam. That is because anyone making \$1 million a year will see a tax cut of at least \$200,000.

On top of these disastrous policies, the Ryan budget, once again, goes after seniors. This version, once again, ends the Medicare guarantee and reopens the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole.

As a result of these cuts, seniors will see their traditional Medicare premiums soar by an average of 50 percent. As AARP says:

Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage for older Americans by implementing a premium support system and asking seniors and future retirees to pay more is not the right direction.

Now these policies have real world ramifications. Last week, Madam Speaker, an incredibly strong and courageous group of women called the Witnesses to Hunger returned to Capitol Hill to talk about their struggles as low-income, working women trying to make ends meet.

It takes guts to come here to Capitol Hill to tell your story and challenge Members of Congress to do better, and that is exactly what these impressive women did. They told their stories. They talked about their struggles, and they challenged us to do more to help so they don't fall back into poverty.

These women, and the millions of Americans like them who work hard every day, don't earn enough to make ends meet. They are having to choose between rent and food and electricity.

These women and their children aren't line items in our budget. They aren't statistics in our reports. They are people, people who just want to have a roof over their heads, food on their tables, and an education system that will help their children learn and succeed.

They want to go to college and not have to worry about losing their scholarships just because they are a single mother and need to work a night job to feed their child.

These women, and millions of Americans, would be hurt, they would be devastated by the Ryan budget. I am glad there are people who are able to make a lot of money in this country. I have nothing against rich people, but we shouldn't penalize those who are struggling.

Madam Speaker, we should be providing ladders of opportunity to help people get out of poverty and move into the middle class. When people need a helping hand, we should provide that assistance, whether it is a job training program, early childhood education, health care, or something as simple and as basic as food.

These aren't handouts; they are hand-ups. They are investments in our future, and we should be providing opportunities to strengthen our communities and the middle class through job creation, higher education, and advancing research and innovation.

This is a great country. We have done great things, but we have begun to think small. That is what the Republican majority has succeeded in doing. They have got us to start thinking small rather than big. We don't tackle big problems anymore. We use deficit reduction as an excuse to do nothing.

What we need to do is tackle big issues like ending hunger. We should tackle the issue of ending poverty. We should want to strive for a country that benefits not just the few who are rich but the many who are poor.

The Ryan budget would set us back. It would do real damage to millions and millions of real Americans, our neighbors, our friends, our fellow parishioners.

As Pope Francis has written in his Papal Exhortation:

I ask God to give us more politicians capable of sincere and effective dialogue aimed at healing the deepest roots, and not simply the appearances of the evils in our world. Politics, though often denigrated, remains a lofty vocation and one of the highest forms of charity, inasmuch as it seeks the common good.

Inasmuch as it seeks the common good. This budget, this Ryan budget, this Republican budget, or whatever you want to call it, does not seek the common good. This budget fails that basic test that Pope Francis outlined. It does not seek the common good. It deserves to be defeated.

We can do so much better in this Congress and for our country. I am ashamed that this is what we are debating here today, that this is the Republican vision for our future.

This the wrong way to go. Democrats and Republicans should say "no" to this.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to say to my friend from Massachusetts, I believe we share many of the same priorities. But because of past Congresses, because of past administrations, because of past decisions that have been made in this Chamber, we are on track to spend \$6 trillion on interest over the next 10 years.

Madam Speaker, that is opportunity to fulfill every single one of those goals my friend from Massachusetts laid out that is frittered away by the borrow-and-spend behaviors of the past.

There is no disagreement in this Chamber about the commitment to a hand-up. The disagreement is about how much further out of reach we put opportunity and success by trading away future opportunities for spending today.

I have great respect and admiration for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have said yes, let's do raise taxes by \$5 trillion. Yes, let's do reset our priorities. Let's actually describe a pathway to a balanced budget. It is not an easy pathway to get to, but it matters.

It doesn't matter because it's a number, Madam Speaker. It matters because every year we don't balance the budget we steal opportunities from our children, and that is undeniable.

The debate is, Do the investments today outweigh those stolen opportunities from tomorrow? Or do the savings today that ensure that opportunity for tomorrow represent the best course of success that we can provide, again, for our children and grandchildren, about whom there is no disagreement about our strong and steadfast commitment?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think one of the differences between what the Republicans have proposed and what Democrats are proposing is that what they propose is just one thing—cuts. Cuts and cuts and cuts in programs for the most needy in this country, and more tax cuts for the most wealthy.

What the Democrats have proposed is a more balanced approach. Yeah, there needs to be some sacrifice, but we also understand the importance of investment.

If you want to find a way to balance the budget, why don't we find a cure for Alzheimer's disease? Not only would that help improve the quality of life for millions of people, but it would also eliminate all the fiscal problems that Medicaid has.

Let's find a cure for diabetes. Let's find a cure for cancer.

Why aren't our energies devoted toward investing in medical research?

And yet the Ryan budget that we are now debating would devastate medical research in this country. It would devastate it.

We have researchers coming in to visit us who are telling us that China is offering them a better package to do their medical research, Singapore. I want these cures to be found here in the United States. I want to invest in that research that will not only save people's lives, but create jobs and also save money.

Yet, my friends on the other side, they devastate investments in medical research. They devastate investments in scientific research. They devastate investments in transportation.

Their way is one way: cut programs that help the most needy, and give tax breaks to the Donald Trumps of the world. Donald Trump doesn't need any more help. Middle class families, those struggling to get into the middle class, do need help.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4415, the House companion to the unemployment insurance extension bill passed by a bipartisan majority in the Senate just yesterday. Representative KILDEE introduced this bill just hours after Senate passage.

Today, on Equal Pay Day, my amendment will also bring up H.R. 377, ROSA DELAURO's Paycheck Fairness Act. It is shameful that women in America still make an average of only 77 cents for every dollar earned by their male colleagues. The Paycheck Fairness Act will require equal pay for equal work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join him in urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately bring up H.R. 4415, which is identical to a bill that passed on a bipartisan basis by the Senate just last night.

It would extend emergency unemployment benefits to the 2 million Americans who have lost those benefits since Congress failed to act late last year.

I also will note that I read today a report that seven of my Republican House colleagues have written the Speaker urging him to bring this legislation up immediately as well. So we have bipartisan support for this effort to restore necessary benefits to individuals who have lost their job.

It takes an average of 37 weeks for someone who loses their job in this country to find their next opportunity. Yet, in my State, after 20 weeks, you are cut off of unemployment.

So while today is a beautiful spring day outside, and all across the country people are breathing in the optimism that comes with spring, for 2 million Americans, they look at this a dif-

ferent way. They go outside today and wonder if today is the day that the foreclosure notice will come, if today is the day that the eviction will be tacked on to their front door, if they will go outside and today will be the day that the car has been repossessed or that there won't be enough food to feed their family.

These are real-life Americans who are facing this struggle. We have it in our power to do something about it.

H.R. 4415, like the Senate action, is fully paid for. Despite the fact that, in the past, on a bipartisan basis, we have approved an unemployment insurance extension without it being paid for, this is paid for. It will not increase the deficit but will decrease the suffering of millions of American people who go every day trying to find their next job.

I have heard some on the other side say, well, we shouldn't do this because it is not an emergency. Well, if you are about to lose your house, or about to lose your apartment, or about to lose your car, or don't have enough food to feed your children, let me tell you, for them, maybe not for all of you, but for them it is an emergency, and this Congress can act, and it should act immediately.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it a constitutional right of the House to change the rules for consideration of a budget resolution as they are otherwise established in the Congressional Budget Act and were adopted in this Congress pursuant to H. Res. 5?

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has the authority to adopt rules regarding its proceedings.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, does House Concurrent Resolution 96, which provides 4 hours of debate, supersede section 305(a) of the Budget Act, which provides for 10 hours of general debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not interpret a special order of business prior to or pending its consideration under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Rule XIII, clause 6(c) states that it is not in order for the Committee on Rules to report a rule that would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 2(b) of rule XIX.

Was it, therefore, in order under House rule XIII for the Committee on Rules to report H. Con. Res. 96?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot interpret the pending resolution under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is a report from the Committee on Rules privileged under House rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending resolution was called up as privileged.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it in order to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment may be offered at this point only if the majority manager yields for it.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, will House Concurrent Resolution 96 be considered under the hour rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the provisions of House Resolution 544.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to permit Representative CÁRDENAS to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield for that request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Is it correct that on April 2, 2014, I offered an amendment to the concurrent resolution on the budget during the markup in the Budget Committee and all Republicans on the committee voted against it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on proceedings in committee.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does clause 3(b) of rule XIII, which requires committee reports to include—for record votes—the total number of votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, apply to the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the standing rules.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is the requirement of House rule XIII, clause (b), that a committee report include the total number of votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, enforceable through a point of order raised against the reported bill or resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may consult the standing rules.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Would a point of order lie against H. Res. 544 if the accompanying report, House Report 113-405 of the Rules Committee, did not include a record of the votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, knowing that transparency is so fundamental to the rules of the House and the democratic process?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 544 is currently pending.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does either manager seek time for debate?

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

I believe that parliamentary inquiries are privileged. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair.

Does either manager seek time for debate?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I seek time for debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

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

Madam Speaker, there are often reasons to come to this floor and instruct the Rules Committee about how the Rules Committee could do better. We do the very best we can, but we accept constructive criticism from all comers.

The rule that is before us today is an example of what has gone right, not what has gone wrong. The rule that is before us today makes in order every single budget that was offered to the Rules Committee.

Now, I don't dispute that there are lots of different agendas that are being pursued here on the floor at this time; but for the budget agenda, for the openness agenda, for the full debate agenda, we have a rule before us that has made in order every single substitute offered in the Rules Committee, which happens to be five substitutes in addition to the base bill, but had there been more, we would have made more in order.

Again, there are lots of things that we can come to the floor of the House and disagree on, but this rule, to bring those disagreeing budgets to the floor, should be a point of great pride for both sides of the aisle.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, would a point of order lie against House Resolution 544 if it did not include a record of the courageous votes cast by Representative ROS-LEHTINEN in favor of allowing an amendment on comprehensive immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is pending; therefore, the gentleman is asking for an advisory opinion. The Chair will not give an advisory opinion.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that Representative CÁRDENAS' amendment, which made the necessary changes in the budget to accommodate passage of H.R. 15, the bipartisan Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, which lowers our deficits and secures our borders and establishes clear and just rules for citizenship, was not made in order under H. Res. 554?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the Committee on Rules regarding its proceedings.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that my amendment, known as the Cárdenas amendment, which also called for the House leadership to allow a vote on H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill, since the House majority had refused to bring it to the floor for a vote, was not made in order under House Resolution 544?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on proceedings in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. How many cosponsors does H.R. 15 currently have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

How many of those cosponsors are Republican Members of the House of Representatives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. How many Members have signed on to the discharge petition for H.R. 15?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the petitions at the desk.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Further parliamentary inquiry on that note, Madam Speaker.

How many of those cosponsors are Republican Members?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the discharge petitions at the desk.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair.

The Chair is prepared to recognize the managers for debate.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I recognize why we are here and so do Members of this body, and the reason why is because, if you look at the pathway of the Democratic Party, which is what our colleagues are arguing for today, it is a pathway not only to destruction, but insolvency for the United States of America, up to and including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and our ability to pay for the things that this great Nation needs.

Last night in the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), who is our representative to the Budget Committee, spent hours not only in understanding, talking, and debating these issues, but in making sure that he brought back a product that was worthy of the sale to the American people by the House of Representatives today.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is taking time to describe how, really, there are two different pathways that we could go down. Now, I am aware that we also made in order five other opportunities, opportunities where there are groups of people, Members who came to the Rules Committee upstairs, talked forthrightly about what was in their bills, and they were very proud of saying they wanted to raise taxes by trillions of dollars; they wanted to blame the ills and woes on a balanced budget and America doing something that was about solvency and a good future.

Here, we are on the floor today to talk about the pathways. One pathway where we can sustain what we do is called the Ryan budget. The chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, thoughtfully and carefully—I think

artfully—came and spoke about how we need to make sure that we continue to grow jobs in this country.

The alternative to that was higher taxes and putting more off on the American people to not only have to work harder for what they would earn, but less take-home pay.

We argued forthrightly about putting us on a pathway with our budget to where we could look at the energy resources of America, providing us with those opportunities to develop jobs and more revenue for the country.

Our friends on the Democratic side want to tax oil by billions of dollars, raising the price of energy. We forthrightly understand this, and we get it. We have seen energy prices double at the pump by President Obama and the Democrat leadership. We have seen food double in price.

No wonder it is difficult for average Americans to make ends meet. We have seen the Democrat Party, through their budget and through the actual laws that they have passed, diminish not only hours of work—which was the debate of the last few weeks about whether we would diminish the 40-hour workweek in favor of a 30-hour workweek.

There are two different pathways, two different directions we could go, taxing and spending, blaming people who have jobs, blaming millionaires and billionaires for the woes of America.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you today that it is the people who are innovative and creative and do well in life that create jobs and opportunities for this country, but they will quit doing so if we really tax them out of existence, if we do what the Democrats want to do and move to the pathway that means that America does not have a brighter future.

We will do exactly what we have seen is happening in Greece, in Iceland, and in France, where the brightest and the best of those people have given up on their countries because they cannot make a go of it.

Quite honestly, the Republican Party is proud of what we are doing. We are talking about how important it is to be careful and cautious, to make sure we can sustain what we do, to make sure that our promise to America's seniors on Medicare and Social Security is taken care of, not to go and make promises that we know we cannot fulfill.

On the other side, they turn right around and say: let's just go tax business, let's go tax energy, let's go tax people, those rich people.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is how you kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I have worked hard and never missed a day of work in 36 years.

I am not one of those people that they want to pick on, but I say thank goodness that we have entrepreneurs in our country who have chosen to make America home, who have chosen to employ American workers, and what the

Democrat Party wants to do with their budget is to throw us all out of work and make us beholden to them.

□ 1300

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that the concurrent resolution on the budget fails to assume enactment of H.R. 15, immigration reform and, in doing so, squanders the opportunity to reduce taxes that Mr. SESSIONS just talked about to the tune of \$900 billion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. CARDENAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, isn't it true that unlike the concurrent resolution on the budget, which fails to balance in 10 years, H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, would, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office, reduce our deficit by nearly \$1 trillion over the next 20 years?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it true that, unlike the concurrent resolution on the budget, which slashes the transportation budget by \$52 billion this year alone, and, according to the Economic Policy Institute, decreases GDP by 2.5 percent, H.R. 15, the House's comprehensive immigration reform bill, would create 120,000 jobs, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN's substitute amendment assumes the passage of immigration reform and that a vote against the Van Hollen substitute is a vote against immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Would it be in order to introduce an amendment to allow for an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 15 as part of the budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment could only be offered at this point if the majority manager yielded for the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow for the consideration of the Cárdenas amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. CARDENAS. Permission to debate for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may be yielded to by a manager. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to respond a little bit to what Congressman WOODALL just said a little while ago. The fact of the matter is that 68 Senators and a majority of the American people believe in debate and reform. When it comes to comprehensive immigration reform, it is about the budget. It is about the budget: 120,000 American jobs every year for the next 10 years, \$900 billion reduction in the deficit—in our deficit—the United States deficit.

That is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. It is about the budget, Madam Speaker and Members. I think it is important for us to understand that that would be the responsible—responsible—budget to pass, one that has comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I recognize that I need to hold some classes up at the Rules Committee so that Members have a better opportunity to understand more about the rules of the House and about how we operate on the floor. The facts of the case are very simple.

The Rules Committee last night made in order anything that was a complete substitute or an opportunity to have their bill heard last night. We do not take on what might be one single issue or literally an amendment.

The process that we are trying to follow here today is one that is happening

because, for 4 years, the Democratic Party had the Speaker of the House, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President of the United States, and they did not do for 4 years what they are asking us to do today. And all these shiny objects swirling around do not fool the American people. They want to raise taxes, raise spending, and blame someone rather than coming to the table and working together.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what you just saw on the floor is frustration. In the supposedly open House that my colleagues brag about—erroneously, I should add—this issue of comprehensive immigration reform has failed to be given a day on the floor.

The United States Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed comprehensive immigration reform, a bill that would, by the way, raise close to a trillion dollars over the next 20 years to pay down our debt, and yet we can't even get it scheduled on the House floor. The leadership here continues to block it, and Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. POLIS last night in the Rules Committee thought that, given the fact that there is such an incredible savings here, it was relevant to this.

And, by the way, the Rules Committee can do whatever it wants to. The Rules Committee could issue the necessary waivers to allow this to happen. There is no reason at all why this couldn't have been brought up today except that a majority in the Rules Committee said no. I mean, that is the reason why.

So what you see is frustration. What you see is frustration not just by Democrats. There are people on the Republican side who, as well, would like to see us debate comprehensive immigration reform, and instead we are blocked at every single avenue. So that has to change; otherwise, you are going to see more of the kinds of displays that you just witnessed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of both the Rules Committee and the House Budget Committee.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the time. I want to urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I would be the first to tell you that this budget is not a perfect budget—no budget is actually perfect—but it is a good budget.

There are a couple of issues that do concern me, as I addressed Mr. RYAN last night; and we are worried that we haven't dealt with the wildfire issue to my satisfaction, which disrupts the appropriating process within Interior, but he assured me that he recognized that was a problem, and we are going to

continue to work on it. I actually am going to vote for Mr. WOODALL's budget when I have the opportunity to do that. It is the most conservative approach on the floor, and I appreciate that.

I think we ought to stop and remember that without PAUL RYAN, we wouldn't have the choices in front of us today. The United States Senate has chosen not to have a budget once again this year, something that it frequently does. And with all due respect to my friends who do have a budget—and I am pleased that they do—in 2010, when they were actually in the majority, they didn't present a budget to this body, either.

It is PAUL RYAN that has forced us to confront the fiscal crisis that is facing the country and has actually put something on the table to deal with it. Now, you don't have to agree with everything in it, but it has a lot of virtues to it. The first virtue is it actually focuses on the number one driver of the debt, and that is our unsustainable entitlement programs.

We have made a lot of progress in the last few years in this body on a bipartisan basis in reducing discretionary spending. We are actually spending \$165 billion less in discretionary accounts than we were in 2008 when George W. Bush was President of the United States. I don't agree with all those reductions, and I suspect my friends on the other side don't either, but that is a tangible contribution to reducing the deficit and moving us toward balance.

What we haven't dealt with, what the President has largely refused to deal with, and what I suspect my friends in their budget will not deal with, but PAUL RYAN has, are the real drivers of the debt: Medicare and Medicaid, in particular. There is an offer in there to sit down and deal seriously with Social Security, as well. And until we do those things—and PAUL RYAN has started us on a path to do them—we will never bring the budget into balance.

Now, one of the other things I like about Mr. RYAN's budget is, gosh, it really does balance within 10 years. It makes a lot of tough choices. My friend, Mr. WOODALL, actually gets there a little bit faster because he makes even tougher choices, but it balances.

My friends on the other side and the administration haven't presented a budget that balances in 10 years or 20 years or 30 years or 40 or 50—or just draw the lines right on out to infinity. I don't think that is what the American people sent us here to do. But until somebody actually has the courage to do what Mr. RYAN has done and what Mr. WOODALL has done, that is the situation the country is going to be in.

The other thing I like about the Ryan budget, in particular, is that it actually incorporates in it the agreement that he arrived at with Senator MURRAY in the other body. Now, there was a lot of criticism about that be-

cause it probably wasn't what I would have negotiated if I got my way or probably Mr. WOODALL or any other Senator, but it was a real agreement—only a 2-year agreement, but a real agreement. And against a lot of criticism, Mr. RYAN incorporated, okay, if that is going to be the settled law of the land, then that should be part of our budget. He put it in there, and I am proud of him for doing that.

Finally, again, it reduces not spending, but the growth of spending. We are going to hear a lot of talk about slashes and not investing. If you actually look at the Ryan budget, Federal spending still grows. It grows by about 3½ percent a year. The difference is the Democratic alternative—well, excuse me—the current course is like 5.2 percent. That is not a great deal of difference. We could really restrain our deficit in the short term and ultimately bring ourselves into balance not by slashing everything, but by simply making some of the simple, commonsense reforms that my friend, Mr. RYAN, to great criticism, has advanced and put on this floor year after year after year.

So I want to urge the adoption of this rule, which is a terrific rule, because despite some complaints, the reality is my friend, Mr. WOODALL, and the Rules Committee have put a variety of choices before this body.

We are going to have a budget from the Progressive Caucus that is very different than I would like, but it is going to get its opportunity. We are going to have a budget from the Congressional Black Caucus—again, different than I would choose, but it certainly deserves to be heard and examined. We are going to have Mr. WOODALL's budget. So we are going to have several choices before we get to Mr. RYAN's budget, any one of whom might win, might actually persuade people.

At the end of the day, we are going to have multiple choices because of this rule, and so it deserves to be dealt with because it does, indeed, open the process. At the end of the day, I suspect Mr. RYAN's budget will be the one that passes. Again, I am very proud to do that, and I urge its passage.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for again putting together yet another budget that balances in ten years. I know from the many meetings that we had on this side of the aisle that there was a lot of thought put into how we can maintain our commitment to fiscal balance, given the mounting debt, and the overall deterioration of our economic growth, brought about, in part, by the over 17 trillion debt.

Additionally, this budget maintains the Republican focus on dealing with the true drivers of our debt, entitlement programs. It would have been very easy, given that the Bipartisan Budget Act set the 302(a) allocations for Fiscal Year 2015, to not do a budget; however, this budget, this blueprint yet again allows us to share our vision for the future.

This budget reflects the discretionary caps which were agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget

Act. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I have seen the devastating cuts in end strength and capabilities we will face if we continue with sequester. And, instead of making discretionary cuts for the fifth year in a row, we have redoubled our efforts in entitlement programs to ensure they are available for all in the future.

I was disappointed to see that the President reversed himself in his budget submission, removing Chained CPI from his budget proposal. However, House Republicans are willing to work with the President where possible and find common ground that will move our debt trajectory downward, instead of increasing at an exponential rate.

Many have criticized this budget for “moving the goalposts” and now transitioning to a Premium Support model for those 56 and below; however, Madam Speaker, we have to face the facts. Every year that we do not act it becomes harder and harder to preserve the current programs for those already at or near retirement. This budget recognizes that hard reality and adjusts itself accordingly.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to say a little about wildfires suppression costs. When devastating wildfires do occur and the costs exceed the Forest Service’s budget, most often, other programs within the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee bear the costs. And that is not right. I am disappointed that this budget fails to consider how we can better budget for the true costs of wildfire suppression activities. My friend from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON, has a deficit-neutral bill that would deal with this issue. Much of what we have considered on the floor the past few days has aimed at ensuring the true costs of programs are reflected in the budget. That is what Mr. SIMPSON’s bill does and I hope we can consider it in the coming weeks.

I hope this budget serves as a wake-up call that it is time to act. Here in Washington, we can become numbed to the problems facing our country. But they are real, and they must be addressed. This budget reflects the Republican vision for the future, one where we are in control of our destiny, as opposed to turning over control to our creditors.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to agree with my friend from Oklahoma that Mr. RYAN has given us a choice. He has presented us a budget that would end Medicare as we know it; it would slash the social safety net to smithereens; it cuts SNAP by \$137 billion; and it would damage the National Institutes of Health and transportation funding. Pell grants would be cut. I could go right down the list. Yeah, I know we have got a choice here, and people ought to understand what that budget is all about.

My friends on the other side may be proud of this. Again, I find that puzzling, because the notion that the only way to balance the budget is by hurting poor people or hurting the middle class, I don’t agree with.

You talk about sacrifices. Why are all the sacrifices on the backs of middle-income families or on the backs of the poor in this country? The rich get a tax cut. The rich get a tax cut. Middle class families get a tax increase. Poor people get their food stamps taken away from them. Why is that al-

ways the choice that you provide Members of this House? Why are those the only people that sacrifice? I just find it unconscionable, quite frankly.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, let’s talk about what is not in the Ryan budget.

The Federal highway trust fund, which funds all highway, road, bridge, and transit projects in the United States of America will be exhausted sometime this summer. A number of States are already delaying or canceling major projects, and there will be a flood of States doing that after the trust fund goes belly up.

For next year, under the Ryan budget, there will be zero—no, none, zero—Federal investment in roads, bridges, highways, and transit despite the deteriorated state of our infrastructure for somewhere between 9 and 11 months until we pay our past bills, and then there will be a little trickle.

Meanwhile, bridges will be falling down, people will be driving through potholes, delays, and congestion. We will walk away from or lose over 1 million construction, manufacturing, and engineering jobs, and it will have an impact on hundreds of thousands—millions—of other jobs across the United States of America, not even to begin to talk about our lack of competitiveness with the rest of the world.

□ 1315

The Ryan budget does address this in a rather novel way, so the trust fund is going broke. Probably what we have done the last couple of times when we get to that point, we say transportation is so important we transferred some general fund money over. The Ryan budget says you can’t transfer general fund money over to transportation; it must go broke.

Well, the other thing is a new source of revenue or user fees. The Federal gas tax is 18.4 cents a gallon, and that has been since 1993, the same tax in 1993 when gas was \$1.11 a gal. Last weekend, I paid \$3.71, and Federal tax is still 18.4 cents a gallon.

Where is that money going? It is going to ExxonMobil; it is going to Wall Street speculators. It sure is the heck not going to rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and putting millions of Americans back to work.

Under the Ryan budget, we are going to revolve Federal transportation. What does that mean? It means we are going to have a 50-State and territory Federal transportation policy. You know, we actually tried that once. This was 1956. This is the brandnew Kansas Turnpike.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Oklahoma promised they would build one, too. Well, they didn’t have the money. They said: sorry, guys, can’t build it.

This is Emil Schweitzer’s farm field. For 3 years, people crashed through the barrier at the end here and went into his field, until Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican, passed the national highway transportation bill with a trust fund.

That would be undone by PAUL RYAN. He says States can opt out. They don’t even have to collect the 18.4 cents Federal tax; they can do whatever they want with that money.

Madam Speaker, counties are actually ripping up paved roads and turning them back to gravel because they can’t afford them. There are 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the national highway system has pavement that has totally failed.

There is a \$70 billion backlog on our transit systems. These are millions of jobs foregone—productivity foregone, and if you are so darn proud, as I heard on that side, why aren’t you proud of the future of America, putting people back to work and competing with the rest of the world with a world class, 21st century transportation system? You’re going to kill it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), a former sheriff, a member of the class of 2010, and a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, one of the most important things that we do in this Congress—and it is a constitutional requirement—is we provide for the common defense of this Nation, to allow things like my good friends on the Democrat side are arguing for in regards to more entitlement programs, more helping our neighbors; but without a national defense, all of this is moot. It doesn’t matter. It adds up to nothing if we can’t defend the homeland and defend our friends when they need it.

Now, I will tell you that this budget does something that is needed. It increases the spending for our military. It actually takes something that the President, the Commander in Chief who has cut the military by \$1 trillion in the last few years, is actually restoring money that he was holding hostage.

He said the military can have \$26 billion more if you give us \$27 billion more for domestic spending. It is about holding our safety hostage. When those that are in a position to talk to us and tell us that the world is changing, you don’t have to look very far.

See what is going on in Russia and China and Iran and North Korea. This is not a safer world since this President has taken office. It has become a much more dangerous world, particularly from state actors.

It is not all his fault, I must say, Madam Speaker. This goes back to years of kicking the can down the road by this Congress.

Mr. WOODALL and I came to Congress at the same time, 3 years ago, Madam

Speaker. We weren't part of the problem, but those who were here prior to that have been part of the problem. They continued to kick the can down the road.

PAUL RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee, and members of the Budget Committee actually took the bull by the horns. It is starting to turn this country.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NUGENT. This is actually talking about difficult questions we have to talk about.

This body loves, if the problem isn't immediate, we don't have to worry about it, don't worry about it because it will never happen; but we are being told by professionals: guess what, Medicare and Social Security are at risk if we do nothing.

If we don't challenge the status quo, if we don't start talking about how do we move forward to protect our seniors today from cuts in Medicare and Social Security, how we move forward for our younger folks as they get closer to retirement age, we have to do more, and I believe this budget is creating a dialogue for us to move forward and do more, not just put our heads in the sand and say we just need to spend more money because we can tax our way out of it. Everybody knows that is not true.

Madam Speaker, the first and most important job of our government is to provide for the defense of its citizens.

If the government can't protect the people's liberty then everything else we talk about today—every dime spent on every domestic program—is all moot.

So when we're considering how taxpayer money should be spent, we ought to keep this at the forefront of our minds.

We ought to put forward a budget that recognizes this basic truth and most fundamental responsibility.

I'm glad to see that Chairman RYAN's budget embraces this fundamental priority because, Madam Speaker, not all the budgets we'll debate today share this perspective.

Not even the budget of the military's own Commander in Chief.

The House Armed Services Committee has analyzed the last several budget proposals from President Obama, and I want to share some of those findings with my colleagues in the larger House of Representatives today:

Since entering the White House, President Obama has proposed more than \$1 trillion in cuts to the military.

Over the next 10 years, the President is proposing \$345 billion less than the minimum amount the military says they need to perform the President's own defense strategy.

Less than 15 percent of our U.S. Army is deployment ready today.

Without regard for the command signals from Combatant Commanders, the President has produced a budget recommendation that neither complies with the statutory nor strategic requirements of the military.

Instead, the President cuts \$26 billion from the military and holds it for ransom until this

Congress is willing to give him \$32 billion in domestic programs.

These budget gimmicks will not stand and I applaud the House Budget Committee for not engaging in the false narrative that this Congress must pay \$58 billion in order to restore \$26 billion to meet the minimum standard of national security.

In this tough fiscal environment, the budget brought to the Floor by this Rule provides the minimum dollars necessary to resource the President's strategy and sustain the World's premiere fighting force.

In fiscal year 2015, that means a commitment of this Congress to our military of more than \$521 billion.

Translating that dollar amount into capability—this budget maintains a force structure well above the drastic reductions recommended by the President:

The Army has the flexibility to retain the 100,000 soldiers on the chopping block,

Navy can preserve the 11 aircraft carriers required by both strategy and law,

Modernization programs critical to maintaining our military's technological edge and our troops' safety will continue to give our warfighters an advantage on the battlefield next year and beyond.

I truly hope the Army will take the flexibility afforded them under this budget as an opportunity to establish the right balance between Active Component, Reserve Component and the National Guard.

By the time this budget goes into effect, our Army will be drawing down from 14 years of continuous war.

To effectively make that transition
To reduce the cost of a war-time standing Army while preserving capability

To "right-size" the forward deployed force and meet the domestic responsibilities to the individual states

Big Army must recognize and incorporate the National Guard's indispensable role in providing our national security at home and abroad.

If such a right-sizing cannot be found internally within the Army, this Congress will have to put Army decisions on hold until a commission can be established to study the correct balance of the Service moving forward.

Finally, I applaud this budget for sustaining compensation for all warfighters, retirees and their families.

Too many times over the past several years, Congress has had to defend the pay of service members—as if the reasons for adequately compensating our all-volunteer military were not self-evident.

I hope that this year, the paycheck of our troops will be spared the political games of the recent history.

We are certainly off to a good start with this budget that meets our compensation commitments to the military—including healthcare.

And so, Madam Speaker, I support this rule and the underlining resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman from Florida that national defense includes more than the number of weapons we have in our arsenal. It also include the quality of life for our people here at home, and these programs that he is denigrating, like SNAP, for example, I should remind him there are an extremely high number of military fami-

lies that rely on SNAP to get by and a high number of veterans who do as well.

Basic food, they are looking for helping with putting food on the table. So before anybody denigrates those programs, understand that they contribute to our national defense as well. They are feeding our military families and veterans because our returning veterans can't find jobs that pay a livable wage.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN.

Madam Speaker, this is pretty exciting this morning. I think this is the first time in 5 years that I have been here that we were actually having a debate, discussing what both sides stand for.

Mr. DEFAZIO was wonderful. He is absolutely right. He knows what he is talking about. We haven't built infrastructure. Do you know, we haven't built one airport from the ground up in the United States since 1972, and every place else in the rest of the world has brandnew airports?

They are all whizzing about on high-speed rail. We don't have any; but we spent \$2 billion a week while we were in Iraq. We were willing to spend that, maimed 46,000 young people, killed thousands of them as well, as well as people in those countries—for oil.

What we really do hear this morning and what pleases me so much is we are really showing the difference in this country and what the two sides believe in. We don't believe over here that the richest people should get richer. We don't believe that we need a budget right now that lowers the corporate tax rate.

We believe that all Americans should be paying their fair share, so we can build back up, and maybe we can start to enjoy some of the things that are happening elsewhere in the 21st century.

This budget is a misguided proposal driven by flawed math. At worst, it is a cynical choice to balance our budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans in order to protect the incomes of powerful special interests and the wealthiest few, and it does precisely that.

It is not news to anybody in the country that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer and the unemployed are desperate. Everybody knows that. The issue is: What is the Congress of the United States going to do about that?

Now, with this proposal, the majority gives an average tax cut of \$200,000 to families earning more than \$1 million a year, so they are okay. They earn \$1 million a year, and they are going to get \$200,000; but to pay for it, we have to raise taxes on the middle class.

Let me tell you how we do that. With this proposal, they defend the tax loophole that we have been trying to close

ever since I have been in Congress, the money we give oil companies so they will drill.

The five major oil companies, we pay them \$4 billion a year so they will drill; like they weren't having the biggest profits on the face of the Earth and no one needs to encourage them to drill, but we pay for that, and to do that, they are going to turn Medicare into a voucher program.

We have discussed this before. That means your aged parents and grandparents will go into a marketplace by themselves—or maybe you can go with them—and look for their own insurance policy.

They will be given a government voucher or a stipend or whatever they want to call it to help pay for it, but it may not cover the cost, so the rest of the cost will come from the senior citizen. It will take exactly away what Lyndon Johnson had in mind in 1968. The benefit guaranteed by Medicare will be gone.

To pay for that, again, they want to keep the Medicare plan we have today, and with this proposal, the majority reduces the tax rate paid by corporations. I have said that before, and I want to say it again. Corporation tax rates are reduced, and we already know that most of them put all of their assets in the Cayman Islands or in some other country and pay no taxes whatsoever.

If we just brought some of the tax money back from the Cayman Islands, I bet we could have high-speed rail in the United States. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

So they take \$137 billion in nutrition assistance, the food people live on, out of the mouths of low-income families struggling to get by. The author of this budget said such draconian cuts are necessary because:

We don't want to turn the safety net into a hammock that lulls able-bodied people to lives of dependency and complacency.

If that is his goal, then he and his colleagues have written a budget that badly misses the mark. For the hammock of dependency isn't found in the homes of working Americans, but on the beaches of the Cayman Islands, where powerful special interest and the wealthiest few depend upon policies like this budget to build their own hammock out of the social safety net that used to support the largest middle class on Earth that is fast disappearing.

For more than three decades, the wealthy and the powerful have used money and influence to secure tax cuts, to deregulate industries, and to pass free trade deals that put corporate profits before America's jobs.

In so doing, they have redirected revenue away from the Federal Government and made it virtually impossible to fund the programs that have made our Nation the envy of the world.

With the wealthy and powerful exempted from paying their fair share, our Nation put tens of billions of dol-

lars and two wars on the Nation's credit card and failed to invest in maintaining our roads, modernizing our airports, or building efficient passenger rail here at home.

As a result, highway bridges are literally falling into the water, our airports have become laughably out of date, and our trains travel at speeds half as fast as those found in Germany, China, and Japan.

Far from solving this crisis, the majority's budget doubles down on the failed policies by reducing taxing for the rich and powerful even further. We have already said a millionaire gets a \$200,000 tax cut, so we are going to ask the most vulnerable Americans to pay the price.

Under this budget, 170,000 children will lose Head Start, and 29,000 teachers and aides will be left without jobs. College students, who are already suffering under staggering costs of higher education, would be told that they must repay their loans while they are still in school.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And \$205 billion would be cut from programs like Pell grants, making it harder than ever to get the education that is needed to succeed in the modern world.

Perhaps, most egregiously, the promise of secure and affordable health care would be broken with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the end of the Medicare guarantee. Under the majority's budget, Medicare would be turned into a voucher, as I said before.

On Sunday, the news program "60 Minutes" traveled down the winding roads of the Cumberland Mountains into the heart of Appalachia in a RV called the Health Wagon. The aging vehicle is the only source of health care for thousands of Americans in desperate need of medical attention.

The vehicle is staffed by two incredible nurses and other medical volunteers, including Dr. Joe Smiddy, the Health Wagon's volunteer medical director. After completing medical school, Dr. Smiddy had to enroll in truck driver school so he could drive the Health Wagon's x-ray lab, an 18-wheel truck that provides insight into diseases that were going undiagnosed.

These volunteers have seen the price individual Americans pay when the Chamber puts the priorities of the rich and the powerful ahead of everyone else. Dr. Smiddy said of life in the Cumberland Mountains:

This is a Third World country of diabetes, hypertension, lung cancer, and COPD in the United States.

Madam Speaker, a Third World country.

Though the work of the Health Wagon does every day is heroic, no individual living in the wealthiest Nation on Earth should be relying upon the good will of volunteers to receive modern medical care.

Doctors and nurses of the Health Wagon should not be relying on Federal grants.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is why we say this budget is not a reflection of our values, but theirs.

It is through the budget we decide whether we protect tax loopholes for Big Oil or provide our fellow citizens with access to secure and affordable health care, an education, a job, and a place to live. It is through our budget we decide whether kids can go to college or not.

Only by choosing to act and asking every American, including corporations, to pay their fair share—corporations are people, I understand, we have established that in the Supreme Court—we will be able to put every American on a path to prosperity and restore our role as the most advanced nation in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the secretary of the Republican Conference.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I also thank Chairman RYAN and his staff for their hard work in producing this budget. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

Madam Speaker, budget puts a numerical value on the priorities we claim to value, and as such, it is a moral document. This budget will protect and strengthen Medicare, preserve our commitment to veterans, and keep faith with future generations by getting spending under control and fostering economic growth.

This budget controls spending by ending sweetheart deals for favored corporations and returning government to its proper limits. Years of overreach and cronyism have weakened confidence in the Federal Government and damaged our economy.

As Chairman RYAN mentioned in his Rules Committee testimony last night, the CBO has warned that, if we fail to address our lackluster economic growth and rising debt, our children and grandchildren are guaranteed a lower standard of living than what we currently enjoy.

For the first time in American history, we may bequeath to our children and grandchildren a less prosperous country with limited opportunities to pursue their American Dream. As a mother and grandmother, I will do all I can to keep that from happening.

Over the next decade, the U.S. Government will spend \$5.8 trillion servicing debt—\$5 trillion, Madam Speaker—simply to make interest payments to our creditors.

Those dollars could be put to work at home strengthening our military, caring for our veterans, and improving the lives of all Americans; but instead, nearly half of it will go to pay for the inability of those who came before to manage the Nation's Treasury responsibly. We need to stop spending money we don't have.

Unlike the President's budget, this budget actually balances within the budget window. A balanced budget will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs. By reducing the capital the government takes out of the private sector, this budget will foster opportunity.

This budget would keep our children and grandchildren from inheriting an insurmountable debt. If we take action now, we can pass on an America that is free, prosperous, and filled with opportunity.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

Defeat of the previous question will allow us to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, an act that addresses the persistent problem of unequal pay in our economy, and would help make the bill before us a real boon for women and their families.

Women are now half of the Nation's workforce and two-thirds of primary or cobreadwinners. The sad fact is they are still only making and being paid 77 cents on the dollar on average compared to men. This holds true across all occupations and education levels. For women of color, the disparities are even worse.

Less pay for women means less pay for an entire family at a time when millions are struggling to enter the middle class. Give their kids a chance at a better life, achieve the American Dream. It affects all of us.

We have seen the Republican budget that is being discussed today already does so much to put that dream out of reach for America's families. It slashes our social safety net, cuts off nutrition support, and denies food to millions of low-income Americans, and our most important anti-hunger program in the Nation.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities said 69 percent of the cuts in this Republican budget would come from programs serving low- and moderate-income people.

Let's be in opposition to this previous question because we will have an opportunity to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question because when women succeed, America succeeds. Let's help hardworking families take home the pay that they deserve and ensure that women are being paid the same as men for the same job.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I advise my friend from Massachusetts that we have no further speakers remaining, if he is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities entitled "Ryan Budget Would Slash SNAP by \$137 Billion Over 10 Years, Low-Income Households in all States Would Feel Sharp Effects."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

The Ryan budget will create a government without a conscience. It is cruel. This budget is a rotten thing to do to poor people; it is a rotten thing to do to the middle class. It is an outrage.

So please, again, vote "no" on the previous question, and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

This really is an embarrassment. We could do so much better in this Chamber. The people in this country deserve much better than what we are giving them.

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

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Apr. 4, 2014]

RYAN BUDGET WOULD SLASH SNAP BY \$137 BILLION OVER TEN YEARS
LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS IN ALL STATES WOULD FEEL SHARP EFFECTS
(By Dorothy Rosenbaum)

House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's budget plan includes cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as the Food Stamp Program) of \$137 billion—18 percent—over the next ten years (2015–2024), which would necessitate ending food assistance for millions of low-income families, cutting benefits for millions of such households, or some combination of the two. Chairman Ryan proposed similarly deep SNAP cuts in each of his last three budgets. The new Ryan budget specifies two categories of SNAP cuts:

It includes every major benefit cut in a House-passed version of the recent farm bill that Congress ultimately rejected when enacting the final farm bill. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated the House cuts, which amount to \$12 billion over the 2015–2018 period, would have terminated benefits to 3.8 million low-income people in 2014. After a difficult two-year process, Congress just two months ago, on a bipartisan basis, passed a farm bill that rejected these House cuts and reauthorized SNAP and other Agriculture programs for five years.

It would convert SNAP into a block grant beginning in 2019 and cut funding steeply—by

\$125 billion (or almost 30 percent) over 2019 to 2024. States would be left to decide whose benefits to reduce or terminate. They would have no good choices—the program already provides an average of only \$1.40 per person per meal, primarily to poor children, working-poor parents, seniors, people with disabilities, and others struggling to make ends meet.

RYAN BLOCK GRANT WOULD FORCE STATES TO CUT FOOD ASSISTANCE DEEPLY

Since 90 percent of SNAP spending goes for food assistance, and most of the rest covers state administrative costs to determine program eligibility and operate SNAP properly, policymakers couldn't achieve cuts of this magnitude without substantially scaling back eligibility or reducing benefits deeply, with serious effects on low-income families and individuals. Table 1 provides state-by-state estimates of the potential impact of the block grant proposal.

Cuts in eligibility. If the cuts came solely from eliminating eligibility for categories of currently eligible households or individuals, states would have to cut an average of 10 million people from the program (relative to SNAP enrollment without the cuts) each year between 2019 and 2024.

Cuts in benefits. If the cuts came solely from across-the-board benefit cuts, states would have to cut more than \$40 per person per month in 2019 to 2024 (in nominal dollars), on average. This would require setting the maximum benefit at about 77 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan, the Agriculture Department's (USDA) estimate of the cost of a bare-bones, nutritionally adequate diet. (Under SNAP rules, the maximum benefit—which goes to households with no disposable income after deductions for certain necessities—is set at 100 percent of the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan.)

The impact of such a change would be pronounced. All families of four—including the poorest—would face benefit cuts of about \$160 a month in fiscal year 2019, or more than \$1,900 per year. All families of three would face cuts of about \$125 per month, or about \$1,500 per year. Of course, policymakers could shield some households from such deep cuts, but then other households would need to bear even larger cuts in order to produce the \$125 billion in block-grant savings.

While states might not seek to hit the Ryan targets through eligibility cuts or benefit cuts alone, these examples illustrate the magnitude of the reductions needed. States would have few other places to achieve the required cuts; as noted, about 90 percent of SNAP expenditures are for food assistance.

PROPOSED CUTS REST ON INACCURATE CLAIMS

Chairman Ryan bases his proposed SNAP cuts on a series of inaccurate claims about SNAP program growth, work disincentives, and waste, fraud, and abuse.

Spending growth. Chairman Ryan justifies deep SNAP cuts in part by claiming that the "explosive growth [of SNAP and other low-income programs] is threatening the overall strength of the safety net" and "SNAP spending is forecast to be permanently higher than previous estimates even after the recession is long past." While SNAP spending did grow substantially during the recession, it has begun to decline as a share of the economy and is expected to continue shrinking over the coming decade.

SNAP grew because of three factors: the depth of the recent recession, which made more people eligible; improvements in reaching eligible households (particularly working-poor families); and the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefit boost (which ended in November 2013). As Figure 1 indicates, CBO projects that SNAP will return to pre-recession levels as a share of the economy

(gross domestic product) once the economy fully recovers. The program does not contribute to the nation's long-term budget problem because it is projected to grow no faster than the economy over time.

Work and dependency. Chairman Ryan also justifies cutting SNAP and turning it over to the states by implying that SNAP doesn't encourage recipients to work. Yet the number of SNAP recipients who work while receiving SNAP has more than tripled over the past decade. Furthermore, CBPP analysis finds that the large majority of SNAP recipients who can work do so, and many more rely on SNAP when they are between jobs or looking for work.

Among SNAP households with at least one working-age, non-disabled adult, more than half work while receiving SNAP and more than 80 percent work in the year prior to or the year after receiving SNAP. The rates are even higher for families with children: more than 60 percent work while receiving SNAP, and almost 90 percent work in the prior or subsequent year. Only 4 percent of households that worked in the year before receiving SNAP did not work the following year.

Moreover, SNAP already has work requirements. Adults without children face a harsh three-month time limit if they are unemployed and not participating in a qualifying employment and training program. States can apply for a waiver from this requirement during a weak economy when jobs are not available by submitting detailed Department of Labor data showing high unemployment in local areas or statewide, but the number of areas qualifying for a waiver is falling as the economy recovers, and CBO expects the number of such areas to shrink markedly over the next few years. (The Ryan budget would eliminate these waivers immediately, even for areas with double-digit unemployment.) In addition, states have broad authority to operate employment and training programs, and the recent farm bill includes a major demonstration program for states to test innovative approaches to providing employment and training services that raise recipients' earnings and reduce their reliance on public assistance.

Waste, fraud, and abuse. Finally, Chairman Ryan justifies his SNAP proposals based on charges that SNAP is rife with waste, fraud, and abuse. The reality is that SNAP has one of the most rigorous quality control systems of any public benefit program and a very low error rate. Despite the recent growth in caseloads, the share of total SNAP payments that represent overpayments or payments to ineligible households fell to a record low of 2.77 percent in fiscal year 2012. In addition, USDA has cut "trafficking"—the sale of SNAP benefits for cash, which violates federal law—by three-quarters over the past 15 years. Only 1.3 percent of SNAP benefits are trafficked. USDA has also permanently disqualified thousands of retail stores from the program for not following strict federal requirements. When cases of SNAP fraud are reported in the news, it is because the offenders have been caught, evidence that states and USDA are aggressively combating fraud.

BENEFIT CUTS WOULD PRIMARILY AFFECT LOW-INCOME FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, SENIORS, AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Ryan budget documents assert that Congress could achieve the required savings by capping federal SNAP funding and "allow[ing] states to customize SNAP to the needs of their citizens" through a block grant. That description leaves the mistaken impression that the program is not serving a population that is overwhelmingly poor and that savings could be achieved without significantly harming millions of vulnerable Americans.

Unlike most means-tested benefit programs, which are restricted to particular categories of low-income individuals, SNAP is broadly available to almost all households with very low incomes. Cutting SNAP thus would affect broad swaths of the low-income population. Currently, 46.8 million people receive SNAP to help them feed their families. Census data show that in 2012 (the latest year for which these data are available), 46.5 million Americans lived below the poverty line, and 64.8 million lived below 130 percent of the poverty line, SNAP's gross income limit.

The overwhelming majority of SNAP households are families with children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Seventy percent of SNAP participants are in families with children; more than one-quarter are in households that include senior citizens or people with disabilities.

SNAP households have very low incomes. Eighty-three percent of SNAP households have incomes below the poverty line while they are receiving SNAP assistance (about \$19,800 for a family of three in 2014). Such households receive 91 percent of SNAP benefits. Two of every five SNAP households have incomes below half of the poverty line. Such individuals and families have little flexibility in their monthly budgets to cope with deep reductions in food assistance.

Low-wage workers rely on SNAP to boost their monthly income. Millions of Americans live in working households with earnings that are not sufficient to meet basic needs. In 2012, some 39 million people (1 in 8 Americans) lived in a working family with cash income below 130 percent of the poverty line. Low incomes like these—which typically reflect low wages or limited work hours—can leave families unable to afford necessities like food and housing on a regular basis. SNAP benefits play a crucial role in boosting such families' monthly resources: in 2012, a typical working mother with two children on SNAP earned \$1,148 per month (\$13,700 on an annual basis) and received \$307 per month in SNAP benefits. If the Ryan proposal had been in place in 2012 and was implemented via across-the-board cuts, this family's monthly benefits would have been cut by \$110 per month—or about 36 percent.

SNAP BENEFIT CUTS WOULD INCREASE HUNGER AND POVERTY

SNAP cuts of the magnitude that the Ryan budget proposes would almost certainly lead to increases in hunger and poverty. Emergency food providers report that more people ask for help in the latter half of the month, after their SNAP benefits run out. Under the Ryan budget's steep funding cuts, a typical household's SNAP benefits would run out many days earlier, placing greater strain on household finances (and on emergency food providers) and significantly increasing the risk of hunger.

Deep SNAP cuts also would cause more families and individuals to fall into poverty and push poor families deeper into poverty. Currently, SNAP helps lessen the extent and severity of poverty; Census Bureau data on disposable family income that include the value of SNAP and other non-cash benefits and taxes show that:

SNAP lifted 4.9 million Americans above the poverty line in 2012, including 2.2 million children.

SNAP kept more children—1.4 million—from falling below half of the poverty line in 2012, more than any other program.

The Ryan SNAP cuts would thus have a sharp, adverse effect on millions of the lowest-income Americans. Moreover, they would not occur in isolation. The Ryan budget contains steep cuts in other low-income assistance programs, compounding the effects of

the SNAP cuts. Many vulnerable families would lose health coverage, housing assistance, and other important supports such as child care at the same time they faced SNAP cuts.

CUTS COULD BE EVEN LARGER UNDER A BLOCK GRANT

Block-granting SNAP, as Chairman Ryan proposes, would eliminate its ability to respond automatically to the increased need that results from rising poverty and unemployment during economic downturns. Annual federal funding would remain fixed, regardless of whether the economy was in a recession or how severe a downturn was. As a result, the House Budget Committee staff's estimate that the Ryan plan would cut SNAP by \$137 billion over ten years may understate the magnitude of the cut—the cuts would be still more severe if the economy performs less well over the coming decade than CBO projects.

If a SNAP block grant had been in effect in 2013 at funding levels set in 2007, before the recession, federal funding in 2013 would have been about 50 percent below actual funding that year (excluding the Recovery Act benefit boost).

Furthermore, under a block grant, SNAP would not be able to respond to natural disasters. Hurricane Sandy victims in New York and New Jersey obtained temporary food aid through SNAP in 2013, as did victims of disasters in five other states.

Also, under a block grant, many states would likely shift funds away from food assistance to other purposes when they faced large state budget shortfalls. SNAP includes several non-food components, such as job training and related child care; a block grant structure would enable states to divert funds away from food to these purposes and withdraw state funds currently spent on these services.

Finally, because of its capped funding structure, a block grant like the one Chairman Ryan proposes would reverse the recent progress made, on a bipartisan basis, to improve SNAP participation among eligible low-income households. Viewing SNAP as an important work support and health and nutrition benefit, the last three Administrations, as well as governors from across the political spectrum, have sought to boost participation rates—especially among working-poor families and low-income elderly people, the two groups with the lowest participation rates. Overall, the efforts have paid off. SNAP reached 79 percent of all eligible individuals in a typical month in 2011 (the most recent year for which these data are available), a significant improvement from 2002, when the participation rate bottomed out at 54 percent. Participation among eligible low-income working families rose from 43 percent in 2002 to about 67 percent in 2011. For the elderly, it improved more modestly—from 26 percent in 2002 to about 39 percent in 2011.

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

You couldn't tell it from the acrimony that has been expressed over the last hour, but this is a good day. There are so many opportunities we have to come to this House and be disappointed with the bills that are here before us.

Why? Because we have different ideas, we have different ideas. My constituency, different from the constituencies of so many of my other colleagues, I don't question that they do their best to serve their constituencies, but in serving their voters, they harm mine and sometimes vice versa.

Today, that is not the question. We don't have a choice between the lesser of two evils. We don't have a choice against my way or their way. We have a rule that allows for absolutely every Member of this Congress to write their own budget. Think about that, Madam Speaker. We are talking about the budget of the United States of America, \$3.5 trillion.

Now, everybody doesn't write their own budget. It turns out we have more in common than we have that divides us around this institution, Madam Speaker. We have six budgets that we are going to be voting on.

That is every single budget that was submitted, but it is only six budgets. One came out of the House Budget Committee, one came out of the Republican Study Committee, one came out of the Congressional Black Caucus, one came from the Progressive Caucus, one came from the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and one came from Mr. MULVANEY representing the President's budget.

By golly, Madam Speaker, if you can't find something that you believe in, in that continuum of budgets, you are not looking hard enough.

Here is the thing: budgets are about choices; budgets are about priorities. The budgets of previous Congresses and previous Presidents have run up a debt the size of which servicing, even at these lowest teaser interest rates in American history, will suck out 18 months of productivity over the next 10 years.

I do not question my friend's commitment to the SNAP program, but understand that decisions of the past, paying the interest alone, require the SNAP program be closed completely for 18 months.

I do not question my friend's commitment to national security, but the budgets and the priorities of past Congresses have borrowed us into such a state that paying interest alone would require us to close our military for 18 months over the next 10 years.

We could not agree more that this budget week is about choices and priorities, and I tell you the choices and priorities of past Congresses and past Presidents are trading away hope for the next generation of Americans. They are trading away opportunities to serve Americans who need to be served today.

They are trading away security that folks should be able to have in a land as great as America; but because of decisions that this body, the Senate, and the White House have made over the past decades, that security is no more.

Not the budget-passed budget, Madam Speaker, the Budget Committee budget brings us to balance. We will begin to pay down that debt. We will reclaim those opportunities for those future generations.

Don't we owe it to them, Madam Speaker, not to advance ourselves at their expense? I think I know what the answer to that question is. We are

going to be debating it over the next 3 days here on the House floor, and I hope my colleagues will agree with me, at the end of that process, that we owe it to them to do better today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, this budget is not about reducing deficit or establishing a regime of fiscal responsibility. This is a budget to dismantle the national safety net system and to transfer those savings to the wealthiest individuals and corporations. Even the Appropriations Chairman, Chairman HAL ROGERS, thinks that this budget is "Draconian."

If you want a perfect example of Republican ideology and book cooking, look no further than H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013.

Republicans want to force the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to use their discredited models to help them mask the true effect of their slash and burn agenda, while at the same time, denying the use of their pseudo-math to the one committee where it would hurt them, the Appropriations Committee. They want to pretend all day long that the discredited "tax-cuts = revenue growth" model will do wonders for America, while denying the fact that the economically proven model of "investment = growth" will bring the much needed prosperity and equality that our citizens desperately want and need.

Defense spending is certainly important, but this budget is a complete failure of imagination when it comes to defending this country. Defense is not simply about bullets, bombs and brigades. We also defend this country militarily and economically through making sure we have an educated citizenry. At the very least, please tell me that you understand that our war materiel is the most sophisticated in the world. Please tell me that you understand that we, at the very least, need educated men and women to operate this equipment. Well, this education does not miraculously appear overnight. Indeed, their journey to where they are today started many years ago. And sure, some of them did not come from wealthy families and yes, some of our men and women in uniform had to rely on federal programs like Head Start, but that is never anything to be ashamed of and is certainly not something we should now turn our backs on. To defend a country as large and complex as ours is a multifaceted endeavor, an endeavor this budget utterly fails to meet.

Can "general welfare," a constitutional obligation of Congress, be defined as a budget that places the heaviest burden on the vast majority of Americans, while bestowing the greatest benefits on the wealthiest?

What is the appropriate level of shared sacrifice that ought to be required? One percent of Americans take home over one quarter of all income every year, and have seen those incomes rise 18 percent in the last decade. But those in the middle have seen their incomes fall. Why do you think that those who have suffered most severely under this recession should bear the greatest burden of hardship? What does this budget do to help those people, as opposed to the wealthy who will be fine no matter what we do with this budget?

In your budget you say, "The first job of the federal government is securing the safety and liberty of its citizens from threats at home and abroad." Why is the only threat to the American Dream that the Republicans deem worthy

of funding the one that comes from abroad? While this budget increases defense spending above pre-sequester levels over the next decade, it ignores the very real threat to the American dream at home, by increasing inequality, and removing any hope for struggling families to move up to or stay in the middle class.

How will deep spending cuts in service-oriented Federal programs help citizens weather the economic crisis? How will huge tax breaks for the wealthiest enable the poor and middle class to obtain jobs? With individual income and payroll taxes comprising 82 percent of revenue resources, and corporate taxes making up only 9 percent, how does this budget anticipate growing the economy when the burden falls disproportionately on those who need the most help right now?

Which specific tax provisions will you target in order to make the "broadening" savings claimed in this budget? The biggest four are (1) the home mortgage interest deduction, (2) the exclusion of employer-provided health benefits, (3) charitable deductions, and (4) state and local tax deductions. What specific tax loopholes do you propose to close?

Where, specifically, does all the projected revenue come from? This budget cuts the top marginal income tax rate to 25 percent, the lowest the rate has been since Herbert Hoover. Yet the budget also predicts that federal tax revenues will increase by nearly \$600 billion by 2021. President Reagan used a similar model which has since been discredited as unworkable, and which, on his watch, drastically increased the deficit and national debt.

How will Americans receive the health care they need if their Medicare premium and out-of-pocket costs become unaffordable under this proposed privatized system? Is the value of the vouchers linked to health care cost growth?

Americans already pay more than twice as much per persons for health care as other wealthy countries with the same or longer life expectancies.

Since the government pays for about half of this country's health care, almost all of which is actually provided by the private sector, future health care costs are increasing because of private sector costs, not the government.

Is it your contention that eliminating government support will suddenly render health care affordable? Or does this budget foresee the government washing its hands of the need to ensure quality health care for its citizens?

How does converting Medicaid into a block grant bear relation to the actual need for Medicaid services? When two-thirds of participants are seniors and persons with disabilities, when half of long-term care is covered by Medicaid, and when 70 percent of people over the age of 65 will require long-term care services at some point, how will cutting \$732 billion benefit these Americans?

Is the goal to control costs or to shift costs? The CBO says that privatizing Medicare will shift costs onto seniors. In 2030, traditional Medicare costs would be less than the private costs envisioned by the GOP budget. Under this plan seniors will be out of pocket for about two-thirds the cost of privatized care, as opposed to about one-quarter under traditional Medicare.

Isn't it true that rising costs and financial risk simply would migrate from the Federal budget to seniors' household budgets? Wouldn't that

mean seniors would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both?

How do you propose to provide relief to millions of homeowners in this housing crisis? This budget dramatically cuts funding for public housing assistance, foreclosure mitigation programs, and neighborhood development activities. How do you anticipate that communities will be able to meet the housing needs of their most disadvantaged residents?

The Republican budget resolution will cut housing aid to 10,000 veterans each year, approximately one-third of the total number of homeless vets. How does the Republican budget plan on taking care of newly homeless veterans? Is cutting these services a fair reward for those who risked their lives in service to our country?

If students can no longer rely on Pell grants and other Federal assistance for their college education, how do you propose to increase the number of students going to college and improve America's system of education? This budget reduces Pell grants to the 2008 level and eliminates the grant increases that Democrats achieved previously, bringing the maximum grant award back down to \$5,000. But the budget does not seem to provide even enough funding for that amount.

In this budget, Republicans slash transportation investment in 2015 by \$52 billion. Do Republicans think that our infrastructure will magically fix itself, like they apparently do the rising inequality that this budget perpetuates? How many bridges have to collapse, and how many schools have to remain un-built so that we can provide another increase to our already bloated defense budget?

Madam Speaker, I am asking a lot of questions, because this budget does nothing but raise them, and provides no answers. It provides no answer for how we will help middle class families as they continue to struggle on Chairman RYAN's road to ruin. It provides no answer for how we will help low income families send their children to college. It provides no answer for how we will provide quality healthcare to our seniors and those who are one medical emergency away from bankruptcy. It provides no answer for how we will provide housing assistance to those who have served their country and need a helping hand getting back on their feet. The fact that we have to even debate these measures is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. Not only can we do better, we have an obligation to the American people to do better. This budget utterly fails to meet that obligation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 544 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4415) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the

bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 4415 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 377) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4415 or H.R. 377.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition.

Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the bill (H.R. 1871) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to

House Resolution 539, the amendment recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1871

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 "Baseline Reform Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. THE BASELINE.

Section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 257. THE BASELINE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) For any fiscal year, the baseline refers to a projection of current-year levels of new budget authority, outlays, or receipts and the surplus or deficit for the current year, the budget year, and the ensuing nine outyears based on laws enacted through the applicable date.

"(2) The baselines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be prepared annually.

"(b) DIRECT SPENDING AND RECEIPTS.—For the budget year and each outyear, estimates for direct spending in the baseline shall be calculated as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Laws providing or creating direct spending and receipts are assumed to operate in the manner specified in those laws for each such year and funding for entitlement authority is assumed to be adequate to make all payments required by those laws.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—(A)(i) No program established by a law enacted on or before the date of enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 shall be assumed to expire in the budget year or the outyears. The scoring of new programs with estimated outlays greater than \$50,000,000 a year shall be based on scoring by the Committees on the Budget or OMB, as applicable. OMB, CBO, and the Committees on the Budget shall consult on the scoring of such programs where there are differences between CBO and OMB.

"(ii) On the expiration of the suspension of a provision of law that is suspended under section 171 of Public Law 104-127 and that authorizes a program with estimated fiscal year outlays that are greater than \$50,000,000, for purposes of clause (i), the program shall be assumed to continue to operate in the same manner as the program operated immediately before the expiration of the suspension.

"(B) The increase for veterans' compensation for a fiscal year is assumed to be the same as that required by law for veterans' pensions unless otherwise provided by law enacted in that session.

"(C) Excise taxes dedicated to a trust fund, if expiring, are assumed to be extended at current rates.

"(D) If any law expires before the budget year or any outyear, then any program with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 that operates under that law shall be assumed to continue to operate under that law as in effect immediately before its expiration.

"(3) HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall be included in all calculations required by this Act.

"(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For the budget year and each of the nine ensuing outyears, the baseline shall be calculated

using the following assumptions regarding all amounts other than those covered by subsection (b):

"(1) ESTIMATED APPROPRIATIONS.—Budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level provided for the budget year in full-year appropriation Acts. If for any account a full-year appropriation has not yet been enacted, budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level available in the current year.

"(2) CURRENT-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, for any account, a continuing appropriation is in effect for less than the entire current year, then the current-year amount shall be assumed to equal the amount that would be available if that continuing appropriation covered the entire fiscal year. If law permits the transfer of budget authority among budget accounts in the current year, the current-year level for an account shall reflect transfers accomplished by the submission of, or assumed for the current year in, the President's original budget for the budget year.

"(d) UP-TO-DATE CONCEPTS.—In calculating the baseline for the budget year or each of the nine ensuing outyears, current-year amounts shall be calculated using the concepts and definitions that are required for that budget year.

"(e) ASSET SALES.—Amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall not be included in estimates under section 251, 251A, 252, or 253 of this part or section 5 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 if that sale would result in a financial cost to the Government as determined pursuant to scorekeeping guidelines.

"(f) LONG-TERM BUDGET OUTLOOK.—On or before July 1 of each year, CBO shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate the Long-Term Budget Outlook for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year and at least the ensuing 40 fiscal years."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1871 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am pleased to be down here with the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman whose opinion and counsel I have respect for.

What I love about the Budget Committee is that we have a chance to talk about issues that are defined by numbers in committee, but whose outcome is a difference in people's lives back home.

After all, the reason the gentleman from Maryland is the highest ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee is not because he cares about math, it is because he cares about people. That is

who the Budget Committee consists of, Madam Speaker.

The bill that is before us today is a bill first conceived in this House by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). I happen to be on the Budget Committee, I happen to have passion on this issue, so my name exists to carry this bill forward; but it has been an idea that has been around in this institution, and it says this.

We have all seen it. We have all been in townhall meetings, Madam Speaker, where you say: this is what we have done to spending for next year.

And somebody is going to raise their hand, and they are going to say: Rob, is that Washington math, or is that real math? Is this one of those things where you raise spending by \$10, but you call it a cut because you predicted you would raise spending by \$20 instead?

How sad is that? How sad is that, that in a country run by the American people, that they have to ask their representatives: Is this real math, or is this Washington math?

This bill, Madam Speaker, puts a stop to Washington math forever. It says this: don't assume you are going to spend more money next year than you spent last year unless the law requires it.

Social Security is a good example of that. We raise Social Security each and every year. Why? Because the law of the land requires it, but not so in Federal budgeting rules.

In the crazy world of Federal budgeting, Madam Speaker, you raise spending next year just because. The assumption is: well, of course, they are going to spend more money than they did last year. Are they getting more bang for their buck?

I don't know. Is the crisis still there? Does it still need to be funded? I don't know, but we are going to assume more dollars go out the door.

My bill asks one thing and one thing only, Madam Speaker, that is to justify the American people's tax dollars when they are spent. If you need more money next year, come to Congress and say so.

If it is a priority for my constituents back home, I promise you, you will get my "yes" vote, but gone are the days of assuming Congress will always spend more, irrespective of the merits.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

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

I appreciate my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for kicking off this debate.

As he indicated earlier, as we debate the budgets, there will be differences of opinion and differences of philosophy, but when it comes to math, there is not a Republican math, and there is not a Democratic math. When you run a math equation, you get the same result whether you are a Republican or a Democrat.

What this bill attempts to do is to legislate away inflation. Gee, that would be so nice if we could pass a law and inflation would go away. What is worse is this bill then says that we are going to put together budgets on the assumption that there is no inflation, on the assumption that the price of goods and services doesn't change over time, and if you do that, you will get very misleading results in your budget.

Now, the gentleman talked about Washington math. Madam Speaker, I would just like to show you the change in the cost of a hamburger from the last 10-year period. We do our budgets in 10-year windows. The price of a hamburger in 2004 was \$2.71. The price of that same hamburger 10 years later, in 2014, is \$4.62. That is not Washington math. That is reality-based math.

Here is what this Republican proposal would do.

It wants to take that fantasy land math and apply it to our budgets. Here is the chart. If you applied that idea in the budgets that we had from 2004 to today, you would assume that the price of that hamburger or of any goods and services that we bought as the Federal Government would remain the same—no inflation, no change—but that is not the reality. The reality is, between 2004 and 2014, we had inflation, and the costs of goods and services went up. The good news is that we did not have this proposal in effect from 2004 to 2014, so we didn't have this detachment from reality. Yet what our Republican colleagues want to do is say, from now on—from 2014 on—when the Congressional Budget Office puts together its estimations of future budgets, it has got to assume away inflation. Presto. As you can see, over time, that would become further and further detached from reality, not Washington reality but economic reality.

Here is what would happen if you budgeted that way.

For \$2.71 today, you don't get as big a hamburger, right? So apply that idea to an aircraft carrier. We have 10-year budgets. The gentleman's proposal is to pretend that, over the next 10 years, there will be no increase in the price of the inputs to making that aircraft carrier. Just assume it away. Inflation. Do you know what? If you plan that way, at the end of the day, you are going to have half an aircraft carrier in your budget just like you would have a half a hamburger in your budget.

Imagine a business that was planning ahead for the next 10 years, trying to do a profit and loss statement, and it had to calculate what it was going to cost it to buy inputs to its manufacturing process—energy inputs, oil and gas, other inputs of material it has to purchase. Then let's say that, today, it miraculously assumed there was no increase in the costs of those inputs. Boy, that would be nice, but do you know what? That private business would go under, and that business would be sued for malpractice by its shareholders.

Why would we do something to the Federal Government that we would never allow to happen in the private sector that would result in a private sector business's going belly up?

I would just say, Madam Speaker, that the reason the Congressional Budget Office projects the budgets as they do today—the reason they include the estimated costs of inflation—is not that they do Washington math. It is that they can go out and go to McDonald's and find out that—do you know what?—the price of a Big Mac is not the same today as it was 10 years ago. It would be misleading to pretend, as we put together our next 10-year budgets, that the price of aircraft carriers and the price of education and the price of providing health care to our veterans will be the same. If you assume that, at the end of the day, you shortchange those veterans, you shortchange that defense policy, you shortchange our kids because, just like you can only buy a half a hamburger today for what you could have in 2004, you are not going to be able to buy the same education for kids and the same military 10 years from now.

We are not talking about Washington math. This is a case of basic math. As I said, it shouldn't be a Republican math or a Democratic math. We would all love to repeal inflation. That is not the real world. Let's stick with real-world budgeting. If we get away from that, we are going to be in a world of trouble here in the United States Congress.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the control of the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds.

I think I have got one of the best chart teams on Capitol Hill. I will say to my friend from Maryland that that is a great Big Mac chart, and I think it drives home my point exactly, which is that Federal Government math assumes that, if you bought a Big Mac 10 years ago, you are still buying a Big Mac today. I just wonder if that is true. I have switched to the value menu. I get the McDouble from time to time for 99 cents. The Spicy McChicken is now a part of what I do. I have to get into my wallet and justify the expense, and when prices double, sometimes we, as Americans, have to substitute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As you know, the value meal on that McDonald's menu 10 years ago cost more than the value meal today. This is just to get about math and budgeting in a transparent way.

Mr. WOODALL. In reclaiming my time, absolutely, inflation is not going to go away, but we have to make tough choices, and this bill requires us to make those choices in a transparent way for the American people.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who first said that we must be transparent in this way, that we must be fair and honest in this way. He is the original author of the Baseline Reform Act.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am immensely grateful to my friend ROB WOODALL.

Madam Speaker, it was back in the 1990s when I heard what apparently was a loveable, old fuzball who turned out to be Rush Limbaugh. He was talking about the absurdity of the United States Government doing something that no person, no family, no business, no charity in all of America could do.

With due respect to my friend who just spoke, Mr. VAN HOLLEN says businesses would go out of business. I would challenge anybody in this room to show me a business, to show me a family, to show me an individual, to show me a charity that has an automatic increase in every year's budget, because America can't do that. I was shocked that this was going on. I mean, in the Army, I helped with the budget. In the private sector, I prepared budgets. As a district judge, I prepared a budget. It had to be approved. We never got an automatic increase. You had to justify any change in anything. If you needed an increase, you had to show why that was important.

I got to Congress, never dreaming that that would not have been taken care of when Republicans took the majority, but in my freshman term in 2005 and 2006, the Republican chair of the Budget Committee said we have to do the automatic increases. I said, Why? He said, Because it is the law. I was shocked. We make the law. We can change the law. Then, of course, our friends across the aisle took the majority, and for 4 years, there was no chance of eliminating the automatic increase in every Federal department's budget, but then we got the majority back.

For all of the disagreements I have had with the Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER agreed that if PAUL RYAN passed a zero-baseline budget—ending the automatic increases—out of committee, then he would bring it to the floor. It meant we would have to have the right guy marshaling this bill. Some tweaking was done, and I will be forever grateful to my friend ROB WOODALL, who is as brilliant as his predecessor, a dear friend, John Linder. He took this bill, and he marshaled it through. PAUL RYAN kept his word, and I will be forever grateful for that. It came to the floor, and we voted it through, and the Senate wouldn't take it up.

For those who want to talk about the children, I am not hearing a lot of that

talk today because, when I talk to college students, high school students, junior high students, they are wondering why they are going to have to pay the debts that we were not responsible enough to pay ourselves. There is not a good answer. It is absolutely immoral and negligent—it is self-indulgent—to say that one generation like ours is so much more important that we have to spend future generations' money. Yes, if there is inflation, let's deal with it that year, but I have heard enough stories from people who are talking about, gee, this department is apparently out there, saying, Spend all your money. Don't leave any because, if you don't, you won't get as much next year. Of course, they get automatic increases every year, so they have got to spend their money. That is no way to run a country. It is not right.

There are some issues I have with the budget, but I know the heart of the man who was behind that, and I know he wants future generations not to be burdened with our negligent handling of our money. So it is time that we end the automatic increases in every Federal budget. When my friend across the aisle was talking about, gee, you could end up with half an aircraft carrier—good grief—we have lost aircraft carriers because of those automatic increases every year for decades now. There are aircraft carriers that won't be there because we couldn't control ourselves as we had to automatically increase everything we spent.

Madam Speaker, it is time we did the responsible thing and ended the automatic increase in every single Federal budget for next year, and I will be continuing in my gratitude to my friend ROB WOODALL.

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

In response to the gentleman from Texas, I think it is important that we be careful in the rhetoric we use on these subjects. It is incorrect to say that, by law, there is an automatic increase in the Federal budget and that that applies to the discretionary budget. That is absolutely incorrect.

What we are talking about here and what this bill concerns is the CBO baseline that is used. The CBO reflects inflation in that baseline as does every serious budgeting professional and forecaster and economist in the real world, but they don't do it because the law has told them they have to or because Democrats have told them they have to; they do it because that is what serious budget forecasters do. They know that inflation is a reality, and they believe that the baselines they use and the projections and forecasts they use should reflect that reality. I think that is an important clarification. We choose to budget and to spend at the level that we choose to do so each and every year. What the CBO does as a matter of baseline projections is a different matter.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Baseline Reform Act does nothing to address the economic challenges facing American families. It does not create a single job. It does not renew expired unemployment compensation for the millions of workers and their families who are struggling right now. It does not raise the minimum wage to a living wage. What it would do is essentially impose sequestration on steroids in our budgetary baseline, and we all pretty much agree that sequestration was a terrible idea that was holding the country back.

The bill in front of us today simply establishes an unrealistic and misleading benchmark against which to measure changes in government spending.

□ 1400

Requiring the CBO and the OMB to construct budget baselines without adjusting for inflation will serve only to weaken fiscal discipline and result in wildly inaccurate long-term spending projections.

Madam Speaker, inflation is an accepted part of a growing economy. In fact, the United States has seen year-to-year increases in the prices of goods and services over every calendar year but one since 1956, the notable exception being 2009 when our economy was mired in the Great Recession. On average, inflation has hovered near 4 percent annually over that nearly six-decade window. It is simply inevitable that goods and services become more expensive over time and the purchasing power of the dollar will be weaker in 10 years than it is today.

Although 2 to 3 percent annual inflation may not appear to be significant at first blush, rest assured that even such a modest inflationary rate will produce considerable price differences over the long term. Using the Federal Reserve's targeted 2 percent annual rate of inflation, an item that costs \$100 today will cost \$122 just 10 years from now. At 3 percent annual inflation, that same \$100 good will cost almost \$135 10 years from now. In total, the price of goods and services in the United States have increased by more than 1000 percent since World War II.

Under longstanding budget rules, CBO and OMB assume that future discretionary appropriations at the account level will be at the same dollar levels but adjusted for inflation. Why do they do this? They do it because it represents a more accurate analysis of our Nation's actual spending habits. The aggregate total of defense and non-defense appropriations are then adjusted down to the spending cap levels

set in law, but even those spending caps are higher than the freeze mandated by this bill.

The CBO's current projections for the next 10 years assume that discretionary spending will be at the caps imposed by the Budget Control Act through 2021, rather than the inflation-adjusted levels. But changing the definition of the budget baseline will have an outsized impact on future budget projections.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman such additional time as he may consume.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Discretionary appropriations are responsible for many of the programs that Americans hold sacred, including education, veterans' benefits, defense, disease research and control, food safety, transportation projects, and the list goes on. By eliminating inflation adjustments and freezing discretionary spending over 10 years, the baseline would be a benchmark that builds in real—and deep—cuts in Federal programs.

The so-called "reforms" contained within this bill are nothing more than efforts at constraining future Federal spending through budget trickery. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a champion for budget transparency and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, our Constitution assigns the principal responsibility over the public purse to the House of Representatives. Under that constitutional doctrine, a dollar can't be spent by this government unless the House says it gets spent. Yet today, spending increasingly seems to be out of our hands, driven automatically by a variety of provisions and practices that thwart the very design of the Constitution. Roughly two-thirds of our spending is for entitlements, over which we have lost any direct control in the appropriations process. That is the big problem.

But there are other reasons for this problem as well that this bill addresses. One of them is the current process by which we calculate the baseline from which we begin our annual budget negotiations. Any family would begin its budget process by asking, for example: What did we spend for groceries last year? Once it has that baseline, then it would begin to adjust for changing circumstances. The price of milk is going up. Should we cut back or look for substitutes? Or should we cut back on something else to afford that increase?

That is the rational process known to every reasonably well-managed family. This process gives budgeters, whether they are a household or the House of Representatives, the ability to adjust for changing priorities, needs, and conditions. Yet the Federal budget process

builds in a variety of spending increases above and beyond what we had previously agreed we could afford—before our budget deliberations even begin.

That same family doesn't begin its budget process by building in assumptions of how it might change its spending in the future. For example, if it took vacations the last several years, it doesn't automatically budget for a vacation next year until it has met its other needs, that is, it doesn't budget for decisions that it has not yet made. But we do, quite routinely.

Thus, we begin the budget process with a baseline that hides the many tough decisions that a budget requires: How do we cope with price increases? Should we continue to deviate from our spending plan next year just because we did last year?

The current budget process denies us the perspective that any family has when prices go up or conditions change. It often prevents us from asking the questions that a family would ask under these circumstances. Instead, we sweep these issues under the rug—or, more precisely, we sweep them into the baseline.

Does this bill make our job harder? Yes, because it requires us to figure out how to cope with changing conditions. Right now, we start our budget by assuming that we are hostages to our spending. This measure makes us the masters of that spending. That is a harder job, but that is our job.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Mr. WOODALL for all of his hard work on this issue, as well as Mr. GOHMERT, who was here a moment ago, for raising this issue, for keeping focus and attention on it, and for bringing this much-needed reform through the House Budget Committee and to the House floor.

This bill basically fixes a real quirk in our budget process. Under the current law, the Congressional Budget Office assumes every discretionary spending account gets an increase every year to keep up with inflation.

What does that mean? This means that this increase is built into the baseline, and the baseline is our starting point of spending. It is our starting point of budgeting. So every year, Congress moves the line forward. It assumes that there is always going to be an increase in every one of these programs, regardless of the facts on the ground. There is no consideration to whether a program is working or not or even whether it is still necessary.

Under this bill, the baseline would just show the previous year's funding level. That is basically what we are saying. If we are spending X amount of dollars today, when we write next

year's budget, we will start with X, and then we will make a decision here in Congress: Should it be more or less or the same?

That is not how it works today. We spend X today, then there is an automatic increase, and then we decide how to budget after that automatic increase.

We should write the Federal budget just like families write their own budgets. They don't get an automatic increase. They don't get to decide like that.

We have got record deficits. We have got an unprecedented debt. Our job here in Congress is to make decisions. It is to set priorities. It is to look at the hardworking taxpayers that are working so hard to pay their taxes, to raise their families, and tell them we are going to watch their money more closely than just assuming automatically each and every year we can just take more from them and then decide how to spend more on top of that. It is no way to run a budget. It is no way to run a government budget or a family budget or a business budget.

So that is all we are saying. This, I think, is an inflated baseline which is a smoke-and-mirror move. What we are saying is take away the smoke and the mirrors, start from scratch, and then make informed decisions from there. That is why I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for all of his hard work on this. That is why I encourage all Members on both sides of the aisle to support this much-needed reform.

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

Madam Speaker, I think this may be one of the more oversold bills we have heard in a while.

We keep hearing references to autopilot spending in mandatory programs. This bill doesn't have anything to do with them.

We keep hearing references to automatic annual increases in spending. We don't have such automatic annual increases.

This is about the budget baseline that the CBO assumes for purposes of helping us make our decisions.

We keep hearing about families and how they budget. I would submit, Madam Speaker, that any family that has reason to believe that some part of their budget is going to increase in the coming year had better reflect that in the reality of their budget or else they are not going to be able to meet their needs.

If they have reason to believe their rent is going up, if they have reason to believe that their utilities are going to cost more, if they have reason to believe that anything that they spend money on is going to cost more, in the real world of America, families do include that in their budget. That is called reality, and that is what the CBO does.

I would love to face a future in which Big Macs cost the same thing 10 years

from now as they do today. I wish I were still paying \$2.71 for a Big Mac, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN's chart showed. But the truth is, in the real world, we know that is not how it works. We know that inflation is reality. If we were in a deflationary or a zero-inflation environment, then I suspect the CBO would create its baselines differently. But we are not, and no one is arguing that we are.

They are just asking us to suspend disbelief and try to legislate away the reality of inflation. Why? So that the budget-cutting, government-reducing agendas that we hear in this House year after year might appear to be a little less draconian in the outyears. That is not a very compelling argument when you think about it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend from California that I do not have any further speakers remaining. I am prepared to close.

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

This bill does not create any jobs. It doesn't save one dime. It doesn't reduce spending. It simply asks the CBO to pretend that the reality of inflation does not exist. It is not a serious proposal. It is a bill that was heard and passed largely on party lines in the last Congress. It didn't go anywhere. It is not going to go anywhere this time either. This is political theater at a time when we really need to be talking in this institution about the real needs of America.

With that, I request a "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I brought down a chart that takes us from 2006 out to 2044. For almost everyone here in the Chamber, that it going to get into the meaty part of our lifetime.

What it shows with the green line, Madam Speaker, is what revenues have been in this country, historic revenues going backward and projected going forward, not in dollar values but as a percent of our economy. What it shows us is that revenues going forward will continue to be historically normal at just under 20 percent of GDP.

But the red line, Madam Speaker, represents projected spending. This is the projected spending if we do nothing at all. We don't need to show up for work another day in this Chamber. We don't need to come down here and pass one new law, spend one more dollar. The spending on autopilot, Madam Speaker, is represented by the red line. You see it rising off the top of the graph.

Spending is the problem. For decades, since 1974 and the passage of the Congressional Budget Act, there has been an assumption that spending was going to rise each and every year. My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle called it inflation. Inflation existed before the Congressional Budget

Act was passed. It is going to exist after the Congressional Budget Act is modified or repealed. Inflation is an economic certainty, and that is not the topic of discussion today.

The topic of discussion today is who makes decisions when it comes to America's budgeting. If spending is the problem, if it is spending that is rising faster than revenues, if it is spending that has changed over the past decade, who should make those determinations?

Here is the thing, Madam Speaker. I will go back to that Washington math that I talked about coming from town-hall meetings, because I know everyone here has been a part of that. I know everyone here has had that hand go up when we talk about cutting spending and they say: Is that a real cut or is that a Washington cut? When you say "cutting spending," ROB, do you mean cutting spending or do you mean that you are only going to increase it by \$10 and the projection was it is was going to go up by \$20?

Only here is increasing spending by \$10 considered a cut. There is no family in America that considers that a cut.

□ 1415

Think about your budget back home, Madam Speaker, whatever that is. I remember buying milk for \$1.99 a gallon. I am a big milk drinker. Skim is my favorite. But \$1.99 I was comfortable paying. Today I am prepared to pay more—I am. There has been inflation. I am prepared to pay \$4 a gallon for a gallon of milk.

I didn't assume that I was going to drink the same amount of milk every day going forward. In fact, I confess, I found powdered milk, Madam Speaker. It was on the discount shelf at Giant. I got two gallons of powdered milk for \$2.25 total. That is \$1.12 a gallon for that powdered milk. I am not paying \$4 a gallon. I am paying \$1.12 because I have to make choices.

American families don't get unlimited dollars to spend. Though, the Federal Government pretends like it does.

We are borrowing from future generations every time we make a decision. So this bill says one thing and one thing only: Who makes decisions for America? Is it going to be the Congressional Budget Office? Is it going to be a statutory baseline, or is it going to be the men and women in this room who put themselves up for election every 2 years?

Madam Speaker, for me, the answer is clear. I have got a Constitution that lays it out fairly clearly here in my pocket. I don't think I need to read it to folks here to get them to understand because I think we all share that view.

We share the view that difficult decisions are not supposed to be made by unelected bureaucrats in a back room. Difficult decisions are supposed to be made by us, right here in this Chamber.

If you have a project back home in your district, if you see a national pri-

ority, and you want to spend a penny more than we spent last year, come to the floor of the House and make your case. Make your case. For Pete's sake, I am a huge supporter of Federal research. The work that goes on at the CDC down in Atlanta, the work that goes on in Maryland at NIH, it is amazing. Nobody else is going to do that if we don't come together and do it here in this body.

I have got to tell you something. I don't need a baseline. I don't need a bureaucrat. I don't need any Washington math to come and make the case that we ought to spend more at NIH next year than we did last year. Why do I not need them? Because I believe it. Because my constituents elected me to stand up for Federal research. We came here to make these tough decisions.

Back in the day, before the class of 2010, before the class of 2012—back in the day, there is good reason to assume that Federal spending was going to go up every year because every year since the end of the Korean war that is exactly what happened. I watched it. Every year, we spent more than we did in the last.

Something has changed in this town, Madam Speaker, and I think the thing that has changed in this town are the people that the folks back home are sending to this town. I think the town's actually the same. I think the folks back home are sending new folks, folks like the gentleman from California, folks like the gentleman from North Carolina. Sending people to town with the direction of not trading away their children's future because they are afraid to make tough decisions today.

So, what does that mean? That means in the 4 years I have been in this institution, Madam Speaker, we have spent less money in these discretionary accounts that this bill would affect every single year than we did the one before. Think about that.

In the absence of this legislation that I am proposing, we are going to go assume that spending goes up every year, but the reality that my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about, the reality of inflation, the reality of congressional decisionmaking, the reality of our budget is that that spending has gone down, not just from 2010 to 2011, though it did; not just again from 2011 to 2012, though it did; not just again from 2012 to 2013, though it did; and not just again from 2013 to 2014, but it did that too. Four years in a row we spent less the following year than we did the year before.

When are we going to get back to that 2010 level of spending? Is it going to be next year? No, it is not. Is it going to be the year after that? No, not by the budgets that we will be passing on the floor here this week. What about the year after? No, not then either.

So, the opponents of this legislation suggest that we should create a process in Federal law that assumes that spending goes up every single year, and

yet the reality of this institution, as it exists today, not as it existed 10 years ago, not as it existed 20 years ago, not as it existed in 1974, when this legislation was first enacted, but as it exists today, is the responsible men and women in this Chamber who are prioritizing taxpayer dollars in such a way that for the entire 10-year window we won't spend a penny more than we did on day one. That is the reality.

Could we spend more each and every year? Of course we could. Could we borrow more and more from our children and grandchildren and ask them to pay it back tomorrow with interest? Of course we could. Did our constituents elect us to come here and make difficult, difficult, difficult discussions? They did.

I was in the Rules Committee last night, Madam Speaker. My colleague from Massachusetts said, Some of these decisions have real consequences for folks back home. I disagree. I think every decision has real consequences for folks back home. Every single one.

This legislation simply asks that before we spend another penny from folks back home that we come to the floor of this House, to the committee chambers around this institution, and make the case for why it is worth doing. I challenge you to look in the eyes of young people whose future we are mortgaging and suggest that they deserve anything less.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1871 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING CUTS IN EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND SAFETY PROTECTIONS.

The amendment made by section 2 shall not apply to the following:

(1) Student loans or available per-pupil expenditures for the education of children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

(2) Benefits, payments, or funds to expedite unprocessed claims for veterans who have

pending disability compensation or education claims.

(3) Programs to protect the safety of patients in nursing homes and other places of care to ensure compliance with the law and best health care practices.

(4) Air traffic safety control, food safety inspectors, or law enforcement officers under the COPS program.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, and it will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today, the Baseline Reform Act, would politicize what is otherwise a simple, straightforward method of accurately measuring changes and spending policies. It is misguided.

Here is why. It mandates that the Congressional Budget Office assume current discretionary spending is frozen indefinitely in its baseline projections rather than adjusted for inflation. This change would undermine the usefulness of the CBO's baselines.

It would make it more difficult to measure the real-world impact of changes in discretionary spending at both the program and budget function levels. Were this bill to be enacted into law and inflation remained at current projections, the CBO's baseline projections by the end of the budget window, or 10 years out, would purchase about one-fifth less than in the current year.

My amendment would blunt the damage this bill could cause, and it would protect many of our hardworking and most vulnerable constituents. Specifically, my amendment would protect programs that help students and help families afford the skyrocketing costs of higher education. It would protect children with disabilities from being kicked out of the classroom. It would protect our brave veterans and the benefits they have earned and deserve through their valiant service to our Nation. It would protect vulnerable seniors in nursing homes. It would protect our air traffic controllers who keep us safe when we travel, our food safety inspectors who help protect us from disease, and first responders who help keep our communities safe.

Madam Speaker, when I am home traveling in my district every weekend, I hear from people who this bill would harm: young people who are trying to better themselves through higher education but struggling to afford the rising cost of college; veterans who are caught in the VA backlog and trying to just get the care that they need; seniors who worked hard and played by

the rules their entire lives, who deserve to live out their golden years in dignity; and law enforcement officers, like my husband, Gerry, a captain with the Rock Island County Sheriff's Department and commander of the Quad Cities Bomb Squad, who rely on programs like the COPS program to help keep our community safe.

Madam Speaker, my amendment would help protect the smart investment we have made in the future of our country: in our seniors, in our veterans, and in those who fight to protect us and keep us safe.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the motion to recommit. I will read from line 1. It says: Section 3: Prohibiting cuts in education, health, and safety protections.

I said something that generally speaking here on this floor we agree on, but it makes the case of why this bill is so necessary. Because this bill has nothing to do with cuts in any account, no cuts in education, no cuts in health, no cuts in safety protections.

This bill does one thing and one thing only, and that is to say, let's spend next year what we spent this year, unless someone makes the case to do more.

I thought the gentlewoman from Illinois made a powerful case for why it is important to pay close attention to these accounts and focus the dollars on those accounts that we can do the most good. But to solve this misunderstanding that there are cuts in baseline budgeting, to solve this misunderstanding that prevails across the conversations across America, let's support H.R. 1871. I reject this motion to recommit.

I support the underlying bill, Madam Speaker, and I ask that we can bring fairness and transparency to the budget again for the first time since 1974.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam 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 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544; and adoption of House Resolution 544, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 221, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—221

Aderholt	Calvert	DesJarlais
Amash	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Cantor	Duffy
Bachmann	Capito	Duncan (SC)
Bachus	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chabot	Ellmers
Barr	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Barton	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Benishek	Coffman	Fleischmann
Bentivolio	Cole	Fleming
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Black	Conaway	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cook	Fox
Boustany	Cotton	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Gardner
Bridenstine	Crawford	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gibbs
Broun (GA)	Daines	Gibson
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Bucshon	Denham	Gohmert
Burgess	Dent	Goodlatte
Byrne	DeSantis	Gosar

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Keating	Runyan
Brown (FL)	Lewis	Schwartz
Campbell	McAllister	Stewart
Carter	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Fincher	Neal	
Frelinghuysen	Perlmutter	
Hanna		

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Keating	Runyan
Brown (FL)	Lewis	Schwartz
Campbell	McAllister	Stewart
Carter	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Fincher	Moran	Visclosky
Frelinghuysen	Neal	
Hanna	Perlmutter	

□ 1456

Messrs. SHIMKUS, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and MICA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. COHEN, HASTINGS of Florida, GARAMENDI, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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. HUFFMAN: Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Amodei	Bachus
Amash	Bachmann	Barber

NOES—185

Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bera (CA)	Clay	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Duckworth
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Edwards
Blumenauer	Cohen	Ellison
Bonamici	Connolly	Engel
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Enyart
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Esty
Bustos	Courtney	Farr
Butterfield	Crowley	Fattah
Capps	Cuellar	Foster
Capuano	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Carney	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Gallego
Cartwright	DeGette	Garamendi
Castor (FL)	Delaney	Garcia
Castro (TX)	DeLauro	Grayson
Chu	DeBene	Green, Al
Ciulline	Deutch	Green, Gene

□ 1503

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM APRIL 11, 2014, THROUGH APRIL 25, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, and providing for proceedings from April 11, 2014, through April 24, 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 190, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
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
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
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)

NAYS—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
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
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kinder
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Loebgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
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

Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
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
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

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
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—22

Barton
Bass
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Byrne
Carter
Fincher

Grijalva
Hanna
Hurt
Kaptur
Keating
Lewis
McAllister
Miller, Gary

Neal
Perlmutter
Runyan
Schwartz
Stewart
Stockman

□ 1510

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 169, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 544. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio

Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Cantor
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
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
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

García
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Joyce	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Keating	Runyan
Carter	McAllister	Schwartz
Fincher	Miller, Gary	Stewart
Hanna	Neal	Stockman

□ 1517

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

The resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 96.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 96.

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

□ 1521

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Govern-

ment for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 96, for the fiscal year 2015.

This is the fourth year we have done this—this being bringing a budget to the floor to balance the budget and pay down the national debt.

This is exactly what our economy needs today. We ask the Congressional Budget Office to look at this kind of deficit reduction. What would it do? Well, it is very clear that it would promote economic growth.

In 2024, economic output would be 1.8 percent higher than it otherwise would be. What does that mean? That means by getting our fiscal house in order, by balancing our budget, paying off our debt, and reducing the deficit, take-home pay for Americans will be \$1,100 higher than it otherwise would be if we don't do something like this. That is just part of our budget.

We also call for more job creation, economic growth policies like tax reform, and energy development. All of these things would help get our economy back on track.

I also understand that there is a lot of confusion about what is going on in our budget. I would like to spend a few moments sort of clarifying and clearing up some of that confusion.

First, our budget does repeal ObamaCare. Let me say it again. Our budget does repeal ObamaCare because we think it is going to do great damage to our economy, to our budget, to health care. We don't keep the tax hikes in ObamaCare. Instead, we propose revenue neutral comprehensive tax reform. Our critics like to claim we are keeping it. What we are saying is let's scrap this Tax Code in favor of a better Tax Code, including replacing ObamaCare taxes with pro-growth tax reform to create jobs, increase take-home pay, and get this economy growing.

Second, we end the raid on Medicare. The dirty little secret that the other side won't want to talk about is the fact that they turned Medicare into a piggy bank for ObamaCare. They raided \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for ObamaCare. We say that those savings from Medicare need to stay with Medicare to make it more solvent, and if some of those savings from Medicare are doing damage to the Medicare provider network, like reducing access to things like Medicare Advantage, then we have a mechanism in here to make sure that we can fix that, just like we did for the SGR, otherwise known as the "doc fix."

We think we need to save and strengthen this program, not only so that it is there intact for those in the near retirement, but for future generations who are facing a bankrupt program if we don't do something to reform it.

Second, we don't slash the safety net. If anything, we strengthen the safety net.

This administration has made all sorts of promises that it has no way of keeping, or it has made all sorts of promises and it is not telling us in any way how they are going to keep these promises. It has promised major expansions in programs like Medicaid and Pell grants. How they plan to pay for it, we have no idea. We refuse to be complicit with the demise of these programs.

We spend \$3.5 trillion over the next 10 years on Medicaid. Under our budget, program spending will continue to rise by population plus inflation. We grow the program each and every year after fiscal year 2016 onward. We simply slow the growth rate by giving Governors and State legislators more flexibility to customize these programs to meet the unique needs of their populations instead of cramming down their throats some one-size-fits-all Washington-knows-best approach, which has been failing the Medicare population in our health care provider network.

This budget spends \$600 billion over the next 10 years on food stamps. It is a program that has quadrupled since 2002. We propose to give Governors more flexibility so that they can customize this program to meet the needs of their populations, but not until 2019, until CBO says the economy will have recovered by then.

CBO says that the Pell grant is going bankrupt. It is going to face a fiscal shortfall in 2016 and every year thereafter. So instead of making all these Pell promises that the government has no way of keeping, the budget maintains the current Pell award, \$5,730, throughout each of the next 10 years and funds it.

Our budget all told cuts \$5.1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years. We do this by cutting waste, by cutting abuse, by stopping the age-old Washington practice of spending money we just don't have, and by making much needed reforms to government programs.

Our critics call this draconian. Look at it this way. On the current path, we are set to spend \$48 trillion of hard-working taxpayer dollars or borrow it from the next generation—\$48 trillion over the next 10 years. Under this path, we will spend \$43 trillion.

By contrast, under the current path, Federal Government spending is slated to rise by 5.2 percent on average for the next decade. Under this budget, it will rise by 3.5 percent over the next decade. Hardly draconian.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing compassionate about making promises that the government cannot keep. When that bill comes due, it is going to hurt the vulnerable, the first and the worst, and the voiceless. This is why we need to get spending under control.

Let me show you what we are proposing in a nutshell. The red shows you our national debt. Our national debt is on course to hit catastrophic levels. Our national debt is going to hit these catastrophic levels which guarantee that the next generation of Americans inherit a bleak future, a lower standard of living, a burden of debt that they cannot have a high standard of living with.

We in our generation have to make tough choices. We have got to face up to this issue. What we are saying here with this budget is, the sooner we get on top of our fiscal problems, the better off everybody is going to be.

□ 1530

We are saying, if we get ahead of these problems now, we can phase in reforms, such as Medicare reforms that don't even affect people in or near retirement. The sooner we tackle these fiscal problems, the better off everybody is going to be, the faster the economy grows, and the more we can guarantee that the next generation inherits a debt-free future.

We have never given the next generation a diminished future in this country before. That is the great legacy of this Nation, work hard and make tough choices, so that the next generation can be better off. We know, without a shadow of a doubt, that that is not going to be the case.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, we know that, in a couple of years, the debt starts taking back off, and we are back to \$1 trillion deficits. Our tax revenues are at an alltime high this year. The problem is that spending is outpacing that. The sooner we can get our fiscal house in order, the sooner we can create jobs and get economic growth.

The sooner we can bring solvency to our safety net, to our social contract, the more that people can depend on these programs, and the sooner we can bring these reforms to get our spending in line with our revenues, the faster we can pay off this debt.

Just like a family, a government that lives beyond its means today necessarily has to live below its means tomorrow. We want to make right by the

next generation. We want to grow this economy.

We want to create jobs and increase take-home pay, and we want to get people to work. That is what this budget is designed to do, and that is why I am proud to bring this balanced budget to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We are looking forward to the debate on the budget over the next couple of days. Chairman RYAN mentioned that the critics of this budget call it draconian. I would just point out to the gentleman that the Republican chairman of the House Appropriations Committee just referred to the budget that is before this House as draconian.

Now, the chairman and I do agree on one thing, which is that these budgets that we bring before this Congress reflect our different visions of America. They reflect the choices that we make. They show what we care about, and they show what we care less about. They are fundamentally different blueprints for the future of this country.

The President has presented a budget that will boost job growth, sharpen Americans' competitive edge, and expand opportunity in the United States of America. Now, we have before us the congressional Republican budget, and of all of the Republican budgets that we have seen on the floor of this House since 2010, this one is the worst for America.

Many will argue, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be taking this budget seriously because, after all, we have a short-term bipartisan agreement and that the Senate would never pass this budget, but I urge the country to take it seriously because what it tells America is what our Republican colleagues would do to the country if they had the power to do it.

If they could impose their will, this is the budget that they would impose, so we need to look hard at the consequences. What does it mean for America? What choices does the budget before us make for our country?

At its core, it rigs the rules of the game for very wealthy and very powerful special interests at the expense of everybody else in the country and at the expense of other priorities in the country.

For example, if you are a multi-millionaire, under this budget, you will have your top tax rate cut by one-third, all the way from 39 percent, where it is today, down to 25 percent. That is an average tax break for millionaires of \$200,000. That is great for people who are well off.

What does this budget do to the rest of this country? It guts vital investments in our children's future, it squeezes the middle class, and it violates important commitments to our seniors.

Now, let's step back because the chairman mentioned the economic ben-

efits of this budget. The reality is that our economic competitors around the world will eat our lunch if we pass this Republican budget. It provides for perverse tax incentives that ship American jobs overseas while shortchanging investments in jobs right here at home.

As we will see over the next couple of days, it guts important investments that historically have helped power our economy, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office tells us that, in the next couple of years, this is going to slow down economic growth, that it is going to slow down job growth. One estimate puts the job loss at 3 million jobs.

At a time when we need to be modernizing our national infrastructure—the backbone of our economy—this budget slashes the transportation budget by \$52 billion in this year alone, stopping new projects, throwing construction workers off the job.

It will condemn the United States to a potholed road of economic decline, and it refuses to include one thing that the Congressional Budget Office says will help boost our economy right now, which is to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Chairman, as this budget provides these windfall tax breaks for the folks at the very top, let's see what it does to others in our country.

We all depend on our kids getting a good education. It is good for families. It is good for the country. The saddest part about this budget is that it casts a dark shadow over the American Dream, and it violates the fundamental promise that every hardworking American should have a fair shot at success.

At a time when we should be investing more in education in the United States, all told, if you look at early education—K-12—and college education, this budget cuts it by \$370 billion below current services. That has devastating impacts on everything from Head Start to Early Head Start to K-12 to college.

Let me just mention one of the things it does to college student loans. It starts charging college students' interest while they are still in college, before they have gotten out and gotten a job. That saves \$40 billion in this budget—actually, a little more than that—in the same budget that provides huge tax breaks to the wealthiest in this country.

So much for wanting to address the lack of upward mobility in America; rung by rung, this budget knocks out the steps of that ladder of opportunity. If you are to the manor born, you are going to be just fine under this budget, but for everybody else, tough luck and worse.

Let's look at seniors as our next example. Those on Medicare will immediately pay more if they have high prescription drug costs, right? The chairman mentioned that the Democratic budget cut Medicare and turned it into something else.

The reality is that the savings that were achieved in Medicare by ending

some of the overpayments in the Democratic budget were recycled to strengthen key parts of Medicare, including to close what has been called the prescription drug doughnut hole.

The Republican budget here reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole. If you are a senior with high prescription drug costs, it is \$1,200 more per year, on average, as a result of this budget.

Seniors who have been able to get preventative health services without having to put down copayments will no longer get those screenings, and now, they will be at risk of not getting the treatment and care when they need it.

On top of all of that, it ends the Medicare guarantee by creating a voucher program. For seniors who decide to stay in the traditional Medicare program, they will see their premiums hiked by 50 percent when that goes into effect. They can stay, but they will have to pay big time to stay. That is not the Medicare guarantee.

Middle class families—I mentioned that this budget cuts the top tax rate for millionaires from 39 percent to 25 percent. That is a 30 percent tax cut, but it says it is going to do that in a deficit-neutral manner, so it is simple math, Mr. Chairman.

If you are going to do that, you are going to squeeze middle class taxpayers. In fact, this budget pretends that Chairman CAMP and the exercise he went through in the Ways and Means Committee—the fact-based exercise—never happened because what Chairman CAMP found was that you couldn't bring that top rate down to 25 percent without squeezing middle-income taxpayers.

That is why he had a top rate of 35 percent in his plan, and yet this says let's go to a 25 percent top rate. That means \$2,000 more in taxes for a family with kids to finance the tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

This budget reserves, perhaps, its cruelest blow for those who are seeking to climb out of poverty into the middle class, to have an opportunity to participate in the American Dream.

In the last election, the Republican candidate, Mitt Romney, said he really didn't care about the 47 percent. This Republican budget sets out to prove that statement. If you look at this budget, it is an assault on Americans who are struggling to climb out of the middle class.

We had a big debate in this Congress about food nutrition programs. The Republican plan called for \$40 billion in cuts. It ended up being \$8 billion. In this budget, it is \$137 billion.

Millions of more kids will go hungry as a result of cutting that safety net, and that is why faith-based groups that have looked at these Republican budgets over the last 3 years have said that they don't meet the tests of a society that cares for the least of these.

I want to close by asking a question because our Republican colleagues say the goal has to be 10 years to hit this political target. It is interesting be-

cause the Republican budget 3 years ago didn't balance until around 2040, but now, we have this sort of political target that they have to hit.

If it is so important to hit that, why do they ask everything of our kids and of our seniors and of struggling families and of nothing from very powerful special interests?

This budget does not close one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not one—not a special interest tax break for hedge fund owners, not a special tax break for big oil companies. We have a race to hit their political timetable here, but we are not going to ask those special interest groups to pay one dime to help reduce the deficit.

Here is the really strange thing: after all is said and done, this Republican budget does not balance in 10 years if, at the same time, the Republicans claim to be repealing the Affordable Care Act. It just doesn't add up. The math isn't there.

What this Republican budget does is this: it gets rid of all of the benefits in the Affordable Care Act. It gets rid of the tax credits that help Americans purchase affordable care. It gets rid of the provision that says you can stay on your parents' insurance policy until you are 26.

It gets rid of the provisions that say you cannot be denied coverage because you have a preexisting condition. It gets rid of all of the benefits.

Guess what it keeps? It keeps all of the tax revenue from the Affordable Care Act.

You don't have to take my word for it. This is The Heritage Foundation. This isn't some liberal group.

Here is what they say:

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare.

It is what they said about last year's budget. This year is exactly the same. This budget also keeps all of the savings from Medicare. It doesn't recycle any of those savings to strengthen it as the Democratic budget does, but it keeps them.

If you actually look at this chart, you will see that, in 2024, when the Republican budget claims to balance, without the revenues and the savings from Medicare, it doesn't come close to balancing.

So our Republican colleagues have got to choose. Either you claim to have a balanced budget and you recognize that you support all of the revenues and savings in the Affordable Care Act or not, but you can't have it both ways. The sad thing is, after hitting everybody but the very wealthy in this budget, they still can't achieve what they claim is their goal.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say: you can't have it both ways.

That is interesting. You can raid Medicare by \$716 billion to pay for

ObamaCare and then count that money as if it is going back to Medicare, counting the same dollar twice. That is not our word. That is the word of the Congressional Budget Office and of the actuaries, themselves, at Medicare, which is what the other side did with ObamaCare.

Look, apparently, the only way to revive and protect the American Dream is to bring our debt from \$17 trillion to \$24 trillion and, on the way there, raise taxes on hardworking Americans another \$1.8 trillion, and if you are not for that, you are against the American Dream.

□ 1545

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this budget because I believe it is the necessary fiscal path to secure our children's future. I hear from my constituents every time I go back home. We can't keep borrowing nearly 40 cents on every dollar we spend.

This budget is a commonsense blueprint that grows our economy. It will force Washington to live within its means by cutting \$5.1 trillion over 10 years to balance the budget. Under this plan, we will make much-needed reforms to the complicated and oversized Tax Code that will make Americans more competitive and create jobs. It will keep the promise to our seniors by strengthening Social Security and give our troops the tools they need to secure our country. This budget will provide relief from rising health care costs by repealing ObamaCare.

Families across my congressional district will be able to keep more of what they earn, which is exactly what we need to have happen to grow our economy. Right now, too many of them are struggling paycheck-to-paycheck under this Obama economy. Gas prices are still high and volatile. My constituents are paying higher health care premiums because of ObamaCare.

Families need a break, Mr. Chairman. This budget gives them a chance to get ahead while holding Washington accountable for its stewardship of your money.

Since we have a budget agreement, I am looking forward to seeing the Senate budget and when they will vote on it. I would encourage our friends on the other side of the aisle to keep HARRY REID's feet to the fire and make sure they do have a budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the ranking member for his extraordinary leadership and for developing a budget proposal that actually reflects our Nation's values and priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget, offered by my colleague from Wisconsin, is another attempt to impose a

failed economic theory on the American people. This budget would damage economic growth in the short term and it disinvests in our future in the long term. It is absolutely the wrong course.

Millions of Americans continue to struggle to find work. Congress should be investing in priorities that will create jobs, priorities like education, rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, and investing in advanced manufacturing and innovation that will help set the platform for a 21st century economy.

The Ryan Republican budget does exactly the opposite. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, compared to current law, the Ryan Republican budget would stifle our economic growth, reducing gross national product per capita by about 0.5 percent in each of the next 3 years.

Let that sink in. If you are searching for work or struggling to get by in this difficult economy, the message from this budget is clear: it is about to get a whole lot worse.

What could possibly be their rationale?

To my colleagues who say we need to make this sacrifice in the short term so we can experience long-term economic gains, they have it backwards. We need to invest in the short term to have long-term economic prosperity.

How does a budget that freezes Pell grants and slashes funding for higher education by approximately \$260 billion grow our economy in the long term?

Our Nation's infrastructure is the backbone of our economy and is essential to move goods and services in the short and long term. So how does a budget that cuts investments in transportation by \$52 billion next year alone help our economy?

How can you say a budget that singles out for elimination bipartisan programs like the Manufacturing Extension Partnership will boost our economy in the long term, a program that leverages Federal funding to provide small- and medium-sized manufacturers the capacity to grow, innovate, and prepare for a 21st century focus on advanced manufacturing? The answer is you can't.

Let's be clear: this budget cuts from today and disinvests from tomorrow. And for what purpose? To pay for another round of tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans, amounting to about \$4 trillion in the next 10 years. But it is okay, they claim, because the benefits will trickle down to the middle class. This budget goes after Medicare, Medicaid, and nutrition programs for hungry children, all to pay for another round of tax cuts for the wealthy. This is immoral. And we know, from past experience, it is the wrong strategy for our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget because it will hurt jobs and inflict unnecessary pain on working families and our economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in August of 2010, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs warned that the greatest threat to our national security was our national debt. That was \$4 trillion of debt ago. In fact, since the inauguration in 2009, we have accumulated more total government debt than we have run up from the very first day of the Washington administration through the third year of the George W. Bush administration.

We were told this would jump-start the economy. It hasn't. Instead, it has deprived markets of the capital that would otherwise be loaned to businesses seeking to expand jobs, to consumers seeking to make purchases, and to home buyers seeking to reenter the housing market.

I would remind the House that we cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if we cannot pay for them, and the ability of our government to do so is being slowly and surely destroyed by our debt. Balancing this budget and ultimately paying down the national debt is a national security imperative, it is an economic imperative, and it is a moral imperative.

Under Chairman RYAN's leadership, the House is about to pass the fourth budget in a row to balance. It stands in stark contrast to the President's budget that never balances and that condemns our Nation to a debt spiral that will consume our future. It reforms and reorganizes our social safety nets. It prevents their impending bankruptcy, and it restores them to financial sound foundations for the generations to come.

This is not beyond our ability. President Clinton, working in cooperation with a Republican Congress, delivered four balanced budgets in a row. Together, a Democratic President and a Republican Congress cut Federal spending by 4 percent of GDP. They enacted what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system. The economy blossomed.

In the years since, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, we have veered far from these policies of fiscal responsibility and economic expansion, and the economy languishes.

The budget before us combines the policies necessary not only to restore solvency to the government and save the social safety net, but it also restores prosperity to the American people. All we lack is the same cooperation from the President and the Senate that we had just two decades ago.

Time is not our ally. Every day we delay, the problem becomes more intractable and the road back becomes more difficult, protracted, and perilous.

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

I would just point out that I think it is useful to look at this through the perspective of history, because the last time we had balanced budgets in this country was at the end of the Clinton administration, and shortly after that, when President Bush came into office, we saw back-to-back tax cuts.

The theory at that time was if you dropped the top tax rate on high-income individuals, it will trickle down to everybody else and power-charge the economy. The only problem is that didn't work. It did not work at all. The trickle-down theory of economics did not work. We didn't get that boost of economic growth. What we did get was huge, huge deficits as far as the eye could see.

And so the problem with this budget is that it is a U-turn back to that philosophy—the idea that we are going to provide these tax cuts and it will create a big boost of economic activity. But reality has shown that it doesn't work that way. We should be building our economy from the middle out and from the bottom up. The top-down approach doesn't work.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this budget is worse than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is like a Dracula in sheep's clothing coming in to suck the blood out of the middle class.

Under the false pretense of deficit reduction and a balanced budget, House Republicans have brought forth another attack on American seniors, students, workers, and middle class families, all the while protecting giveaways for the wealthy and corporations that ship jobs overseas.

This budget kills jobs at home by gutting critical investments in education and technological research and throws a wrench in the engine of American innovation. Instead of laying the foundation for innovation to create the new middle-class jobs of tomorrow or spur new technology, economic growth, and the next generation of entrepreneurs, this Republican budget uses fuzzy math and magic asterisks to hide its attack on the middle class.

This embarrassing budget is an excuse to assault the social safety net that has saved millions of Americans who fell off the economic ladder of opportunity during the Bush recession. Programs like food stamps, unemployment insurance, Medicaid, and job retraining are helping to get Americans back on their feet—Americans who lost their jobs and homes due to no fault of their own, but instead due to the fault of reckless Wall Street speculators. The victims include defenseless infants and dependent children, as well as the sick and the elderly.

The Republican budget uses these programs as punching bags for their

reckless agenda today to cut and gut. Republicans' relentless attacks on these programs will only hasten the descent and harden the fall of Americans who are already teetering on the brink.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans are playing their favorite game with the budget—hide and cut it. First, they hide behind budget gimmicks and magic asterisks, and then they cut unnamed programs that all magically fall only upon the backs of the poor, working families, seniors, and the middle class.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, wow, that sounds horrible. Good thing it is not true. Only in Washington is a slower increase in spending awful, blood-curdling, cut-throating, terrible, and draconian cuts.

If we are going to get our fiscal house in order, what we are saying in this budget is, instead of increasing spending 5.2 percent a year on average, let's do it by 3.5 percent a year on average—hardly draconian.

And by the way, maybe people closer to the problems, like our States, might have a better idea on how to help people in their communities. Those are the principles we are talking about here.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My home State is Illinois. The State of Illinois, Mr. Chairman, is a delightful place. It is the "Land of Lincoln" and the birthplace of Ronald Reagan, but it is a fiscal basket case. From a fiscal point of view, my home State is a national punch line, because one party—the other party—has dominated State government for years. For a decade, they have had the Governor's mansion. They have got majorities in both the Illinois House and the Illinois Senate.

And what has happened? It has been avoidance behavior, Mr. Chairman. An unwillingness to take on serious issues.

So what did the Democrats in Springfield, Illinois, do? They raised taxes. They didn't deal with the underlying fiscal problem.

And what was the net result? The budget gap didn't close, higher than average unemployment, and more per capita debt than nearly any other State in the Union on the taxpayers of Illinois.

□ 1600

All right. So what does that all that have to do with this?

Springfield, Illinois, is a foreshadowing, Mr. Chairman, of what not to do. Basically, we need to look at the fiscal situation in Springfield, Illinois, and look at it like a big, big traffic signal that says, don't come here; don't go this route; don't take this pathway. Instead, go another direction.

The direction that we need to go is the direction that the chairman has articulated, and that I think a majority is going to vote for tomorrow, and it is

a pathway that says, let's look clearly at these difficulties. Let's articulate them clearly. Let's be clear-eyed about what they are, and let's make decisions.

So what does this budget do?

The budget repeals ObamaCare and makes way for a patient-centered approach on health care that our constituencies are calling out for.

It says that we are going to empower States to make decisions. It says we are going to keep promises that are going to be made, not false promises, not telling folks that something is going to be there, and then just assuming that there is going to be some pixie dust that makes these problems go away.

No, these problems are going to be dealt with, and they are going to be dealt with in a forthright manner.

I think we are at an inflection point. I think the House is actually at an incredibly important stage right now, and we can go one of two pathways. One pathway we know, one pathway of more taxes, more spending, more avoidance, and not dealing with the underlying spending programs.

This is not theoretical, Mr. Chairman. The State of Illinois has tried that, and it is a mess. It is a mess that becomes worse. The longer the State waits, the worse the options are.

So what the chairman is saying is, let's not get to that point. We have got options. We have got time. We have got choices. We have got remedies, but we need to act now.

So I urge favorable consideration of this budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think, for the people who may be watching this, and for our colleagues, the question is, how do we achieve the priorities that we hope we all want to achieve, which is jobs growing faster, the economy growing faster, and deal with the long term deficit and debt in a responsible manner?

The glaring problem with the congressional Republican budget is that they don't call for any shared responsibility. They don't ask the most powerful special interests to contribute one dime by closing a single tax break, not one. And because they shelter the most powerful and the most wealthy, everybody else has to take a hit in their budget.

As a result, the entire country takes a hit because those are investments in our kids' education, in basic science and research that are important to help power our entire economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you to my friend from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for yielding, and for his leadership.

He is exactly right. What this budget fails to do is address the fundamental questions that we have to address.

As a new member of the Budget Committee, during the most recent budget markup, I offered an amendment. A couple of dozen of our amendments were heard and dismissed rather quickly.

I offered an amendment that would deal with that question of shared sacrifice, an amendment that would have simply said that if you make more than \$1 million in this country, you should pay your fair share, applying the so-called Buffett Rule that basically says, if you are doing well, you should at least pay the same rate that another member of your staff would pay.

As Mr. Buffett pointed out, his secretary pays a higher rate. This would have required a 30 percent rate to apply to those folks making \$1 million.

What was interesting to me was what I was told by the other side, that this amendment was because people in the working middle class, people who go to work every day, are jealous of those who have done well in the United States.

Let me assure you, this has nothing to do with jealousy; it has everything to do with fairness. The only thing we ask is that if we are all going to pitch in to adopt a balanced budget and invest in growing our economy, we should all pitch in and not have a tax system that benefits the wealthiest, and has the rest of us not only have to pay more than our fair share, but not receive the important investments that will grow our economy.

So what this budget doesn't do is require we all pay a fair share. Neither does it extend unemployment insurance to those who are just trying to get from their last job to their next job without losing their house and their car and having their family split up.

It doesn't raise the minimum wage so that those who go to work every day won't live in poverty. It doesn't address the fundamental question facing us, and that is immigration reform, which would have a significant effect on growing our economy. People on the left and the right agree with that.

No, this statement of our collective values fails to address that fundamental question.

But what it does do is cut basic education. It would kick 170,000 kids out of Head Start, changing the trajectory of their lives forever; cuts \$89 billion out of education, \$35 billion alone out of Title I. Cuts higher education, which is an investment in our future, which we know pays dividends downstream. Cuts infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. KILDEE. Cuts infrastructure, which we have to address. If our companies, if our manufacturers are going to be competitive, we are going to have to make those sorts of investment.

This budget does none of those things. All it does is protect those who

continue to be sheltered by a system that allows for this kind of inequality in this country and doesn't address the fundamental questions facing us.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in opposing this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains between both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 72½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 68 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Republican budget, which is a path to prosperity. It includes commonsense priorities and policies that will foster economic growth and job creation.

This is a plan to balance the budget in 10 years and begin to pay down the national debt, and this is exactly what our economy needs.

CBO says that, by reducing the deficit, our budget would promote economic growth. In stark contrast to budgets put forward by the President and by House Democrats, our budget will cut wasteful spending, rein in our national debt and, we hope, balance the budget. And the budget needs to be balanced. This would be done all without raising taxes on hardworking Americans.

It includes pro-growth policies that will harness domestic energy, restore patient-centered health care, strengthen retirement and the safety net programs that are so essential, and it will reform our Tax Code.

I thank my friend, Chairman RYAN, for putting forth a budget blueprint that addresses our Nation's long-term fiscal challenges truthfully and in a fiscally responsible manner.

Let me say that this blueprint spends \$43 trillion over the next 10 years. It reduces spending by \$5 trillion. Only in Washington can an increase annually of 3.5 percent be considered a cut. That is ridiculous.

At the rate we are going now, our spending would increase by 5.2 percent. We reform it to 3.5 percent annually over the next 10 years.

I applaud Chairman RYAN's hard work and courage, and look forward to an honest discussion here on the floor of the House.

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

I would just point out that we hear a lot about the global aggregate numbers, but the distribution of those cuts is important.

If you look at the portion of the budget that we have, historically, used to invest in education, to invest in innovation, to invest in places like the National Institutes of Health, that portion of the budget is cut by 24 percent relative to the bipartisan Ryan-Murray agreement. And it is cut from there.

So the part of the budget that does a lot of damage that we are focused on in terms of future investments, really does mean that we are going to be less competitive as a country. It will dull our competitive edge. And I will tell you, our economic competitors will be cheering.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the RYAN of the Ryan-Murray agreement, look, I wish that the Murray side of the agreement would have agreed to these out-year numbers. That didn't happen. That agreement is a 2-year agreement, so to compare this budget and the baseline against that of the 24 cut, that is not accurate.

Here is the problem, Mr. Chairman. We are spending money we don't have. We are going through the budget, program by program, line by line, and trying to reform these programs so that they can better deliver on their promises.

We are looking at certain programs, say, like food stamps, and saying, some States have some pretty innovative ideas on how better to deliver these services.

There have been some wasteful and fraudulent activities that needed to be gotten at so that we don't waste taxpayer money.

We think it is important to encourage able-bodied adults who do not have dependents to go to work. When we did that in welfare reform in the 1990s, it worked. People went to work.

By the way, child poverty dropped by double digits. Single moms went to work. It helped reduce poverty. We want to replicate that kind of success with these kind of reforms on these kinds of programs.

When they talk about education, this administration, and this Democratic budget, is making a bunch of empty promises. They are promising the world in Pell grants, but they are not funding that world.

We are saying, let's keep Pell and let's fund it, and let's keep it where it is, but let's fund it throughout the decade. I would rather take a full-funded promise than an empty promise any day. I think that is more honest with our students.

The other part I think we have to look at is, we are feeding tuition inflation. If we just keep pumping more and more borrowed money, empty-promised money into the system, what we are getting out of it is higher tuition.

Why don't we look at why tuition is going up so much in the first place?

Gosh, when we look at that, we are learning the Federal Government is part of the problem. Let's fix that.

Mr. Chairman, we do go through these things line by line.

The gentleman likes to talk about tax reform. What he won't tell you is specifically what this tax reform bill does, because we don't have a specific

tax reform in here because this is the budget.

The Ways and Means Committee does specific tax reform. That is where the loophole closers are.

We are saying the outline of it is to get tax rates down on businesses, small and large, so they can compete.

There are \$1 trillion in loopholes every year that they can work with to get those tax rates down. So to suggest that this, all of a sudden, does these tax breaks for millionaires and does this for these other people and does that, they are just making that stuff up.

What I think we ought to do is put the rhetoric aside and balance this budget.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the committee recognized that there are about \$1 trillion worth of tax expenditures. What does that mean?

That means tax preferences in the Tax Code. \$1 trillion a year, he said. That is right.

And yet, the Republican budget doesn't close one penny of those tax expenditures to help reduce our deficit, not one. It says we have to reserve all those tax loophole closures to cut the top rate for millionaires by one-third, from 39 percent to 25 percent. That is what they want to do with all the tax expenditures.

Because they refuse to get rid of one of those tax expenditures for the purposes of deficit reduction, their budget does hit all these students.

What is honest is to tell students who are going to college right now that this budget is going to charge them over \$40 billion more in interest because now they are going to have to pay interest while they are still in college, even though it doesn't close one of those tax expenditures for very wealthy people to help meet the targets and reduce the deficit, not one.

So, as we look at the priorities in this budget, we have to ask ourselves, why is it that this Republican budget doesn't call for any shared responsibility?

Why is it that it does provide tax breaks to folks at the very top at the expense of the rest of the country?

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

□ 1615

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yielding myself 15 seconds, the shared responsibility we are asking for is let's fix these problems within our generation and not pass it on to the next generation.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the policy chair of our conference.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was the basic principle that George Washington laid out in his farewell address, that every generation should

take care of the responsibilities of that generation, rather than pass it on to their child. It is a 200-year-old concept. It is fairly straightforward.

What is interesting to me is I have been in a personal conversation with our current President of the United States about debt and about balancing the budget. The conversation back and forth was circled around a simple principle: Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich, two decades ago, made it their crowning achievement that they balanced the budget in a bipartisan time period.

My request to this President was: Can we agree that we should set a goal to balance the budget? His response to me was: No. Twenty years ago, that was a good idea, but now, the perception is that we should have sustainable deficits, that is, balance everything except for interest.

This year, our interest payment is \$233 billion. CBO forecasts that 10 years from now, our interest payment—single-year, one-year interest payment 10 years from now will be \$880 billion.

We must get us back to balance, and when I say balance, I mean real balance. Families balance their budget. Businesses balance their budget. States balance their budget.

We see times in our past when we had a balanced budget and saw the economic activity from that; but for whatever reason, now, we are just going to ignore that. Why? First off, it is because they will say it is hard. It is difficult to balance our budget. Well, I am sorry that it is hard.

This is what leaders do. We make difficult decisions to be able to get our Nation back on track for now and for the future.

The second thing is let's do a balanced approach. Let's raise taxes if we are going to reduce spending. Right now, this year, we have the highest amount of revenue in the history of the United States coming into the Federal Treasury.

Even with a down economy, this is the highest amount of revenue that has ever come into the Treasury, the second highest amount that has ever come into the Treasury, last year.

This is not an issue about not having enough tax revenue. We have the highest amount we have ever come into the Treasury. The issue is we are overspending. That is the key issue that we have got to get into.

The other argument that comes out is, you know what, there are no more efficiencies left. There is nowhere else left to cut in the Federal Government. Well, I have difficulty finding anyone outside of Washington that believes this government is running so efficient; there is no fraud, there is no waste, there are no inefficiencies in government, there is nowhere to cut.

When you walk through our budget, we are not trying to damage our economy. We are trying to protect our economy. We are trying to help grow and establish jobs that are happening by stabilizing the economy.

You go to businesspeople all over the country. They ask for one simple thing: give us a stable plan that gets us back onto balance, give us some stability in our economy, and we will grow our business.

Some predictability, that is what this budget is headed towards. It also is dealing with some simple things, like national defense. National defense is a prime—prime task of the Federal Government. This budget aggressively steps up and says we have a responsibility for national defense. We should maintain that.

The conversation about going to 10 carrier units around the world, 10 aircraft carriers may sound like a lot until you realize only two of them are in the ocean at any given time when you get down to 10.

When we get back up to 11, which is the established amount that we want to have, we can now have three out in our oceans. When you drop down that amount, you are making a decision that we are not going to have a presence somewhere in the ocean.

We have a stable peace when we are strong. It is a basic principle. If we weaken our military presence, we expose ourselves to weakness.

We need to be able to do this. We need to take out ObamaCare. We need to get us back into a stable economy. We need to deal with national defense. That is what this budget is all about.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to the gentleman that the President's budget has two things in it. First of all, it actually calls for a fund to increase defense spending for readiness in fiscal year 2015, which is not included in the Republican budget.

Number two, in the outyears, the President also grows our defense spending; and as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have testified, those investments will make sure that the United States is second to none.

In fact, the next 10 countries after that, together, spend much less on defense than the United States, and we will continue to have that additional robust defense spending to make sure that we are strong, but we also need to make sure that our economy is strong to support that kind of budget, and if you have got the important investments that have helped make the economy grow over time, you will not get that.

Now, I will just respond to the gentleman's comments on revenue. Anytime the economy is growing, if you have a certain tax rate, you are going to get more absolute dollars of revenue in, but I mentioned that the last time we had actually had a balanced budget in this country was in the year 1998 through 2001.

If you look at the amount of revenue that was coming in during that period as a percent of the economy, you will find that revenue was 19.2 percent in

1998, 19.2 percent in 1999, 19.9 percent in 2000, and so on, way ahead of the amount of revenue as a percentage of the economy that this Republican budget calls for in year 10, even though, between now and then, we will have millions more Americans on Medicare and Social Security.

So, again, they just can't bring themselves to close one of these special interest tax breaks, not one for the purpose of reducing the deficit and contributing to our economic well-being.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The first priority and responsibility of the Federal Government is to secure our Nation and to provide for the common defense of our Nation.

The gentleman from Maryland mentioned the President has this proposal for this year that would have violated our bipartisan budget agreement. It is a proposal that holds hostage defense for higher taxes and more domestic spending, but worse than that, we had a hearing in the Budget Committee about 2 years ago.

Then-Secretary of Defense Panetta, along with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, came and testified; and they said to our Budget Committee: This is as far as we can go, we can't cut any further without doing damage to our military.

That is effectively where the Republican budget is. That is not where this year's Obama budget is. The President's budget, which is also replicated by the Democratic substitute, cuts the military far lower than that. They are bringing the Army and the Marines to a level we have not seen since before World War II. They are shrinking our Navy to a size we have not seen since before World War I. They are shrinking our Air Force to a level we have never seen before.

They are cutting compensation for our men and women in uniform, not to save money for other parts of the military, like readiness and training and equipment, but they are cutting compensation, cutting force structure, cutting personnel, cutting equipment, cutting defense—not to reduce the deficit, but to spend it on more domestic spending.

The Joint Chiefs have said that now, with this budget submission, it represents a moderate risk of actually affecting our national security. They have never said that before. They have said we have had a low risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 15 more seconds to say, of all the problems that we have in the President's budget, it hollows out our military, sends the wrong signals overseas, and we are not going to do that.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, the distinguished vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by commending the

chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, for his wonderful and positive work on real solutions. When I go back home and I talk to folks, they say: Well, don't y'all have any solutions that will actually work?

That is what this is. This is a real solution, a commonsense solution. My constituents back home in the Sixth District of Georgia also tell me that they are saddened and disheartened by the comments that we hear from the other side, primarily, on dividing Americans, pitting one American against another.

It really is a cynical ploy. It may be politically opportune, but it is not helpful. It is not helpful for the discourse that we have in this country. It is not helpful for us reaching those real solutions; so I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's get together and work together and find those real solutions.

What my constituents back home also tell me is that the path we are on just isn't working. The economy is not thriving; record deficits continue. I mentioned the mantra of division that seems to be the MO of the other side, but the other side, the Democrats, seem to be happy with all this.

They seem to be happy with an economy that is not thriving. They seem to be happy with an economy that has resulted in fewer Americans working. They seem to be happy with fewer success stories across this country.

They seem to be happy that more jobs are leaving the country, as opposed to being created here. They seem to be happy with higher and higher taxes and more and more spending. They seem to be happy with borrowing more money from foreign countries. They seem to be happy with compromising opportunities for future generations.

We believe that there is a better way, that there are positive solutions and real solutions, and that is our budget—a responsible, balanced budget; yes, a balanced budget, a path to prosperity for every single American.

We have had a little discussion over the past few minutes about defense. I want to talk about some specific issues in our budget, defense being one of them. This is a very dangerous world.

Our budget recognizes that. It realizes the danger that we have and that our allies have, and we increase spending for defense and for national security. We account for that in our budget in a positive way.

The President, irresponsibly, seems to bury his head in the sand. His budget, as has been mentioned, puts us back at pre-World War II levels for our men and women in uniform. That is not consistent with what the American people see in the real world right now, so what we do is account for that and increase defense spending in a responsible way.

In the area of health care, I am a physician. I recognize that the world of health care is in an upheaval. There

are physicians leaving their practices. There are seniors who are losing their doctors. There are new Medicare patients who are unable to find physicians.

In fact, the actuaries of Medicare—not Republican or Democrat—but the actuaries of the Medicare system have said that the system is going broke. Within a 10-year period of time, it will not be able to provide the services for seniors that have currently been promised.

Our budget positively addresses these issues. We save and strengthen and secure Medicare. How? With positive reforms; putting patients in charge, not government in charge.

In fact, the proposal that we outlined a number of years ago and continue to include in our budget right now, the premium support for seniors, making it so that they have more choices, the Congressional Budget Office did a study on that exact program published last September.

They recognize that this program that is proposed by the Republicans will not only save money for seniors, but it will save money for taxpayers—real positive solutions. Again, it will put patients in charge and not government.

Another exciting difference between our proposal, our budget, real solutions and the other side, is that we understand that a growing economy is essential to getting us back on the right track. The past 5 years have certainly not been helpful.

The Congressional Budget Office, once again, has evaluated our proposed policies and has said that, if we are able to get our economy back on the right track by instituting our plan of saving over \$5 trillion, that there would be significant benefits to the economy.

Realistic scoring shows that—and I will quote from the Congressional Budget Office—“CBO finds that reducing budget deficits is a net positive for economic growth. Deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation. These benefits are both significant and lasting.”

That is our budget, positive growth in the economy and significant and lasting benefits to the American people.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Finally, I want to just mention briefly the issue of the debt. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, said just a few years ago that the number one threat to our national security is not the threats that we see from other nations and rogue regimes, it is the threat of our national debt. The American people know this.

We are over \$17 trillion in debt, and the President continues to spend, in his

budget, record deficits—record annual deficits. The Path to Prosperity, the plan that we are proposing, gets us back on the right track, gets us on a path to balance, balancing within a 10-year period of time, and on trajectory to pay off the entire debt of the United States of America, thereby increasing economic opportunity and viability and all.

□ 1630

We are for the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans and the greatest number of American Dreams being realized. The way that you do that is through the Path to Prosperity, a balanced and responsible budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that it is this Republican budget here in the House of Representatives that divides America. And when we point out that this is a budget that protects tax breaks for the very wealthy at the expense of everybody else, our colleagues say, oh, no, no, that is dividing America. But what we are explaining is the Republican budget, and that is, unfortunately, what it does.

The chairman originally said that only in Washington is an increase really a cut. I would just point out that in the President's defense budget, it goes from \$521 billion in fiscal year 2015 to \$646 billion 10 years from now—hardly a cut, in fact, quite an expansion going forward.

I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee who has focused a lot on defense.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN, for all of your work on this.

Mr. Chair, there are many damaging cuts in this budget, but I would like to speak just a minute about the cuts to education. In ancient civilizations, literacy and education were closed off to all but the very affluent; and the beauty of America, since its founding, has been the democratization of a way to become educated, make your way into the middle class and to do well.

This budget would threaten that, and it does it in several ways. First, it cuts Pell grants, that is, grants to college students, by \$145 billion. It also very significantly makes Pell grant aid unavailable to part-time students.

I want to focus on that for just a second because this is something we see over and over in our districts again: single moms or working parents, men or women, who are trying to balance a job and go to school at the same time. They are trying to take two or three classes maybe, make their way, still be able to work to support their families, but also go to college and finish off and slowly get their degree.

This budget would not allow them to access Pell grants. It would make

achieving their goal of getting their education, maybe training for another kind of job, impossible for millions of Americans. The cuts to Pell grants are especially significant because in States like mine, in Texas, since 2003, tuition has gone up an average of 104 percent for thousands and thousands of Texans.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. So when Republicans put forward a budget that cuts off access to higher education, what they are doing is cutting off a path to the middle class for millions of Americans, and every American, young and old, should be concerned about that.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a terrific member of the Budget Committee who is focused on lots of important issues including the challenge of poverty in America.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for your tremendous support and leadership on behalf of the majority of the American people in our country.

Mr. Chair, I rise, of course, in strong opposition to this very reckless Republican budget. This is yet another Republican messaging document masquerading really as a budget resolution. Once again, Republicans have brought forth a budget that slashes the programs that keep the poorest and most vulnerable Americans healthy, working, and with food on the table.

Under this cruel plan—and, yes, it is a cruel plan—seniors on Medicare would see their payments for services and prescriptions skyrocket. We would see an end to the Medicare guarantee as we know it.

By converting SNAP to a block grant program, Republicans, once again, seek to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable by cutting our Nation's first line of defense, and that is hunger. Between cuts and policy changes, this budget would cut \$137 billion in SNAP benefits over 10 years—\$40 billion wasn't enough.

And at the same time that our Nation is facing the greatest income inequality since the Great Depression, this Republican budget would protect some of the most outrageous tax breaks and loopholes for the wealthiest millionaires, billionaires, and Big Oil companies. That is right. Once again, this plan really wreaks havoc on the poor and the middle class, who really pay the price so that my colleagues across the aisle can claim a balanced budget.

Sadly, it does not stop there. While the Republican budget continues to keep the American Dream out of reach for the poor, it would increase spending, mind you, for the already bloated Pentagon budget and continue the

Overseas Contingency Operations slush fund, which is really paying for wars hopefully in the future that won't exist. We simply cannot continue to write a blank check for spending on war if we are to ever have a chance of getting our fiscal house in order.

We can't do this to America's struggling families and the working poor. Republicans claim they want to eliminate poverty, and, yes, we are holding this debate. Finally, it has become a national debate. We are debating poverty and how to make sure people find pathways out of poverty. Yet just read this budget. It is a pathway into poverty.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Yes, I said a pathway. And thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, because we have looked at this budget and looked at how it will create more poverty. So it is a pathway into poverty.

Budgets are moral documents. They reflect our values. So the underlying values in the Ryan budget really do not reflect who we are as Americans, believing that we really are our brothers' keepers and we really are our sisters' keepers.

So I urge Members to reject this Republican budget and instead support the budget proposals presented by the Democratic Caucus, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus. We need a budget that puts Americans back to work.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. I just want to conclude by saying we need a budget, and all three of the budgets that I just mentioned put Americans back to work. They invest in our future, they protect the safety net, and they work to reignite the American Dream for all. This budget does just the opposite. So I hope that all of us will vote "no" on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say there are different visions. We don't think we should take more money from hardworking taxpayers to spend it in Washington and then borrow more from our children. We think we should balance the budget and pay off the debt.

We are going to see a lot of budgets coming to the floor here offered by the other side, which is great. It is their right. I am glad they are offering alternatives.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN's Democratic budget will have a \$1.8 trillion tax increase, just like the President's new \$1.8 trillion tax increase. The Progressive Caucus budget, they have the candle here: a \$6.6 trillion tax increase they are encouraging.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Spending by the other side, what they are saying is let's just have a bidding war on how much we can raise people's taxes. Let's even raise spending more. And nobody else is offering a budget that will ever balance the budget. So the idea here is borrow endlessly, never balance it, and give our children an inferior standard of living.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for yielding, but, more importantly, thank him for his work and leadership in this area.

Tonight around America, families will sit down at the kitchen table to talk about their family finances. And there always seem to be more needs than there are dollars in a paycheck. So those families will sit down. They may shed tears tonight, and they may have some tense words between them, but before the night is over, they will sit down and make tough decisions about how they will spend their family's budget.

Just last week, the State legislature in my State adjourned, but before they did, they made some tough choices. They weren't able to fund everything they wanted to fund, and they had to set priorities. Local governments and county governments are making tough choices.

When it comes to American families sitting around their kitchen table, if the State legislature, if city governments and county governments are making those tough choices, they have every reason to expect their government in Washington to do the same thing. And for 4 years now, under the leadership of Chairman RYAN, we have put forward a budget that does make these tough but necessary decisions about getting control of our Federal spending.

That is why I am proud to join my colleagues and vote for a budget that responsibly cuts \$5.1 trillion over the next 10 years by reforming the main drivers of our debt—targeting wasteful spending. At the same time, this budget seeks to expand opportunity to help the private sector create jobs by highlighting policies that will grow the economy.

Meanwhile, the administration wants to take more money out of the paychecks of hardworking Americans by raising their taxes, wants to spend more money, and wants to borrow more money from successive generations and never balance the budget.

This administration has made all sorts of promises it can't keep. For example, the Congressional Budget Office says that Pell grants will begin to have a shortfall in 2016 and every year thereafter. Medicare? My mom and dad

worked all of their life, paid into a program, and their government made them a promise. They said that, when you get to retirement age, we are going to provide you health care; yet the actuarial models say that program is going bankrupt, and the administration doesn't deal with it.

This budget does make tough decisions and makes tough choices. And the critics? They call this budget draconian. Only in Washington is making a tough choice labeled as being controversial.

It is important that we make these decisions and put our government back on a path of sustainable finances to grow our economy. By making these tough choices, we ensure our children and our grandchildren a better future because we are doing more than just balancing a budget. We are living out the American Dream. Beating in the heart of every American since this country was founded is the desire to leave a better way of life to successive generations, not saddle those generations with massive amounts of debt.

So, for those reasons, I support this budget, and I urge my colleagues to support this budget, as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred to tough decisions. Well, it is true that the House Republican budget is really tough on our kids' education. It cuts deeply into early education, Early Head Start, and Head Start. It cuts very deeply into K-12. That includes Title I and special education for kids with disabilities. As we have talked about, it charges college students higher interest rates.

And it is true that the Republican budget is tough on seniors on Medicare, because if they have high prescription drug costs, the Republican budget reopens the doughnut hole so they will face \$1,200 more per year on prescription drugs.

So it is tough on kids' education, and it is tough on seniors.

I will tell you who it is not tough on. It is not tough on powerful special interests, people who are spending millions of dollars right now on TV advertising trying to influence people's votes. It is not tough on them at all. As I said, this budget calls for cutting the top tax rate by, fully, 30 percent.

Now, during the Budget Committee debate, the Democrats said, okay, the only way you can do this mathematically, if you are cutting the top rate by 30 percent, from 39 percent to 25 percent, is if you do it in a deficit neutral way, then you are going to be increasing taxes on middle class taxpayers and families to finance those tax cuts. And so we said to our Republican colleagues, if that is not what you intend to do, let's at least pass an amendment telling the Ways and Means Committee that one of our principles is at least maintaining the current progressivity of the Tax Code so we don't increase taxes on middle class families or lower-income families to finance the tax breaks for the folks at the top, called

the Protect the American Middle Class from a Tax Increase amendment.

□ 1645

Republicans said no to that.

They have got all sorts of other instructions to the Ways and Means Committee in their budget, like reducing the top rate by a third for millionaires; but when it came to instructing the Ways and Means Committee not to increase the tax burden on middle class Americans, they said no to that.

So, yes, this Republican budget is tough on the middle class. It is tough on seniors, and it is tough on our kid's education; but for folks at the very top, they just don't ask for any shared sacrifice. We are just pointing that out. It is a fact in their budget.

The chairman talked about all those tax expenditures, \$1 trillion a year worth. Not one of those tax expenditures are closed for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

Now, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), a Member of Congress who has worked hard throughout his entire career to try and make sure that our country grows and that every American has opportunity, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have a choice to make. The House Democratic budget and the Republican's budget present very different choices about America's future. The Democratic alternative promotes job growth and expands opportunity. The Republican budget gives away trillions to the wealthy and special interests, while shredding the social safety net.

The Affordable Care Act is the most significant expansion of health coverage in 50 years. It ends discrimination based on preexisting conditions. It promotes health and prevention. It improves quality and lowers cost.

The Republican budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. Over 10 million Americans will lose coverage immediately. Insurers could discriminate based on preexisting conditions. More than 8 million seniors who have saved more than \$10 billion on prescription drugs and more than 32 million who have benefited from free preventive services would immediately see higher costs. The 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions would no longer be safe from discrimination.

After they repealed the Affordable Care Act, the Republican budget would slash Medicaid by a full 25 percent. This will hurt millions of seniors in nursing homes, millions of low-income babies whose mothers receive important prenatal care, and millions of people with disabilities. These are immoral and outrageous cuts.

The Republican budget also ends the Medicare guarantee, forcing seniors who stay in fee-for-service to pay more for the coverage they have today. It slashes key domestic spending, cutting biomedical research, key job creation programs, and programs that keep kids

from going hungry, just to name a few examples. Are these responsible choices? I don't think that is the path we ought to take.

The Democratic alternative is fiscally responsible and good for our Nation's health. I urge my colleagues to reject the House Republican approach and, instead, support working families, seniors, and people with disabilities by protecting our health care system from these attacks.

I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget. Vote support for the Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, at this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlemanly from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the Armed Services Committee, I am proud to support a balanced budget that stops spending money we don't have. It provides regulatory relief and promotes for a strong defense.

Our Federal debt tops an astonishing \$17 trillion. This is unacceptable. It is irresponsible to take more money from hard-working families just to spend more here in Washington.

Our Path to Prosperity budget balances in 10 years by cutting wasteful spending and reforming government. Just as importantly, this budget gets our priorities right again by providing for the common defense. It replaces \$274 billion in scheduled defense cuts to ensure the American people have a bright, safe future.

It is imperative we do so because, since taking office, President Obama has directed over \$1 trillion in cuts to our military. Under the President's budget, which cuts \$75 billion over the next 2 years, with deeper cuts expected if sequestration returns in fiscal year 2016, Secretary of Defense Hagel and other senior defense and military officials acknowledge that these budget choices will create additional risk to our Nation. We can't allow this to happen.

While we cut nearly one-fifth of our defense resources, Russia and China are arming at an alarming rate. Russia's military spending is up roughly 30 percent, and China's has more than doubled in recent years.

Given our military shortfalls, we must build upon the recent compromise and further reverse the current trajectory to mitigate the permanent damage to our national security.

I am proud to support a balanced budget that reins in government spending, promotes job creation, and reprioritizes our national defense. Our Path to Prosperity budget accomplishes these goals.

We cannot keep going to the Department of Defense to cut spending. We must deal with the real drivers of our debt and put our country on a sustainable path to grow the economy. America's future depends on it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a fighter for working Americans and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago, the gentleman from Mississippi said that families were sitting around at their kitchen table. Yes, they are sitting at their kitchen table, and they are crying.

They do not have a job. Their unemployment benefits have not been extended. Their wages have stagnated. They can't afford to send their children to college; and this majority fiddles while Rome burns and refuses to address any of these issues, but they certainly make it easy to lower the top tax rate for the richest Americans.

I rise in strong opposition to this cruel budget proposal; yet again, the House majority has put forward an ideological plan that puts all of the burdens on the most vulnerable among us, especially women and families.

Today is Equal Pay Day, a day that women's earnings finally catch up to what men made in 2013, but the fact is this dubious milestone, that it even exists, is a sad testament to the financial pressures that women and families face.

This budget proposal puts more pressure on women and families. Two-thirds of seniors in poverty are women. They rely on the bedrock American institution of Medicare to survive. This budget ends Medicare as we know it. It turns it into a voucher program. Seven in 10 elderly individuals, six in 10 non-elderly individuals rely on Medicaid, they are women.

The budget proposes \$2.7 trillion in cuts to Medicaid and other support that help low- and middle-income families buy health insurance.

WIC provides critical food benefits to 8.3 million pregnant postpartum women, infants, and children across America. The budget drastically slashes the program, hurting the same family struggling the most in this economy.

It devastates food stamps, the program in which almost two-thirds of the adult participants are women and children, and they account for nearly half of all recipients.

It cuts 170,000 kids from Head Start, educational services for 3.4 million disadvantaged children. It cuts the Pell grant by over \$125 billion. It allows the insurance companies to, once again, charge women more than men.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, it cuts Pell grants, and yet it allows insurance companies to, once again, charge women more than men and to treat pregnancy as a preexisting condition.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, 69 percent of the

cuts in the Republican budget would come from programs serving low- and moderate-income people. This Ryan Republican budget is not a reflection of America's values. It is not who we are as a country. It is an ideological document that threatens American families.

I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert into the RECORD a very specific recitation of the Center for Budget Priorities' claim that the gentlewoman mentioned, and at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

RESPONSIBLE SPENDING RESTRAINT AND REFORM—RESPONSE TO THE CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

In Brief:

A smaller increase is not a spending cut.

Under this budget, spending will grow, on average, by 3.5 percent a year over the next decade—on the current path, it will grow by 5.2 percent.

This budget spends \$3.5 trillion on Medicaid over the next ten years. We increase spending every year from fiscal year 2016 onward.

This budget spends \$600 billion on food stamps over the next decade. And it does not convert SNAP into a block grant until 2019, when the economy will have recovered.

This budget maintains the current maximum Pell award (\$5,730) throughout each of the next ten years of the budget.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities claims the House Republican budget "gets 69 percent of its cuts from low-income programs." Instead, the House GOP budget grows them at a more sustainable rate.

On the current path, the federal government will spend roughly \$48 trillion over the next ten years. By contrast, this budget will spend nearly \$43 trillion.

On the current path, spending will grow, on average, by 5.2 percent a year over the next decade. Under this budget, spending will grow, on average, by 3.5 percent a year.

Nearly \$43 trillion is enough. Increasing spending by 3.5 percent instead of 5.2 percent is hardly draconian.

President Obama and his party have made promises they can't keep—they've promised huge expansions to safety-net programs that ultimately would bankrupt them.

Medicaid: This budget repeals Obamacare—including the law's massive expansions of Medicaid, which are unsustainable. Instead, this budget spends \$3.5 trillion on Medicaid over the next ten years. We grow the program every year from fiscal year 2016 onward. We simply slow the rate of growth and give states the flexibility to meet the unique needs of their people.

SNAP: This budget spends \$600 billion on food stamps over the next decade. By capping open-ended federal subsidies and allowing states to develop new, innovative methods, the budget's gradual reforms encourage states to reduce rolls and help recipients find work. The budget also doesn't convert SNAP into a block grant until 2019, when the economy will have fully recovered. The budget also calls for time limits and work requirements like the reforms that helped reduce poverty nationwide in the mid-1990s.

Pell Grants: Congressional Democrats and the President have pushed Pell Grant spending to unsustainable rates. The Congressional Budget Office reports the program will face fiscal shortfalls starting in 2016 and continuing through each year of the budget

window. We need to reform the program so it can keep its promises. This budget brings Pell spending under control and makes sure aid helps the truly needy, not university administrators. At the same time, this budget maintains the current maximum Pell award (\$5,730) throughout each of the next ten years of the budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget plan. Unlike the President's budget, this is a serious proposal that balances our budget and helps our economy grow.

Our Nation is \$17.4 trillion in debt. If we want to preserve this country for our children and our grandchildren, we must reform the way Washington works.

Everyone knows that Medicare will soon go bankrupt, and that is why I am so happy that this budget proposal saves this important program for our seniors and future generations. By transitioning to a premium support model, we can preserve Medicare for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for younger generations.

Furthermore, this budget ends ObamaCare's raid on the Medicare trust fund and repeals ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board to help ensure our seniors get the care they deserve.

Despite what some critics say, this does not eliminate traditional Medicare. Instead, it ensures that Americans will always have traditional Medicare as an option. Under this plan, every senior will have the support they need to get the care they deserve. Those who attack this reform without offering credible alternatives are complicit in Medicare's demise.

So I want to commend Chairman RYAN and my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee for leading, where President Obama and the Senate Democrats have failed. One way or another, this country will have to address our out-of-control debt and deficits, and this budget does so responsibly.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 4 minutes to a fellow Marylander, Mr. HOYER, the Democratic whip, who has spent a lot of time focused on budgets to empower our economy and to make sure we do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I would first observe, Mr. Chairman, that the American people ought to lament another opportunity missed, an opportunity to come together and adopt a big, balanced plan for investment and balance in our fiscal system in America.

Mr. Chairman, last year, we adopted a budget. During the course of its implementation with the consideration of appropriation bills, the Republican chairman of the committee called the sequester numbers adopted in the 2014 Ryan plan unrealistic and ill-conceived.

For 2016 through 2024, Mr. Chairman, this budget has numbers below sequester levels that the chairman said were unrealistic and ill-conceived.

Chairman ROGERS has called the numbers in this budget draconian, Chairman ROGERS, responsible for funding the operations of government and assisting and building our economy and its people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is all that and a call to disinvestment. This budget is a call to disinvestment in America's growth and success.

We have heard a lot of claims, of course, about what the Republican budget will do for our country. I have heard those claims from previous Republican chairmen, frankly. They did not pan out.

Let me clear that fog away and get down to the raw numbers which reveal the magnitude of the damage the Republican budget will inflict. As a matter of fact, with all due respect, I call it a retreat—an alliterative retreat of course, the chairman's retreat.

First, the Republican budget would repeal the patient protections and other benefits of the Affordable Care Act, leaving millions without health insurance coverage.

Of course, it keeps the money; it just didn't give the benefits. It would turn Medicaid into a capped block grant program and cut its funding by \$732 billion over the next decade.

□ 1700

That is from seniors who need long-term care. That is from people with disabilities who need medical services.

Two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to low-income seniors, and the Republican budget cuts it by a quarter.

It would also end the Medicare guarantee and reopen the doughnut hole for prescription drugs, shifting costs back to seniors.

Secondly, the Republican budget disinvests, as I said, from many of the very important initiatives Congress has made a priority for the future growth and competitiveness of our economy.

It cuts over \$120 billion from middle class college affordability programs like the Pell grant and will leave a college undergraduate taking out a student loan as much as \$3,800 deeper in debt.

By eliminating funding for applied research, their budget will reduce Federal research grants by half—by half disinvestment. It could result in 2,400 fewer National Science Foundation research awards and 1,400 fewer National Institutes of Health awards.

The reality is, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget would decimate pediatric research. We have heard a little bit about that. It would decimate pediatric research. It would decimate all other research as well and other medical research in the lifesaving diseases by billions of dollars, not just pediatric research: cancer, heart, lung, blood, Alzheimer's, and others. \$173 billion

will be cut from highway spending over the next 10 years, disinvestment, even though infrastructure investments are critical to the growth of our manufacturing sector and job creation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. Overall, the Republican budget reduces our long-term investments in education, research, infrastructure, and job training by over 15 percent over the next decade compared to the deal the Republican chairman negotiated just 4 months ago.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, our competitors around the world are not retreating in terms of investments. Perhaps the most egregious mark against this budget, though, is that it does not achieve the fiscal balance its authors give as the reason for these cuts in the first place.

Instead, it relies on "dynamic scoring." That is, pretend something will happen. Now, if it happens, we would have a bonus and we could use that bonus. But if it doesn't happen, this budget will guarantee that we will be further in the hole.

It has an asterisk for \$966 billion. It doesn't say what that \$966 billion is about, at least two-thirds of it. But you guess, pretend, hope. If it doesn't happen, you are in the hole.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. This budget, Mr. Chairman, is a blueprint for economic decline, for vulnerable Americans being left to fend for themselves, and for an America less equipped to protect its citizens.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution and send a message that our country will continue to invest in its priorities: opportunity, security, and growth. Let us not retreat. Let us serve this country and serve its greatness.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to rest the mind of the distinguished minority whip at ease. Chairman ROGERS does support this budget. His comments in 2013 aside, he is a supporter of this budget. This budget balances using CBO numbers.

I would also say this. All these complaints about spending cuts or slower increases in spending aside—this budget, by the way, doesn't specify that NIH is going to have all of that—all of these reductions in spending or reductions in the increase in spending will pale in comparison if we have a debt crisis, if we have a bond market incident, if we have an interest rate shock.

If we keep kicking the can down the road, the solution then will be so much uglier, so much more draconian, than any of this hyperbolic rhetoric even suggests.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the House Republican budget.

Today, our national debt exceeds \$17.5 trillion. Mr. Chairman, that is a blueprint for decline—more than \$55,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. If we fail to address this mounting debt now, our children and our grandchildren will inherit an America that will be poorer, less free, and provide fewer opportunities.

To address this looming crisis, Republicans propose balancing the Federal budget in 10 years. Most Americans don't realize that discretionary spending has decreased 4 consecutive years, a tremendous accomplishment spurred on by House Republicans.

Now we must show the same resolve to tackle our largest drivers of debt, mandatory programs, including Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and SNAP. We can achieve balance without reducing overall spending—let me say that again—we can achieve balance without reducing overall spending by simply slowing the rate of growth at which spending increases. We must spend hardworking taxpayer dollars smarter.

Mr. Chairman, I am Medicare age, and I realize that for every dollar that we pay in in premiums, we get \$3 out in benefits. This is clearly not sustainable.

As a physician, I would like to commend Chairman RYAN for his continued efforts to save and strengthen Medicare. We must act to protect seniors' access to medical care before the Medicare trust fund becomes insolvent in 2026, a short time from now.

This proposal achieves that goal while ensuring those Americans 55 and older experience absolutely no change.

I urge my colleagues to support this very conservative budget.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, to create jobs and grow our economy, we must work toward lasting solutions that put our Nation back on solid fiscal ground, stop wasteful Washington spending, and balance our budget.

The American people deserve more accountability from Washington, and Washington has a responsibility to the American people to produce, number one, a budget, and, number two, a budget that balances. Anything less than that is a failure to lead.

That is why I introduced the Balanced Budget Accountability Act, which requires Congress to pass a balanced budget or Members won't get paid. The principles found in my Balanced Budget Accountability Act reflect Montana commonsense, and they stand in stark contrast with the President's budget, which never achieves

balance, and the Senate, where Democrat leaders have decided the American people don't deserve a budget at all. That is irresponsible and will only lead to never-ending deficits and a debt that will take generations to pay off. That is not the Montana way, that is not the American way.

I don't agree with everything in this budget, but I know that the people of Montana want and deserve a solution to our debt crisis, a balanced budget, and a Congress with the courage to lead.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me time.

As I am sitting on the floor listening to the back and forth and the division, I was thinking back to a time when there was consensus in this body on important investments for our future.

Indeed, the character of our Nation, our economic vitality, was grounded in the investment the United States made in our ports, our railroads, our highways. The finest infrastructure in the world gave the United States the strength to be victorious in battle in World War I and World War II, to have the economic strength to be able to meet national challenges, and to provide economic security and well-being for our families.

Unfortunately, as families struggle, as we have difficulty providing family-wage jobs for American workers, the American infrastructure is no longer the envy of the world, as it was in the past. In fact, all the independent studies show we are not anywhere near the top of the pack. We fall into the lower ranges of the development world.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our infrastructure a grade of D-plus and suggests we will need to invest over \$3 trillion over the next 6 years just to remain economically competitive in the global marketplace. The failure to deal with our infrastructure is going to cost American families in terms of wear and tear on their vehicles over \$1,000 a year and millions of hours stuck in traffic in congestion.

We are facing a soon-to-be-bankrupt highway trust fund. The clock is ticking. By the end of September, it will run out of money, which means we are seeing cutbacks on Federal contracts this summer, which means some States are having to act now this spring. The decision of Tennessee this last week—it is the 11th State that has announced cutbacks.

The Republican budget being debated today ignores this pending crisis, let alone the growing needs of American communities. Their budget would freeze us in decline, a 30 percent reduction over the next decade from already inadequate levels, making it impos-

sible to deal with projects of national significance and severely straining on-going maintenance of our highway and transit systems.

It doesn't have to be this way. A broad and powerful coalition ranging from the AFL-CIO to the Chamber of Congress, the trucking association, AAA, bicyclists, environmentalists, local governments, contractors, businesses large and small have joined with a group of 17 bipartisan governors and the heads of 31 State chambers of commerce to urge that Congress face this funding crisis so that we can have a full 6-year reauthorization so that we can put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work, strengthen the economy, and protect our communities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Instead of wasting more time on a budget that is going nowhere, we should come together to address our failing bridges, roads, and water system. Our future demands it, our constituents expect no less.

I strongly urge the rejection of the Republican budget if for no other reason than it freezes us in this decline for infrastructure and look forward to the day when we will work together to solve this problem.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 40 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 41½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Does the chairman have any further speakers?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I do not have any further speakers at the moment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and ranking member of our Budget Committee for the opportunity to share some thoughts.

Mixed messaging—it really grips the American public. Washington Republicans are presenting their budget and proclaiming that we are about reducing the debt and reducing the deficit. We are concerned about our children, we are concerned about our grandchildren.

At the same time, the mixed message is to the crowd that is above a million dollar threshold, income threshold: We have money for you we are going to spend for you. We are so concerned about the debt and the deficit that needs to be reduced, but we will spend on you. We will offer you an average \$200,000 tax break, so allow us to spend on you.

Somehow the children and the grandchildren are not a worry then. So the mixed messaging on this one is amazing.

□ 1715

Over the last couple of days, I have had the opportunity to either meet in the office or in group sessions or in large gatherings here in Washington with a number of advocates who are concerned about investments that need to be made in this Federal budget.

There is the Alzheimer's Association that is imploring us to find a cure, to invest in research. Washington Republicans say: no, we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy, and we need to use your funds to reduce the debt and the deficit.

Washington Republicans will tell our college-bound students who need an affordable path to that higher ed opportunity that: we can't spend on you or invest in you, we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy.

Washington Republicans will sweep the savings and the revenues of the Affordable Care Act and proclaim to the senior community that: we are now repealing the Affordable Care Act, all of the benefits that were there for you are now removed.

Washington Republicans will tell a group that I met with about water infrastructure needs: we can't spend on you because we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy.

This is a mixed message that is disingenuous.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I think we should be real with the American public. We either stand for spending or we don't. We want to address the debt and deficit or we don't. We believe in investment, as the Democratic minority in this House believes, that will grow the economy and provide a greater opportunity for jobs.

There is this path to prosperity for a few that the Republicans have put together with their budget. I suggest that we look at a highway for hope that has been advanced by the Democrats in the House that invests in Alzheimer's research, higher ed opportunities, infrastructure for this Nation, and a continuation of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think there is this view that the pie of life is fixed, that society is static—the economy, a fixed pie—and that we here in Washington should decide how to redistribute the slices of the pie.

We reject that whole, entire premise. Life is dynamic. The economy is dynamic. We want to grow the pie for everybody. You don't grow the pie—grow opportunity or grow the economy—if you drive this country to a debt crisis, if you continue spending way beyond your means, if you spend money we

don't have that is taken from the next generation.

This President has already raised taxes \$1.7 trillion. The top effective tax rate on successful small businesses is almost 45 percent. The tax rate on big businesses, like corporations, is 35 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional minute.

Our competitors, the countries we compete with, tax their businesses at 25 percent. When we tax ourselves a lot more than our foreign competitors tax themselves, they win, and we lose.

What we are hearing from the other side is that \$1.7 trillion tax increase is not enough. Let's go farther and tax another \$1.8 trillion.

Then this rhetoric about winners and losers and the few and the this and the that is a notion that all of the good ideas come from Washington. It is a notion that goes beyond the idea that government needs to play a supporting role in our lives, in fulfilling important missions like health and retirement security and a safety net, to government needs to play the commanding role in our lives, that it needs to dictate these things, that government runs the economy, that government decides who wins and who loses.

Guess what, Mr. Chairman? When you do that, the interest groups that they are all complaining about, they are the ones who call the shots up here.

What we are trying to do with this budget is to get the basics right. What we want to do is to make sure that we can make good on these very important missions of health and retirement security, and we want to make sure that people get to decide how it is done in their lives.

We want to make sure that American businesses have what they need to compete and survive and grow and to create jobs in this global economy. What we want to make sure is that we don't live beyond our means so that our kids live below their means. We want to grow this economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional minute.

We have got a big debt. We all know that. The question is: Who owns our debt? Who is in control of our future?

We already know we are asking a lot from the next generation, more than any other generation has before. Back when I was born in 1970, 6 percent of our national debt was owned by foreigners. In 1990, when I was in college, 19 percent was owned by foreigners. Today, 47 percent of our national debt is owned by foreigners. They control half of our debt.

That is not in our country's interest. Relying on other countries to cash flow our country—to cash flow our budget—is not smart economics, and we know

we are taking control of our country and are ceding it elsewhere.

This is why we have got to get this debt under control, for our kids, for our grandkids, for our economy, and for our sovereignty.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We all believe in a growing economy, and we all believe in greater prosperity. The issue is how do we make sure we have that prosperity as a country.

We have two very important strains in the American character. One strain is the entrepreneurial strain, the self-reliance strain, and that has helped generate great prosperity in this country.

It has helped unleash huge amounts of potential; yet we have also learned as a country that there are some things we can do better by working together than if we are just hundreds of millions of people who are separately operating on their own, with things like investing in our national infrastructure, with things like investing in a world-class college system, with things like working and investing in medical research, so that we are the world's leader in those areas.

Those are what have made us a world economic power and that have allowed us to support our military.

The problem with the Republican budget is that it ignores that part of the American character. We keep hearing from our colleagues about all of those tax expenditures that are out there, but I just have to go back, Mr. Chairman, to point out that they don't close one of those tax loopholes for the purpose of helping to reduce the deficit.

Because they make that decision—because they decide to say: we are not going to touch those very powerful special interests and the very wealthy—their budget mathematically has to come after other people in the country, after the middle class, after seniors, after our kids' education, after our infrastructure. That is what this is all about.

Our budget and the President's budget dramatically reduce the deficit. They reduce the debt as a function of a share of the economy in the outyears going down. The Republican budget didn't balance until 2040 just a few years ago.

So the issue is whether you are going to be driven by the ideological target or whether your fundamental focus will be jobs and opportunity. That is what ours does.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for the hard work that he has been doing over the last several years as we look to get a handle on the spending problem we have here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, our debt is out of control. In the past 10 years, it has more than doubled, from \$7.1 trillion to \$17.6 trillion today. We paid almost \$416 billion in interest just last year. Imagine where that money could have been better spent.

The failure to address the debt and deficits reduces opportunity and prosperity for future generations. It directly threatens our ability to pay for our priorities like Social Security, Medicare, a strong national defense, and taking care of our veterans.

Unfortunately, President Obama has offered another budget that increases taxes, that expands the government, that does nothing to save Medicare or Social Security, and that never balances. HARRY REID's Senate will not even consider a budget this year.

The budget we offer to the American people protects and preserves Medicare and Social Security, and it balances in 10 years. When Congress responsibly budgets, we increase economic security for our families and ensure that we leave our children and grandchildren with more opportunities and a brighter future.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues to do the right thing by workers, families, and future generations. Pass this budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I thank all of the Members for a thoughtful and important debate.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this is all about. It is about gripping—taking hold—of the heart and soul of America.

As I said in the Rules Committee, the budget is actually a moral document, a moral compass, of where we want to take this country. I think what needs to be explained to the American public is that, in actuality, we have been making progress.

The deficit has gone down from \$1 trillion from the past administration, from the Bush administration, to now \$680 billion. We are making progress, from losing 800,000 jobs a month to gaining close to 200,000; yet the document that is on the floor today, the Ryan budget—the Republican budget—chooses not to have the morality and the affection for the American people that is desired.

When you look at their budget, you will see that \$3.3 trillion of their budget—69 percent—is cut from programs

for people with low or moderate incomes, from the very people who need a staircase of opportunity, and they give \$200,000 in tax cuts to the top 1 percent.

None of us have any challenge to prosperity and opportunity, but how can you have a budget that hits low-income programs or programs that give opportunity?

How many have gone to school because of Pell grants? \$175 million in cuts. How many people have gotten their health care from Medicaid and still do, like children? How many people have needed to have the SNAP program?

I believe that we should have budgets that work for all people. I intend to vote for the CBC budget and for the Democratic budget and “no” on this underlying Republican budget. We need to have a standard that respects all people in this country, and this budget does not.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 96, the House Republicans’ “Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2015.” I oppose this irresponsible budget resolution because it continues the reckless approach to fiscal policy that the House majority has championed for years, with disastrous results.

Mr. Chair, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or “Obamacare” would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought. But they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 10 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it. (7 million through the exchange and 3 million through Medicaid).

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again. Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs. Wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, I strongly oppose the Republican budget because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

I oppose this Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and SNAP programs into a block grant and Medicaid into a voucher.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the backs of working families, seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, we Democrats have a better way. We understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to “wither on the vine.”

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

5. The Republican plan would re-open the “donut hole,” forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than \$2,970 for the year.

6. Seniors reaching the prescription drug “donut hole” would pay an average of \$828 more in prescription drug costs in 2014 and approximately \$13,000 more from now through 2022.

7. Under the Republican budget, the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2012 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

8. The Republican budget slashes \$31.71 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

9. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve 91,717 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, this budget could have invested in programs that help strengthen the middle class, reduce poverty, and strengthen our economic recovery. Instead, the Republican budget makes deep cuts to the area of the budget

helping low-income families put food on the table and make ends meet.

These are families who are already struggling with unemployment, lower wages, and just simply trying to make ends meet.

The House Republican budget will push millions more Americans into poverty and put a large number of low-income children, seniors, and people with disabilities at risk.

It guts Medicare and Medicaid and calls for massive cuts to food assistance, all in order to protect tax breaks for special interests and for multimillionaires who are not even asking for them.

The Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, short-sighted, reckless—but “fair and balanced” is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and Congressional Progressive Caucus, which were made in order by the Rules Committee, are each worthy of support because they fairly balance the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

Specifically, the Alternative Budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, CBC, and CPC:

- help create more jobs now;
- replace the sequester;
- make key education investments;
- invest in research and development and clean energy;
- invest in long-term infrastructure;
- preserve Medicare as we know it;
- protect health reform’s benefits for seniors;
- protect Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes;
- preserve Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP);

reduce the deficit through a smart, targeted, and steady approach provides tax relief for working families and ends tax breaks for the wealthy;

- take a balanced approach to reducing the long-term deficits and debt; and
- put the budget on a sustainable path

Mr. Chair, under the Democratic budget, the deficit would fall from 7 percent of GDP in 2014 to 2.3 percent of GDP in 2024.

The Democratic Budget Alternative will generate at least a million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans’ “austerity first” plan by making the investments needed to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, create greater upward mobility, and ensure opportunity for our children and future generations.

The Democratic alternative budgets extend Emergency Unemployment Compensation for the long-term unemployed, which provides a lifeline to the 2.37 million jobless workers who have already lost their benefits and the 72,000 persons who stand to lose their benefits each week if Congress does not act.

Additionally, the Democratic budget immediately ends the Sequester, which would otherwise cost the economy 750,000 jobs by the end of the year, and replaces it with deficit reduction resulting from a balanced approach combining responsible spending cuts with increased revenues by cutting tax breaks for special interests and wealthy individuals without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic alternative budget maintains our commitment to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; expands the EITC for childless workers; extends the tax credits from the American Taxpayer Relief Act due to expire at the end of 2017, and provides \$7.6 billion annually for early childhood education.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values. As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

For that reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility. To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards. The Democratic alternatives do not. For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 96 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this ill-conceived and unwise measure.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I ran over here right now is that I have been listening to some of the speakers on the left.

As the gentlewoman just spoke, in referring to the budget as a moral document, I actually somewhat agree with that, but let's actually discuss what is moral for the next generation and the generation after that and the generation after that.

For the fun of it, as I was running out the door, I grabbed this little poster which had been dropped off to me last week. It is a little poster from over at the Mercatus Center, which has been doing some calculations of what the United States' debt would look like if you took the debt in the unfunded liabilities of this country and put it on GAAP accounting, so if you actually treated it honestly.

What is the real number, the typical actuarial 75-year window, attached with regular debt?

Process in your mind what you have been told year after year of our unfunded liabilities, and I need you to wipe that number clean. The number they came up with recently has hit \$205 trillion of debt in unfunded liabilities.

You do realize, if you go right now to Google and look up the best estimates of the wealth of the world, our unfunded liabilities are now exceeding many of the estimates of the wealth of the entire world.

This is what so many Members are willing to hand to our children, to our great-grandchildren, and to the future generations?

If you want to make a moral argument, that debt—those unfunded liabilities—is the moral argument.

□ 1730

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. We are both making an argument that aligns with our points of view on the budget, and the bottom line here is that we have got to invest, we have got to have a balanced budget, and we have got to figure out how to do it. But the question I have about this budget is: What is going to happen to the potholes in America?

I came out of a State legislature where we had constraints on us. We had to find ways to pay our bills within the means of the people of Vermont to be able to pay them. We had to deal with real problems. It required a confident approach to investing in the future. That has to be part of a budget.

America's roads are falling apart. Our bridges are falling down. This is a real disaster when it comes to meeting the infrastructure needs of this country. The American Society of Civil Engineers rates our infrastructure D-plus and estimates that the amount of investment needed by 2020 is \$3.6 billion.

This budget accepts the looming insolvency of the highway trust fund, and it does absolutely nothing to fix it. Those potholes are not going to fix themselves. And that is not a Republican or Democratic deal. Those are potholes in your district and mine.

It is scientific research as well. Both sides of the aisle are proud of America's scientific achievements. What this budget continues to do is reduce and squeeze National Institutes of Health grants by about 1,400. Just in the State of Vermont, the University of Vermont has seen a 20 percent drop in those research grants that help those with Ph.D.'s find cures for diseases in the future.

A confident nation is going to fix its roads.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has approximately 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Having the right to close, we have no more speakers on this side.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Just so I understand, the majority has consumed 34 minutes?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do appreciate the back-and-forth discussion here, but I want to put this in perspective, if I could, because our friends with the Republican budget

have assumed, for instance, that we don't necessarily have to raise taxes. We could actually cut some of the loopholes that we have offered repeatedly; and although that is referred to rhetorically, they have never been able to follow through with any that they would cut.

There are Medicaid cuts. And make no mistake about it, these Medicaid cuts are actually reductions in nursing home care for America's most vulnerable. That is two-thirds of this money that it is going to be visited back on the States and impacting families.

They repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they keep all the associated revenues.

We went through a campaign season excoriating Democrats for the reductions in Medicare Advantage, and they keep that in their budget.

There is the magic of dynamic scoring, which we have heard about repeatedly for years, which never really quite proves itself.

And then we have cuts to Pell grants. We heard described in committee that these cuts to Pell grants are not a problem because they are just an excuse to raise tuition and enrich lavish academic salaries.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget would not only freeze us into a downward decline in our infrastructure, it would be the lowest level of nonmilitary discretionary spending that we have seen in generations. It is not going to happen; it shouldn't happen; and my Republican friends should not be able to get away with assuming that this is a viable and responsible approach.

I hope we will come to the point again where we can find a way to come together to deal with things that we actually agree on in a tangible way and make some real progress.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, budgeting is about choosing. Budgeting is about setting priorities. In this particular case, it is about setting a path for the country.

We have got serious fiscal challenges unlike any we have ever had before; and when we look at some of these fiscal challenges, it is very clear that the sooner we get on top of these problems, the sooner we deal with these problems, the better off everybody is going to be.

Here, in a nutshell, is our big fiscal issue. It is not a Democrat or Republican thing. It is not a partisan thing. It is really sort of a demographic and math thing.

We are going from roughly 40 million seniors to about 80 million seniors, retirees. The baby boomers are retiring, 10,000 people a day, at this pace, for 10 years. The programs that they rely on, like Medicare—really important programs—grow 6 to 8 percent a year.

So when you have a pay-as-you-go system where current workers pay current taxes under their current paychecks to pay for current retirees—as I

am paying my payroll taxes for my mom's Medicare and Social Security benefits, and when I am retired, my kids will do the same for me—and you have an 89 percent increase in the retirement population but about a 17 percent increase in the taxing population, therein lies your challenge.

So these programs are growing so much faster than our ability to pay. They are growing faster than wages, economy, and revenues, to the point where these programs that we rely on that are so special and necessary—I have seen Social Security and Medicare do important things in my own family and my own life—these things are going bankrupt. The sooner we fix it, the better off we are all going to be.

The other problem is, if we don't fix this, if we don't even show the world or the country that we intend to fix this, our economy really suffers, because the economy, businesses, banks, credit unions, creditors, small businesses, and large businesses don't know what the future is going to look like.

So all these things we need to do to get people to take risks and hire people and invest and start a new business, we are slowing that down. That is why the CBO says the economy is slowing down. It is hard to get people out of poverty if we don't have good jobs for them to get out of poverty with.

If you look at this chart, we are going into uncharted territory. We have had big debt before. Our debt was as big as our economy in World War II, but for the years we fought World War II, then it went back down.

Because of this problem I described—not a Republican or Democrat problem, but just America's problem—our debt has grown more than twice the size of our economy. You can't have a prosperous society with that kind of debt. It has never been done before.

And so what we are saying is let's get ahead of this problem. Let's phase in these reforms so that we can make good on our promise to our seniors who have already retired and so that all those people nearing retirement—people in their later fifties thinking and planning for their retirement—let's make good for them. But let's acknowledge that those of us in the X generation and lower—those younger—these programs will not be there for us when we retire. We need to fix this.

And by the way, we need pro-growth solutions: reform the Tax Code, balance the budget, have an energy renaissance in America, and streamline regulations so businesses know how to plan so that we can create jobs and economic growth. This budget does all of that. That is why I urge its adoption, and that is why I look forward to continuing this debate tomorrow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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. BARR) having assumed the chair, Mr.

HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, had come to no resolution thereon.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Senate acted forcefully by passing legislation to renew emergency unemployment insurance. I would encourage this House to follow that example so we may provide a vital lifeline to over 2 million Americans to provide for their families. These are hard-working Americans who are out there every day looking for employment or receiving education to be better prepared to reenter the workforce.

In Ohio, 75,200 unemployed workers need these extended benefits they earned. As our economy continues recovering from the greatest recession in modern history, let us give them what they earned.

We must avoid making this a partisan issue. Workers in both Democratic and Republican districts desperately need this critical lifeline. The House must act today. Let the Speaker bring the Senate bill up for a vote here so the House can finally pass legislation.

Let us do what is sensible and allow these Americans to keep our economic recovery going by not falling into the ranks of poverty themselves. These hardworking Americans have earned their benefits.

[From The New York Times, Aug. 30, 2012]

MAJORITY OF NEW JOBS PAY LOW WAGES, STUDY FINDS

(By Catherine Rampell)

While a majority of jobs lost during the downturn were in the middle range of wages, a majority of those added during the recovery have been low paying, according to a new report from the National Employment Law Project.

The disappearance of midwage, midskill jobs is part of a longer-term trend that some refer to as a hollowing out of the work force, though it has probably been accelerated by government layoffs.

"The overarching message here is we don't just have a jobs deficit; we have a 'good jobs' deficit," said Annette Bernhardt, the report's author and a policy co-director at the National Employment Law Project, a liberal research and advocacy group.

The report looked at 366 occupations tracked by the Labor Department and clumped them into three equal groups by wage, with each representing a third of American employment in 2008. The middle third—occupations in fields like construction, manufacturing and information, with median hourly wages of \$13.84 to \$21.13—accounted for 60 percent of job losses from the beginning of 2008 to early 2010.

The job market has turned around since then, but those fields have represented only 22 percent of total job growth. Higher-wage occupations—those with a median wage of \$21.14 to \$54.55—represented 19 percent of job losses when employment was falling, and 20 percent of job gains when employment began growing again.

Lower-wage occupations, with median hourly wages of \$7.69 to \$13.83, accounted for 21 percent of job losses during the retraction. Since employment started expanding, they have accounted for 58 percent of all job growth.

The occupations with the fastest growth were retail sales (at a median wage of \$10.97 an hour) and food preparation workers (\$9.04 an hour). Each category has grown by more than 300,000 workers since June 2009.

Some of these new, lower-paying jobs are being taken by people just entering the labor force, like recent high school and college graduates. Many, though, are being filled by older workers who lost more lucrative jobs in the recession and were forced to take something to scrape by.

"I think I've been very resilient and resistant and optimistic, up until very recently," said Ellen Pinney, 56, who was dismissed from a \$75,000-a-year job in which she managed procurement and supply for an electronics company in March 2008.

Since then, she has cobbled together a series of temporary jobs in retail and home health care and worked as a part-time receptionist for a beauty salon. She is now working as an unpaid intern for a construction company, putting together bids and business plans for green energy projects, and has moved in with her 86-year-old father in Forked River, N.J.

"I really can't bear it anymore," she said, noting that her applications to places like PetSmart and Target had gone unanswered. "From every standpoint—my independence, my sense of purposefulness, my self-esteem, my life planning—this is just not what I was planning."

As Ms. Pinney's experience shows, low-wage jobs have not been growing especially quickly in this recovery; they account for such a big share of job growth mostly because midwage job growth has been so slow.

Over the last few decades, the number of midwage, midskill jobs has stagnated or declined as employers chose to automate routine tasks or to move them offshore.

Job growth has been concentrated in positions that tend to fall into two categories: manual work that must be done in person, like styling hair or serving food, which usually pays relatively little; and more creative, design-oriented work like engineering or surgery, which often pays quite well.

Since 2001, employment has grown 8.7 percent in lower-wage occupations and 6.6 percent in high-wage ones. Over that period, midwage occupation employment has fallen by 7.3 percent.

This "polarization" of skills and wages has been documented meticulously by David H. Autor, an economics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A recent study found that this polarization accelerated in the last three recessions, particularly the last one, as financial pressures forced companies to reorganize more quickly.

"This is not just a nice, smooth process," said Henry E. Siu, an economics professor at the University of British Columbia, who helped write the recent study about polarization and the business cycle. "A lot of these jobs were suddenly wiped out during recession and are not coming back."

On top of private sector revamps, state and local governments have been shedding workers in recent years. Those jobs lost in the public sector have been primarily in mid and

higher-wage positions, according to Ms. Bernhardt's analysis.

"Whenever you look at data like these, there is this tendency to get overwhelmed, that there are these inevitable, big macro forces causing this polarization and we can't do anything about them. In fact, we can," Ms. Bernhardt said. She called for more funds for states to stem losses in the public sector and federal infrastructure projects to employ idled construction workers. Both proposals have faced resistance from Republicans in Congress.

REMEMBERING THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, my Special Order deals with the very difficult and even painful subject of Rwanda.

Mr. Speaker, there is an ancient story about Rwanda. It is one from which a number of meanings can be extracted.

We are here today because we remember the victims of the horrific events in our world's history. We honor survivors and recognize the steps that have been taken to remedy the atrocities that have occurred.

Over and over, you will hear people on this floor, Mr. Speaker, say that things that have happened in our history that were horrific and inhuman shall never happen again. Things like American slavery and the European extermination, mainly by Germany, of Jews throughout Europe should never happen again.

□ 1745

So we must continue to fight for justice as the international issues come to our consciousness. And we know that, as time moves on, there will be additional tragedies around the globe.

Rwanda has certainly experienced its share, if not more than its share, of tragedy. This ancient parable in Rwandan is, God spends the day elsewhere, but he sleeps in Rwanda—Imana yirirwa ahandi igataha I Rwanda. For those of us who are familiar with the creation story, we know that God worked for 6 days and then rested. The Rwandan people believe that God, on the seventh day, came to Rwanda to rest from his work the previous 6 days.

Rwanda is 1 mile above sea level, about what Denver, Colorado is. And because of its elevation, Rwanda is paradisiacal, in the sense that the climate

is cooler in Rwanda than it is in many of the other parts of Africa, certainly sub-Saharan Africa, and the greenery is like that of no other place in Africa, and it will rival even some of the beautiful spots in the Caribbean.

It is also a fabulous place, the Rwandans thought, for God to come to rest.

Well, in a country of seven million, at least in 1994—who knows what the population is today, after many of the atrocities, but the people believed that God could rest there in this beautiful, this lush, very, very receiving and welcoming land, without being interrupted.

Now, all cultures, all religions choose to elevate its land or its people. For example, the Jewish people, understandably, refer to the Sea of Galilee as a sea. For those who know geography, you know that the Sea of Galilee is actually a lake.

The Jordan River—before I went there for the first time, back in 1994, I envisioned the Jordan River as something comparable to the Mississippi River or something comparable to the Missouri River, which is about 2,000 miles across the country.

The truth of the matter is, there were certain points of the Jordan River that I actually jumped over. And it flows down into the Dead Sea, which is, again, not a sea, but another lake.

So it is understandable that people will declare something to be a little more than it really is. So the Rwandan people, believing that God came to their country, this paradise, 1 mile above sea level, was something that, I think, many of us would have done had we been Rwandans.

I also know that there were people who would question how could God sleep in a place with all of the genocide that has taken place there, with all of the violence against the men and women and children, and even violence based on tribal ethnicity. But the Rwandan people still believe that God sleeps in their country.

I believe that God sleeps in Rwanda, but I also believe that He is awakened because of what has happened. God can neither sleep nor slumber where there is injustice, where there is wrong, where there is murder, and so God has had an unrestful amount of time, unrestful nights in Rwanda since the beginning of the great genocide.

800,000 people, Mr. Speaker, mostly ethnic Tutsis and moderate Hutus, died at the hand of Hutu extremists during a 100-day period; a 100-day period.

That would be killing all the people of my hometown of Kansas City, Missouri, the largest city in our State, and all the people 221 miles away in St. Louis. Both cities would be completely exterminated if they lost 800,000 people.

But the Rwandan people lost 800,000 people in 100 days. That is seven individuals, seven human beings created by God, murdered every 7 minutes.

Ten thousand victims were killed each day. Just think about it: 10,000

human beings created with the hands of the alms-giving God. And then someone stole their lives for something as petty as ethnicity, something as petty as a different language.

So when you think about hundreds of thousands of victims who were murdered, there are hundreds of other thousands of victims who were infected with HIV, as the Hutu extremists raped, as a tool of violence, women and young girls.

The killing ended once Tutsi rebel forces attacked and retook the country.

When I think about what we have done and what we have spent in lands around the world, to tragedies no less repulsive, I have to raise the question, why has the United States been asleep, lo, these many years?

I think that our children and our children's children will look back on the nineties, in particular, and wonder, where were the Americans?

Where was the United States while this happened?

Now, 20 years after all of the genocide, Rwanda has moved stunningly in a new and positive direction. I am very pleased that they have, and all Americans should be pleased. But there still is much work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. CLEAVER, I appreciate you doing this.

You know, it is just staggering to think about what happened and all of those people going about their daily lives 20 years ago, on April 7, and knowing they are going to die, knowing their loved ones are going to die.

It is so unspeakable that we can't, I can't really imagine what it would be like to live in that country, to live in a neighborhood where you know your moment is coming, where you have a child who is going to die before your very eyes, where your daughter is going to be raped and then killed.

To have this sense of the horror of what is taking place, it is unspeakable. But the realization that the world is going to ignore it, and that happened, day in and day out. Most of us didn't even know about it. There would be reports, but it would be in a distant place. It wasn't anything that you could do anything about.

It was only as the stories fully came out and the horror was fully revealed that the collective gaze of the world that was not acting—there were all kinds of reasons why I suppose we couldn't or we didn't.

But just try to put yourself in the place of the family, up and down that country, where the word is going from one village to another, from one community to another, from one family to another, that you have got to do everything you can to get out.

And where you live in a community where the majority is going to kill you if they find you, where, as you hide and try to conceal yourself or your kids, you can't figure out how to feed them,

and you have got to come out into the light of day and put yourself at the mercy of your luck, where do you find or meet somebody who might give you a meal so that you can carry on another day.

It is not anything that I can imagine, just the wholesale use of murder in ethnic cleansing, in order to achieve a political goal.

What is an amazing thing is what Mr. CLEAVER just told us, about the recovery of Rwanda. These people go on.

Imagine living with the heartache that will never leave you, that you lost a son or daughter, a parent or grandparent. How do you get yourself up and start all over again?

How do you deal with the hatred that you have to fight because it will consume you and prevent you from carrying on yourself?

How do you do that?

The people in Rwanda are doing that and rebuilding that country, rebuilding their economy, and facing life on a day-in-and-day-out basis.

But having a moment to pause and remember is, I think, humbling for all of us. The capacity that we have, as people, to go awry and do things that never, in a million years, do we think was possible, reminds me of just how fragile life is and how really, in a lot of ways, fragile good governance is. You can't take it for granted.

I think all of us here know that there are forces that can get unleashed which, once they are, have an enormously powerful and destructive tendency. The challenge for all of us is to create ways where we can resolve conflict in peaceful and civil ways. The work of that is the work of this Congress and the work of this democracy.

It is fragile. It isn't anything we can ever take for granted. It has to be with that purpose of allowing people to find ways to resolve differences peacefully.

So this is an amazing moment, 20 years after the beginning of the slaughter of 800,000 innocent people, and a slaughter by very cruel and very painful and very relentless efforts.

So thank you so much, Mr. CLEAVER, for allowing us to have this moment of reflection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you to Mr. WELCH, who is a very conscientious Member of this body. We appreciate his sensitivity, as well as that of many others who probably will not be here on the floor.

I will state again, because Congressman WELCH has mentioned it, that is 800,000 people, 800,000 people killed, murdered in 100 days. 10,000 human beings killed every 24 hours in this world during our lifetime.

So the Rwandans' ancient parable about God sleeping at night in Rwanda is only partially true. God could not sleep nor slumber with this kind of tragedy taking place anywhere in a world that He created for freedom and justice and peace and harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman

from the Fifth District of Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the whip of the Democratic Caucus.

□ 1800

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

Mr. HOYER. Never again. We intone those words, "never again." We intone those words because we have seen horror and felt guilt that it happens on our watch, and so we say "never again."

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of chairing the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That commission was formed as a result of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975 by Gerald Ford and leaders of 34 other European nations, including the Soviet Union, including West Germany, including East Germany. Never again.

The extraordinary Holocaust that cost the lives of millions and millions and millions and millions more; not only in the Holocaust, where 6 million Jews were taken from us, taken from their families, taken from their countries, taken from life, but millions more in Russia, Ukraine, and literally in scores of other venues murdered.

They were murdered not because of their engagement in war, not because of their engagement in crime, but because of who they were, what religion they had, what ethnic background they claimed—murdered—murdered because of what they were, and the murderers did not like what they were—not their character, not their intellect, not their conduct, but who they were.

So here we are, 20 years later, having watched as genocide was, again, perpetrated in Rwanda. The genocide in Rwanda, the 20th anniversary of which we mark this week, provided Americans with one of our most painful examples of a failure to act, but not Americans alone, Mr. Speaker. The entire civilized world waited, watched, lamented, but did not stop the genocide.

America and much of the world waited far too long to become involved in Rwanda, and even then, international peacekeepers were not given a mandate for the resources to stop the killing.

I am sure many of us, Mr. Speaker, saw the movie "Hotel Rwanda." Nick Nolte played the blue-helmeted colonel who was in charge of the U.N. unit. When carnage was occurring and the colonel that Nolte was playing was watching, someone asked: Why aren't you doing something? And his response was: because that is not our mandate, it is to report.

I will say, in a minute, that thousands of lives were saved by the blue helmets and by others, but the U.N. mandate was not to stop it, but to report it.

President Clinton has expressed regret that the United States did not act in time to save lives, saying last year, "If we'd gone in sooner, I believe we could have saved at least a third of the lives that were lost."

Now, the figure of 800,000 is being used, but that is an estimate. It could be as little, perhaps, as 500,000 and as many as 1 million-plus. It is estimated that more than 1 million men, women, and children were killed in a span of—as my friend from Missouri, Reverend CLEAVER—Congressman EMANUEL CLEAVER has said. 1 million in 100 days, 10,000 victims every day, 7 people shot or hacked to death with machetes every minute, every minute, and the world watched and wrung its hands and said how wrong that was, and the machetes kept hacking.

More than just killing, the Rwandan genocide left hundreds of thousands of people infected with HIV as a result of another implement of war that those who perpetrate genocide have used, rape, a crime not of sexual desire, but of violence, of injury, of hate.

Widows of murdered men were infected and, in many cases, left to bear the children of their rapist. The children, of course, were infected, too.

The violence left 400,000 orphans, small children who then had to learn at a young age how to care for their younger siblings on their own.

Mr. Speaker, the Rwandan genocide provided the world with yet another lesson in our shared responsibility not just to say the words "never again," but to mean them. Mr. Speaker, we are our brother's keeper, and our brother needs our vigilance and our help, as we need his; and we are our sister's keeper, just as well.

Just as the genocide displayed humanity's darkest side, it also provided us with proof of human courage and defiance in the face of evil. From the outnumbered U.N. peacekeepers who saved lives wherever they could—and that ability was far too limited—to the individual Rwandans who risked death and rape to protect their neighbors, we acknowledge those few moments of moral clarity in the midst of great evil.

I said that I was the chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Mr. Speaker, 250,000 Bosniaks lost their lives in a genocide perpetrated by Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic.

We finally acted in that case and saved literally hundreds of thousands of more, deposed Milosevic, and put him in the dock for war crimes in the Hague, but not before 8,000 souls in Bosnia were gunned down and murdered in Trebenista. The U.N. troops failed to stop that—again, insufficient resources.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we mark this 20th anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, I join my colleagues in mourning those who were killed and in recognizing the many changes Rwanda has undergone over the past two decades. We all wish Rwanda continued success in its efforts to take from the ashes a successful society and to protect the safety and freedom of its people.

I hope Americans across the country will take some time this week to reflect not only on the Rwandan genocide, but on all genocides, to remember its horrors and to promise never to let our Nation sit idly by as a genocide takes place. Mr. Speaker, it is a complicated conclusion, too long, too often delayed.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me to recognize this solemn anniversary. I want to thank, in particular, my dear friend from Missouri, EMANUEL CLEAVER, who preaches to his flock, who preaches to his constituents and, yes, who preaches to all of us to look to the better nature of our souls, to reach out, to lift up, to protect, to give solace, to give sympathy, to give empathy, to give understanding, and to be our brother's keeper.

Mr. CLEAVER. I thank the distinguished whip for his comments and for, frankly, requesting that we have the opportunity this evening to remember those horrific events in world history.

As the whip said, we must declare "never again," and it must be real and serious; and, if necessary, we must redouble our efforts against evil anywhere it presents its ugly head.

The pain that I am still feeling here tonight is because, since 1995, the international tribunal has indicted 95 individuals. Let me go back and remind you, 800,000—it could be many more—died, 95 individuals have been indicted, and there have been 49 convictions.

Now, if there is a person with a heart anywhere on the planet, that heart should be broken right now, knowing what happened to the Rwandan people, what happened to women, little girls, children. The world shall not tolerate this again.

I would like to now yield to the distinguished Congressman from the Ninth District of Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. STEVE COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding, and I appreciate the whip for bringing this hour to the attention of Members of Congress and the opportunity to speak on this historic 20th anniversary of this slaughter.

I had the opportunity to visit Rwanda in the company of one of the great men who served in this House, Congressman DONALD PAYNE of New Jersey. Congressman PAYNE had made several trips to Rwanda and several trips to Africa.

We visited the memorial there to the victims, which is a very special place in the world, burial spots and flowers and plaques and the museum company there, too. It made a great impression on me, and it would make a great impression on anybody.

One thing that came out of the trip was my realization that today, in Rwanda, the Hutus and the Tutsis get along and that what was horrific 20 years ago, in one of the most horrific ethnic cleansings—or attempted ethnic cleansings and hate, atrocities, murders, over time, the Rwandan people have overcome them.

The distinctions are no longer present, and the people do get along. Obviously, because of the horrific situation, there is an imbalance in the populations, and I am sure there are still some memories; but we do need to learn, as I am sure has been said, about when we turn to thinking of other people as different because we are all the same.

There was a time a little after this, I think it was about 1999, when I was at Union Station. President Clinton was there, and we had some time to talk, and he related how the Human Genome Project that Dr. Francis Collins—now the head of the NIH—was heading up and how that we are all 99.96 percent the same, and we are.

He mentioned the Hutus and the Tutsis and how they were just so, so, so, so, so alike, but the minor differences that were visible caused them to have this awful, awful, horrific genocide.

It pained President Clinton. Whip HOYER mentioned that this is something that he brought up before, that it was a mistake while he was President not to intervene. It was right after the difficulty that we had in Mogadishu with the helicopter and the way the American soldiers were killed and horrifically treated in the streets of Mogadishu by the Somali groups there.

It was a reticence to get involved in another situation in Africa, and it is a tight line sometimes to determine when you go in and when you don't. Well, the President made a mistake there, as he has admitted over the years.

If we look at other situations that might present themselves to us, as Members of Congress, we have to realize the United States of America has a special place in the world.

We are the only country that has the ability to see that mankind doesn't engage in horrific genocides again, so when the opportunity for the United States to get involved and prevent a slaughter, prevent a genocide, the United States has a responsibility.

Inasmuch as it is difficult after the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to commit our troops to action when situations like Rwanda present themselves, it is incumbent upon us, I think, to support—whoever is the President—in taking the proper actions to preserve humanity.

□ 1815

So I thank Whip HOYER for calling for this hour and Mr. CLEAVER for leading it, and I just wanted to add my thoughts and my reflections after having visited Rwanda with a great Member of Congress, DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 28 minutes remaining.

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

REMEMBERING THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for the remainder of the time as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLEAVER for giving his voice of remembrance, his voice of comfort, his voice of concern, his voice that says this terrible genocide shall never happen again, nor should anybody who is of the human species sit back and allow such a tragedy to occur as what happened 20 years ago when, simply because of being a member of a different tribe, people were killed.

When I visited Rwanda, I had the opportunity to go to the museum where memorials were set up, but you saw the remains, the bones, of a number of individuals that were slaughtered, and you also learned the history of what took place in Rwanda, how the people were taught, especially during colonization, to make one feel that they were better than the other and one should rule over the other. And it went on to such a time when people started to cry out for equality and democracy moving on, and just because they happened to be of a different tribe, the Hutu majority, to terminate the Tutsi ethnic group.

Tragedy. Husbands turning in their wives, wives turning in their husbands where there were mixed groups, feeling one was superior to the other. Tragedy. Yet, the global community sat silently on the sidelines—sat silently on the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, before I say more, I see the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Illinois and the city of Chicago, and I yield to the Honorable DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from New York, Representative GREGORY MEEKS not only for yielding, not only for being engaged in this discussion, but for the tremendous amount of time, energy, and effort that he spends dealing with international issues, recognizing that every day, as we see the increases in technology and our ability to communicate more effectively with other people across the world, how small and how much smaller our world is becoming, so things that may have been considered far away are now much closer to our everyday existence. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I also want to commend Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER and our whip for convening this session. As I listened to Representative CLEAVER give a bit of the history of Rwanda, I was actually glued to the television set and felt immobilized that I couldn't or didn't want to move. And to think that during the last two decades we would experience, in our modern-day world, such horrific actions as that which we are

commemorating and remembering here today some 20 years later, to think that the international community sat by, watched, discussed, but didn't move, wouldn't move, couldn't move, and watched 800,000 people, and perhaps even more, be annihilated, wiped out, to see them experience some of the most horrific actions that could be taken against a people. I guess the whole lot of us share in the blame because we saw it, didn't move on it, couldn't find a way to bring world interest, world concerns together to stop it or prevent it before all of these people had lost their lives. And so, yes, it is shame on our world, and all of us must take some of the responsibility and share in the blame.

When a tragedy is occurring to some of us, it really affects, in a way, all of us. When a government is unable or unwilling to protect its people, then it becomes a world issue, and the rest of us have the responsibility to step in. And as much as some of us abhor war and as much as we know that it is not the best utilization to get involved in warlike activity that is unnecessary, I think that there are some things that you just can't let go without doing whatever it is that you can do.

So I hope that our world is saying that never, ever again will we stand by and let such as this take place, that never, ever again will we be immobilized and wondering about what to do or can we do or should we do. We know that something must be done.

So, GREG, again, I thank you for not only yielding, but I thank you for your leadership on international affairs which helps us to know that, yes, we can be our brothers' keepers. And our brothers don't have to be just across the street—they can be across the ocean; they can be across the continent; they can be in other lands—because all of us are joined together as a part of the mutual elements of our world. So I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the United Nations reported that between April and June of 1994, as the international community watched, more than 800,000 Rwandans, mostly ethnic Tutsi, were massacred by Hutu militia and government forces over a period of just 100 days. The killings began the day after a plane carrying the presidents of Rwanda and Burundi was shot down as it prepared to land in Kigali, the capital of Rwanda. The presidents were returning from peace talks aimed at shoring up a fragile peace agreement and ending the conflict between the largely ethnic Hutu-dominated government and the largely Tutsi rebel army. The crash reignited the war. Retreating government forces joined ethnic Hutu militia in inciting civilians to kill ethnic Tutsis. They alleged that civilians were helping the Tutsi rebels and used this to justify the mass targeting of innocent peoples. A small peacekeeping force which had been sent by the United Nations to monitor the peace accord was not authorized to intervene. A warning that genocide was planned was not acted upon. Today, the effects of the genocide

in Rwanda are still felt in many different ways both inside the country and in neighboring states, including in the eastern regions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where large areas of South Kivu province are still controlled by Hutu militia from Rwanda and their local allies. Alongside other fighters in the Congo war, they continue to commit serious human rights violations, including abductions, killings and rape. Sexual violence, particularly against women and children, is widespread.

This week marks the 20th year anniversary of the Rwandan Genocide. Since this genocide, certain concepts and initiatives have come forward by the international community that when a nation fails to protect its citizens or people the responsibility relies upon the international community to step in to stop the killing of people.

Mr. MEEKS. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, from the great city of Chicago, who long before he came to Congress, as a member of the Chicago City Council, spoke truth to power. And the words he has just articulated, that we should never forget that we will make sure that we are our brothers' keeper, that we need not have what I would call a gang mentality ourselves, that simply because someone is away across the ocean, may not look like some of us look, may not talk or speak the way we speak, that when we see evil, we won't stand silently by. We will stand against it and fight.

Dr. King once said that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and so it is that evil anywhere is a threat to all of us everywhere.

Yesterday, Rwanda launched a week of official mourning to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the genocide which left 800,000 people dead and changed the face of a nation forever, and I want the people of Rwanda to know that I stand in solidarity with them during this week of mourning. But I will also stand with them next week, and I will stand with them the week after that, and I will stand with them the week after, because what happened during the spring and summer of 1994 is too important to be mourned only on an anniversary.

The tragic consequences of ethnic hatred and violence must never be forgotten, for we must never allow the events of 1994 to be repeated—not in Rwanda or anywhere else. We must, once and for all, put all racial and ethnic strife behind us as we strive for a better and a brighter future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in this Chamber today, one whose voice has always spoken about justice, one whose actions were to feed those who were hungry, clothe those who had no clothes, and put a roof over the head of those who were homeless. We have in the Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, an individual who didn't sit idly by and quietly when he saw injustices take place here in America. He stood up and was counted for. He wasn't silent and inactive as, unfortunately, the world was in 1994. He stood up. He put his life on the line and said: I must have a voice for

the voiceless. He is an American hero whom I, with pleasure, am able to tell my children that I serve in the United States House of Representatives with an American hero, an American icon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), an icon, a true American hero, a fighter for justice, and a man who is committed to Almighty God.

□ 1830

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York who not only has yielded me some time to speak on this issue, but I just want to observe that he has been one of the most remarkable persons to ever serve in this House, this exalted House of Representatives. He is a man who has made enormous contributions to the plight of those who need a voice, to those who need a heart, to those who need a spirit that will fight for them where they cannot fight for themselves. I know that Congressman GREGORY MEEKS has stood the test of the opposition to those who are denied human rights anywhere in the world, and I am so honored that he will allow me a few minutes to share with the Nation the sadness of the hour, but also to celebrate the resurgence of the Rwanda people.

The sadness of the hour is we come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, to commemorate a very salient and sober observance. As was indicated by prior speakers, just 20 years ago this week the world witnessed one of the worst acts of violence since the end of World War II. It unfolded before our very eyes. Most of us can recall where we were, what we were doing, the life that we lived just 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am right now referring to the outbreak of violence just 20 years ago in a place that most of us had never heard of, a place called Rwanda. And now this place, Rwanda, is written in our psyches as one of the horror stories of our lives of our time. This outbreak of violence in Rwanda ultimately led to the death of over 800,000 ordinary men, women, boys, and girls. This is an atrocity that has been appropriately labeled and called and will go down in history as the Rwanda genocide. Just that word "genocide" should give us all pause, and all should strike an attentive ear whenever we hear that word "genocide" because the images that are conjured up in our minds are images of some of the most horrendous acts of man's inhumanity to man, of human's inhumanity to human beings.

Since the time of the Rwanda genocide, I want to congratulate the decent people, the justice-seeking people, the honorable people of Rwanda who have made great strides to rebuild their lives and to rebuild their country, to heal the deep, biting wounds, and to move forward as a nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Rwanda is being led by a President that 20 years ago would have been unimaginable, an ethnic Tutsi. President Paul Kagame has,

for the past 14 years, overseen Rwanda's rebirth and has made the world proud of Rwanda's incredible resurrection and progress.

At yesterday's memorial service in Rwanda, he offered these simple words of everlasting hope:

As we pay tribute to the victims, both the living and those who have passed, we also salute the unbreakable Rwandan spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, salute the Rwandan spirit and applaud the Rwandan people on just how far they have come in just a few years, just 20 years. At the same time that I applaud the Rwandan people, I admonish, I encourage, I plead, I ask, I beg the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to continue their quest for justice and to bring those to trial, those who have, up to now, escaped the might of justice and the appeal of justice-seeking people throughout the world.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must remind our own government that in 1994 we stood on this floor, in this Congress, in this Capitol, in this Nation, and we promised ourselves, we promised the world, we promised anyone who had ears to hear, that we would never, ever again allow such brutal violence to occur anywhere else in the world, that we had finally learned our lesson and that we would never have to relearn this awesome and brutal lesson. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we still see the same thing occurring, the same atrocities, the same murders and rapes, the same pillaging, the same acts of inhumane treatment toward fellow human beings. We bear witness that this same thing is again happening all over our world.

Whether Syria or South Sudan, our Nation, the United States of America, the American people, and the entire global community must rise up and stand up shoulder to shoulder and ensure that humanitarian rights are protected all over this world. As we have witnessed in Rwanda, global inaction has already led to genocide. Global inaction will always lead to genocide. We simply cannot idly stand by and allow genocide to continue in our world.

Mr. Speaker, I must close with a quote from the English poet John Donne, who said:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

I want to paraphrase Mr. Donne's quote and say that any human's death diminishes me, because I am involved in humankind.

Again, hats off to you, my honorable and humble colleague from the great State of New York. You don't surprise me being the chief sponsor of this particular moment in time in the history of this institution because, Mr. MEEKS, this is just simply another step for you, because when it comes to the history and when it comes to justice for people throughout the world, it is a step forward, and you are a stepper for mankind.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. RUSH. I thank you for having the broad shoulders that I stand on and for being here.

Let me wrap up. Over the last several months, thousands of Rwandans have watched as a torch symbolizing the memory of those who perished, known as the Flame of Remembrance, was passed hand to hand, village to village, across the nation. In a fitting climax to its journey, that torch finally arrived yesterday at the National Genocide Memorial beneath dark skies and a gentle rain. But the rain did not distinguish the flame, nor will it for the next 100 days. The Flame of Remembrance will burn in Rwanda's capital of Kigali and remind the world of the 100 days of violence which marred its streets 20 years ago. Let us work together to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that it never happens again and that we can live in peace.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1845

NEW BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LEASE AND PERMIT DATA

(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, yesterday, the United States Department of Energy released its 2014 strategic plan, which reiterates how the President is committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

I personally was pleased to hear the administration reiterate their commitment to expanding all of America's domestic energy resources, including fossil fuels, which is fundamental to the Nation's future economic security.

The report also outlined the administration's goal to "decouple our economy from the global oil market."

Unfortunately, the administration's policy continually falls short of their unbelievable rhetoric.

Just one example: since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has declined 7.8 percent and Federal natural gas production has declined 21 percent. It is no wonder, for according to new data released this week from the Bureau of Land Management, Federal onshore oil and natural gas leases and permits are at the lowest levels in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, real energy security will take actually pursuing, rather than merely claiming, an all-of-the-above energy approach.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a deeply troubling matter that has come before our government here in the United States. Once again, Iran is at the bottom of it. They have shown since 1979, since President Carter basi-

cally was pushing for the ouster of the Shah, we turned on an ally who was not a good man necessarily, but we—well, actually, President Carter—hailed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace.

What has been wrought—to use the words of Samuel F. B. Morse—has been years and years of terrorism in the hands of violent radical Islamic jihadists.

Then we get word that Iran has named one of the people involved in the original hostage-taking incident in Tehran in 1979 as its Ambassador to the U.N.

At this time, I want to recognize my very good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has really taken the lead in an appropriate response from our House.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in getting this time tonight so that we can talk about this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned something shocking and appalling. The Iranian government wants to appoint a terrorist as their Ambassador to the United Nations. A man who assisted in the 1979 terrorist attack on our embassy in Tehran. A man who helped hold American diplomats hostage for 444 days. This is a man that the supposedly moderate new government in Iran wants to represent Iran on American soil in New York City. This is unconscionable and this is unacceptable. It is time for all of us to speak up with one loud and unified voice against this injustice.

Amazingly, at this moment, the President of the United States does not have the legal authority to keep this man off of our shores. The President can deny visas to diplomats if they have been caught spying on ourselves or our allies, but he can't keep someone out of our country if they are a terrorist. They can be admitted as a diplomat and get a visa.

Last week, Senator TED CRUZ and I introduced legislation to fix this problem. Our bill would give the President the authority he needs to do the right thing and to deny this man a visa. Senator CRUZ received strong support from Democrats in the Senate like Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York. The bill passed the Senate unanimously last night 100-0. How many issues pass the Senate 100-0?

I am working here in the House to quickly move this bill forward so that we don't have an Iranian terrorist walking the streets of Manhattan with diplomatic immunity.

It is mind-boggling, but if Osama bin Laden himself had been named an Ambassador to the United Nations by somebody, the President would not have had the legal authority to deny him a visa. We have got to fix it. That is why this legislation is before us. The Cruz-Lamborn legislation would give the President the ability to do the right thing and to deny this Iranian terrorist a visa.

Time heals some wounds, but time should not cause amnesia. Letting this man into the country with all the pomp and circumstance of diplomatic immunity would cause pain to those who are hostages. It would jeopardize the safety and security of this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and for House leadership to move it quickly to passage as soon as possible.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas once again for taking leadership and bringing this issue to the attention of the American people through this time here on the floor tonight.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Colorado.

In fact, when I heard that such an outrage was being suggested, I said to my staff, we have got to do something. I was told, and I should have suspected, my friend DOUG LAMBORN from Colorado was already out there, he already has a bill, H.R. 4357. I was brought a Dear Colleague letter accompanying that, and I said we have got to help our friend do what is right for America.

I was pleased that TED CRUZ was able to get that pushed through in the Senate. Frankly, it shows there is still hope for the Senate. That is encouraging. You look for hope where you can get it.

But I remember so well 1979–1980. I was in the Army at Fort Benning. This attack occurred and we were outraged. There was nobody I knew in the Army who was dying to go to Iran. But really everybody I knew at Fort Benning and other posts, we expected to go because it was an act of war.

Our embassy was attacked in Tehran, it was an act of war, and nothing really happened for 444 days. There was a failed rescue attempt. I still, Mr. Speaker, have asked from the floor before, and I wish somebody could verify for sure, but I had a friend from Fort Benning who had told me that the original plan for the rescue required that 12 helicopters would go 500 or so miles inland into Iran to a staging area there.

At the time they knew where the hostages were. There was still good intel. They knew where they were. So this was going to be an effort to rescue them. This was the original Delta Force. Our friend General Jerry Boykin, now at the Family Research Council, was one of the original Delta Force. I have talked to him about that time out there in the desert.

They were to rendezvous with some aircraft that would have supplies, things they needed. In order to make the trip, as General Boykin confirms, they knew they had to have six helicopters there make it that far inland.

What I would like to get substantiation on or just prove, that originally the military proposed, the joint military group proposed 12 helicopters to go in. Their reasoning, as a friend from Fort Benning pointed out—this is back when I was in the Army this was being told—the reasoning was when you go

across hundreds of miles of sand, desert, with turbine engines, that you run the risk of having a high loss rate of your helicopters.

So they asked for 12, thinking since six was absolutely essential to have at the staging area inside Iran, that they should allow for 50 percent loss of the helicopters. What I still want to find out, is it true that the 12 helicopters were proposed, but that the White House said: No, 12 would look like an invasion, so let's scale that back to eight. I was told the dialogue went: Well, if we have eight and we have four losses, then we only get there with four and there is no mission; if we don't do it now, we may not know where they move them. We really should go with 12. But I was told the White House said: No, we can't go with 12. We don't want to make it look like an invasion, scale it back to eight.

General Boykin confirmed that there were eight helicopters that made the trip. But when they got to the staging area, when it was clear that only five helicopters were going to make it, he said there was an automatic abort at that point. Unfortunately, as we know from the news of what happened, one of the choppers as it attempted to rise up, the pilot must have had vertigo—it is very easy to happen in the desert sand as the sand swirls around you—but whatever the reasoning, the helicopter slightly turned, the rotors went through the C-130, and we lost American lives out there on the desert floor at the staging area in Iran.

I don't fault anyone who was part of the Delta Force. They were some of the most heroic people America has produced. They were willing to risk it all, and some did give all in the effort to go after our hostages.

But whether the proposal was originally 12 and it was scaled back to eight, or whether the administration, the Commander in Chief, just said go with eight, either way the error was where the buck stops, at the top with the Commander in Chief. Because just like President Kennedy admitted after he withdrew the full air support that he had promised during the Bay of Pigs invasion, as he said afterwards: We should have gone ahead. We would have been better off doing a full-scale invasion instead of having something as embarrassing and humiliating as this—or words to that effect, is what I had read.

If you are going to rescue American lives, you commit whatever it takes. The military is always ready to commit whatever it takes.

Our problem comes in the chain of command usually at the very top. That is why it has been so tragic in Afghanistan that in a period of half the time of President George W. Bush being Commander in Chief, President Obama as Commander in Chief had around twice or so the fatalities and even more of injuries, debilitating serious injuries.

The rules of engagement are critical in a battle like that. Whether it is

going to rescue hostages, whether it is going to provide a peacekeeping mission, it is absolutely imperative that our military have the full authority to protect themselves, win whatever battle may be confronted, and come home.

The lesson that all too often is not learned from Vietnam is not that we should never get involved in foreign battles. The lesson is and should be, the one that has not been learned is this: if we are going to commit American men and women to combat, then give them authority to win and bring them home. That should be the lesson of Vietnam.

□ 1900

It should be the lesson of Iraq. It should be the lesson of Afghanistan, and yet, we still have people in Afghanistan who don't really understand why they are there, but don't want to be the last American to die in Afghanistan.

As we see surveys around the world indicating that the United States has lost tremendous respect—and in areas where our President, along with many of the rest of us thought, okay, we have a President who did a lot of growing and learning in an Islamic country as he has indicated.

So surely, he will help our relationships with and in Muslim countries; and yet, as you look at surveys in Muslim countries around the world, we are less respected now than we were under President and Commander in Chief George W. Bush, especially when you are dealing with radical Islamic leaders.

There are so many people in Iran. I have met some of them in surrounding countries, refugees from Iran, who verify that there are so many Iranian people—they love Americans, but clearly, their leadership does not.

It is a slap in the face for the Iranian leadership to think that they could get away—to think that we have such a weak Commander in Chief that they could send over someone who is a participant in an act of war, an international crime against humanity, attacking an embassy and taking hostages and mistreating those hostages; yet they thought they could get away with it.

If you look at what has been happening around the world, perhaps it is not that difficult to understand why Iran thought they could get away with something so heinous as to send a participant of the original international crime, an act of war of attacking our Embassy and holding hostages.

Well, some may say: this guy, we don't know that he was there when the Embassy was actually attacked.

But as I know from my judge days and prosecutor days—the Federal law, State laws I am aware of, and in the international circles—anyone who aids, encourages, and abets is considered a principal of the crime.

So that is what we have here, an arrogant, condescending slap in the face of the United States President, Congress, everyone who has any leadership

in this country, a show of no respect to send someone who is well-known to have participated, despite the efforts to minimize roles he may have had.

So why would they think they could do that? You look, gee, the Russians and the Chinese have taken the measure of our President. They know he is the Commander in Chief. They know how our government functions. Iran has done the same thing. Syria has done the same thing.

Others around the world have looked, and they saw, and I have even had some world leaders say: look, Mubarak—none of us really liked him—but he was your ally, and he gave you a longer period of peace on the Israeli border with Egypt than any other time; so we couldn't believe when you turned on your ally, you have written agreements with Mubarak. We don't understand how you could just toss aside an ally who has helped you so much.

People in other countries have said: we couldn't believe Qadhafi had blood on his hands; and yet, after 2003, he had some kind of conversion experience after he saw the U.S. go into Iraq.

He said: look, I am giving up my nukes, you can take them, you can come in and inspect whatever you want, and I will be your best friend in fighting terrorism.

As some other moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said: he was your friend. As other leaders in the Middle East have said: he provided you more help and more information on terrorists than any other country but Israel.

So what did we do? We came after Qadhafi. We bombed his forces, and it seems pretty clear, without the United States' assistance, Qadhafi would have stayed in power. We would still be getting information on terrorism in the Middle East from Qadhafi and his people.

We would have four people that didn't die in Benghazi, and terrorism wouldn't be so profoundly manifesting itself in north Africa and the Middle East, but this administration turned on someone who had turned into a friend to the United States, an enemy of terrorism.

We have moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who actually defeated the Taliban for us. My heart breaks for my friend Masood and others who risked their lives to fight the Taliban, who defeated the Taliban under the leadership of General Dostum, who some now in this administration call a war criminal. He fought the Taliban like the Taliban fights. He defeated them. He did us a great favor.

The Taliban was acknowledged to have been in disarray and completely defeated, and then we decide to nation-build. I know this is not the fault of President Obama, it was done before he came in, but we decided to nation-build.

We sent tens of thousands of troops into Iran, whereas we had only had less than 500 there at the time that the Taliban was routed.

How could we do that? Well, we provided them weapons, we gave them air cover, we gave them intel. We had embedded special ops and intelligence, and we let them do the fighting, and we whipped the Taliban by letting the enemy of our enemy defeat our enemy.

Now, this administration refers to them as war criminals? They were our allies, they were our friends. They defeated the Taliban. So we mistreat our friends who risked their lives fighting our enemy for us—and for themselves, make no mistake.

Then this administration is constantly reaching out to the Taliban: we want to talk, we want to sit down with you—and offered at one time to buy them luxurious offices, international offices—if you will just sit down, you don't even have to agree to reach an agreement, just to sit down with us and talk; we may let a lot of your people who have murdered Americans go free if you just sit down and talk with us.

Then the Chinese have seen how we have turned on allies and reached out to our enemies. They have had their eyes on certain places near China, South China Sea, other places surrounding China, they have had their eye on places, just like Russia has.

Now, they see the United States turning on allies, embracing enemies. They ask the same questions. They are bound to ask the same questions some of our allies have expressed: Are you still fighting against terror? Because they are still fighting you and we can't tell that you are helping in the fight anymore.

So China starts making moves they never would have made 5 years ago because they wouldn't have wanted to risk a U.S. response; and Russia wouldn't have made the move 5 years ago, but they have counted the cost, they have measured the leader of the United States of America, just like Khrushchev did in the early 1960s. They have figured: we can move on Crimea, and the United States will do nothing.

That is why they laughed when the President announced that he was going to put sanctions on some of the Russian leaders. They were shocked. That is all you are going to do? That is it? Wow. Let's move some more troops to Ukrainian border. Maybe we can grab some more of Ukraine, and the U.S. will continue to do nothing.

Weakness is provocative. It has always been; it will always be. I knew I owed 4 years to the Army, and I would do that before I did anything else, so I majored in what I loved, history. There are so many lessons repeated over and over in history.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to hear an educated Secretary of State that knew that you pronounced Genghis Khan as "Genghis Khan" actually make the statement that the Russians were making a 19th century move on Crimea, when history dictates that what the Russians did in moving on Crimea, an area they have had their eyes on and wanted to take

is—yes, it is 19th century, it is 20th century, it is 21st century, it will be 22nd century if the Lord tarries. It was 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13. It has been in every century.

You go back to the Dark Ages, whether you say that is 500 to a 1000 A.D. or whether you say it is specifically 476 to 800 A.D., whatever you call the Dark Ages, these were the kind of moves that were made then. People made moves—assaultive moves on other people, places, and things because there is evil in this world.

Mr. Speaker, there is the good that our Founders acknowledged, that God put there. It is why they said we are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights because they knew there was a Creator, that they knew there was evil in the world, and they set up as many obstacles to power grabs in this country as they could.

They felt pretty comfortable that Congress would never allow either the Supreme Court or the President to usurp legislative power without reining them in. It is time that we did that.

My dear friend, DOUG LAMBORN, produced H.R. 4357. It says this:

The purpose is to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to the United States, and other purposes.

It goes on to say:

A bill to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to United States national security interests, or has engaged in a terrorist activity against the United States.

Then it goes on in detail, as far as changing section 407(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, in order to make it possible where we could deny entrance to Iran's proposed U.N. Ambassador. It is time we did that.

There was a story from Fox News, dated March 31, that is entitled, "One-time hostage of Iranian militants urges denial of visa to new Iran envoy involved in siege."

□ 1915

This was written by Eric Shawn. It says:

Hostages captured after the 1979 siege on the U.S. Embassy in Tehran are seen in this undated file photo.

Former American hostage Barry Rosen, held by student extremists at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran for more than a year, said Monday it would be an "outrage" and "disgrace" if Washington gave a visa to one of the militants recently named by Iran as its new U.N. Ambassador.

"It may be a precedent, but if the President and the Congress don't condemn this act by the Islamic Republic, then our captivity and suffering for 444 days at the hands of Iran was for nothing," Rosen said. "He can never set foot on American soil."

This is a quote from Rosen.

He also said:

It's a disgrace if the United States Government accepts Aboutalebi's visa as Iranian Ambassador to the U.N.

Rosen was the Embassy's press attache who was blindfolded and held at gunpoint, along with 51 fellow Americans taken hostage. In a statement to FOX News, Rosen demanded that the Obama administration deny a visa to Aboutalebi to prevent him from taking up Tehran's U.N. post.

We need to take action. We hold the purse strings. We need to cut off any funding for any effort that might be undertaken to grant this international terrorist a visa so that he can come on American soil and have diplomatic immunity.

So I am quite proud of my friend from Colorado. Mr. LAMBORN and I have traveled to Israel together. I have seen him conduct himself in international settings in ways that should make Colorado proud of him, as well as the United States.

My friend TED CRUZ got a bill through the Senate that passed 100-0. As reported by the AP April 7:

The Senate approved a bill Monday to bar a man with ties to the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis who's been tapped to be Iran's Ambassador to the United Nations from entering the United States.

By voice vote, Republicans and Democrats united behind the legislation sponsored by Senator Ted Cruz, Republican of Texas, that reflected congressional animosity toward Tehran and its selection of Hamid Aboutalebi. Iran's envoy's choice was a member of a Muslim student group that held 52 American hostages for 444 days in the 1979 seizure of the Embassy in Tehran.

The "nomination is a deliberate and unambiguous insult to the United States," Cruz said in remarks on the Senate floor in which he describes Iran's anti-Americanism since 1979, and added, "This is not the moment for diplomatic niceties."

I am very proud of my friend TED CRUZ, the Senator from Texas. This is the way we need to respond to Iran's slap in the face of the United States.

Again, if you look at the way this administration has reached out to Iran, they have laughed openly and said yes, they were negotiating, and yes, they reached a preliminary agreement with this White House, but they are not stopping anything in the way of developing nuclear weapons. They made that clear. They are not abandoning their nukes.

So what have we done? We gave them a free space in which to keep developing nukes. We don't know what they have been doing behind the scenes because there have not even been inspections in all the facilities that we know of, and they brag that they are not abandoning anything.

And what else did the administration do? The administration eased up and allowed them billions of dollars in relief from the sanctions which, no doubt, would help them pursue nuclear weapons as they move forward.

It is just tragic why and how this administration is giving the impression to nations like Iran that we will not stand up to them. But, again, look at what we did as a nation. We reelected President Obama, knowing that before the election he had turned to the leader from Russia and basically said: Tell

Vladimir Putin that I will have a lot more flexibility after the election.

People elected the President, knowing that he had telegraphed to the Russians that he would show a lot more weakness and would be able to give the Russians a lot more of what they wanted after the election in 2012.

If you look at this administration's activities after the election in 2008, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was sent over with a goofy-looking button that they thought had, in Russian, "reset," when, actually, I don't know what that says. She thought it said "reset." It didn't say that. And we embarrassed ourselves.

But the message was very clear because the Russians, and Putin in particular, knew that the reason that relationships have been strained was that, toward the end of the Bush administration, the Russians moved on Georgia, and the reaction was swift from President Bush. He didn't do as much as I might have thought should be done, but he was embarrassed. He was bound to have been embarrassed because he said he looked to this man and knew that he was a man of peace, or words to that effect, and it had to feel like a bit of a betrayal to President Bush when he moved on Georgia.

The Russian activities of moving on Georgia, totally abandoning and betraying the outreach by the Bush administration, put a significant chill on U.S.-Russian relations. That is why they were chilled. That is why diplomatic relations were so stiff at the time that this administration took over.

So when you know that it was the Russian invasion and move on Georgia that caused a strain in relations, to the Russians, when this administration says, Hey, we are really sorry for the way we acted in the past; we want a new relationship; we want to hit a reset button or whatever we put in Russian on this thing, we want to start over, the message was clear to Vladimir Putin: we're sorry that we were offended when you broke your word to us and invaded Georgia; we're sorry that you were an aggressor, you attacked and invaded and went into a neighboring country. This administration was apologizing for the Russians being that aggressive, and the message was clear that we are not the country we once were. And the message was sent to go ahead and take what you think you can, and he has.

Countries around the world are looking at us. We know we still have the greatest military. Despite all the cuts, it is still the greatest military in the world. And yet, if you don't have leaders willing to show strength, then people will take advantage. It is not a 19th century historical action; it is a 21st and every century since man has been on this planet.

Some have asked, gee, if these inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness really are inalienable, why do all people around the

world not have them? And the answer, I think, is because yes, they were an inheritance bequeathed to us by our Creator; but just as any inheritance, if the heir does not claim that inheritance and have a willingness to protect it and fight for it and maintain it, then you won't keep it.

Thus, when Ben Franklin was purportedly asked, "What have you given us?" he replied, "A republic, if you can keep it."

Muslim moderates are concerned because they see the United States trying to embrace radicals. Again, I am so proud of the moderate Muslims in Egypt in joining, literally and figuratively, arm in arm, hand in hand with Christians and secularists in Egypt and coming to the street in millions and millions and millions and demanding a leader who would not usurp power that was not his in the constitution, demanding his removal, demanding a constitution that would allow them to impeach a leader like Morsi had become as a Muslim Brother. They made clear: we don't want radical Islamist leaders or people in our government because they have one goal, and that is taking overall power, subjugating everyone else, including moderate Muslims and Christians.

That is why it was so ironic to hear one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, in effect, saying just pay the tax and then you have got your religious beliefs, because that is a shari'a law belief. And I know she is not aware of that. But actually, under shari'a law, if you are a Christian, you can pay a tax and subjugate yourself humbly before the Muslim government and they will allow you to practice your religion so long as you remain subjugated to shari'a and to the Muslim leaders.

But in this Nation, you are not supposed to have to pay a tax or a fine in order to practice your religious beliefs. In Egypt—God bless those people—they didn't want to do that either, so they got rid of the Muslim Brother leaders.

What else did they do, Mr. Speaker? They declared the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. And if one reads the opinion from the Dallas Federal court and also from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Holy Land Foundation trial, it seems pretty clear the evidence is there that Muslim Brotherhood should be accepted as a terrorist organization.

□ 1930

And groups like CAIR, who have such a powerful influence in this administration, who can call and have an intelligence briefing shut down at Langley, as they have, who can call and complain that the training materials at the FBI offend them and have them purged so those FBI training materials no longer offend a front organization for the Muslim Brotherhood, as found by the Dallas court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now there is a story from England. The BBC news reports "David Cameron Orders Review of Muslim Brotherhood":

Prime Minister David Cameron has commissioned a review of the Muslim Brotherhood's UK activity, No. 10 says.

The Muslim Brotherhood is an Islamist movement which has been declared a terrorist group by Egypt's government.

Recent press reports have suggested members have moved to London to escape a crackdown in Cairo, where the group backs ousted President Mohammed Morsi.

Well, they had that in common with at least one or two of our U.S. Senators who went over there to back Morsi.

In any event, the article goes on:

Number 10 said the review would examine the group's philosophy and activities, and the government's policy toward it.

According to the Times, it was prompted by evidence received by the government that Muslim Brotherhood leaders met in London last year to plan their response to events in Egypt.

The Prime Minister's official spokesman said that the "main conclusions" of the review, which is due to be completed by the summer, would be made public.

Asked what had triggered the review, he said the government had received a succession of reports from its Embassies in the region, building up a picture which the Prime Minister believed should be examined.

But No. 10 does not provide any details on which bodies are to be involved in the review.

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in Egypt, but now operates in many states and has influenced other Islamic movements around the world with its model of political activism combined with Islamic charity work.

While the Brotherhood—and it has the Arabic name—says it supports democratic principles, one of its stated aims is to create a state ruled by Islamic law or shari'a.

Its most famous slogan, used worldwide, is "Islam is the solution."

The organization's backing installed Mr. Morsi as Egypt's first civilian president in 2012, but he was ousted—and this is the same mistake that CNN and this administration makes; they called it a military coup last year—after widespread street protests.

As the millions and millions and millions of people in Egypt made clear, millions more than even Morsi claimed voted for him, it was not a military coup. This was an uprising by the people of Egypt demanding the Constitution be followed, and the ouster of a president who was grabbing power at scary speed, and many knew if they didn't move at the time they did, a year later would be too late. He would be like dictators often are, elected, then seize all power, and you can't ever get rid of them.

In any event, this article says:

In December, the new Egyptian government declared the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist group after blaming it for an attack on a police station that killed 16 people.

A Downing Street spokesman said in a statement: "The Prime Minister has commissioned an internal government review into the philosophy and activities of the Muslim Brotherhood and the government's policy toward the organization."

So, anyway, it is interesting, Egypt has declared the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization, and they should know better than any nation in the world.

I thank God for the Egyptians that rose up. Estimates are a third of the

population went to the streets to demand removal. And I didn't know till I was over there last fall, they didn't have any provision in their Constitution for impeachment, so they needed a constitution where they could impeach a president who usurps power that is not his under the Constitution.

Now, England is taking a look to see if they shouldn't declare them terrorist organizations.

The reason we can anticipate that, in the near future, this administration will not declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization is because they get advice from two front organizations, as the courts have said, of the Muslim Brotherhood. That would be the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, and I can see them, their building from my window, so they have got a good spot to keep watch over Capitol Hill, and also, ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America. And its leader is Imam Magid, who, as far as I know, is frequently giving advice, continued advice to the State Department, the White House on anything to do with Islam.

We know that the Egyptian paper had reported in December of 2012, when the Muslim Brotherhood was running the government, that six Muslim Brothers were in very key and top positions of power and advice within the Obama administration. They heralded that as a great thing for the Muslim Brothers to have that much influence in Washington.

So there shouldn't be a great deal of wonder at why this administration, with one of those individuals, reported an Egyptian paper, being a top adviser in homeland security, charged with keeping us safe, that we have, according to the Egyptian paper, a Muslim Brother, Mr. Elibiary, who was given a secret clearance by Janet Napolitano, and given access to confidential material or secret material. And we, apparently, get advice from this man, whose business started a foundation, or he started a foundation called the Freedom and Justice Foundation.

Most of us would say freedom and justice? That is great. He believes in freedom and justice. Until you look up the meaning of freedom and justice. Under shari'a law, freedom and justice means freedom to worship Allah only, and justice only under shari'a law. And so it is no big surprise that the Muslim Brotherhood political party in Egypt called itself the Freedom and Justice Party.

But if there are enough leaders here in the United States that know what is good for us, we will see what Egypt has done, what England is doing. And even Russia has noticed that radical Islam is an enemy. They have even tried to warn us, but found we don't take warnings well.

We should declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization.

THOUGHTS ON THE CAUSATION OF THE FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS

Now, that brings me to another point about the first Fort Hood shooting that was clearly an act of terrorism by an enemy combatant.

Even though this administration calls it workplace violence, it was an act of war by a warrior for radical Islam. And he was able to kill the 13 people, Nadal Hasan, for more than one reason. One was, political correctness kept superior commissioned officers from calling it like they saw it because they didn't want to be called some racist or Islamaphobe, the term that the OIC, the Islamic council, had put together to try to intimidate people from recognizing the danger that radical Islam was.

They didn't want to be called Islamaphobe, and they knew, going all the way up the chain of command, that they might be looked upon badly if they reported this man for what they saw, not a moderate Muslim, but a man that was a potential problem, a person who was being radicalized.

Another problem was that the people we entrust with rocket-propelled grenades, with tanks, with all kinds of weapons, with helicopters that can fire blistering rounds thousands of meters away and kill hundreds and thousands of people, they have that much authority, that much ability, that much power, we trust them with these tremendous weapons that kill people, and yet, we tell them, but we don't trust you to have a pistol with you on a military installation.

So just as when a killer walked into a cafeteria in Killeen, Texas, that adjoins Fort Hood years ago, he knew no one would have a gun there, and so he killed a lot of people, including a woman's parents. She had put her gun in her glove compartment, and knew she could have saved her parents if she had been able to keep her weapon.

So she fought for and obtained passage, as a new State representative, for a concealed-carry permit. So we now have concealed-carry because of that first shooting incident in Killeen.

But this administration didn't learn anything when they called that shooting workplace violence, didn't learn anything about reporting potential threats, and so more people died at Fort Hood.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we said, you know what?

Military Members, men and women who are putting your lives at risk for us, with whom we have entrusted weapons of mass destruction, we are going to trust you with a firearm. So if you will get a permit, and they show they are qualified—I know my 4 years in the Army, every year we had to go qualify—make sure they are qualified with the firearm they have, and let them carry firearms.

I started to put it in the bill that I drafted, that they would be concealed, but I think we should leave that to the

commanders. So we, just as I was coming over here, got the draft from legislative counsel and will be filing it this week.

It is a bill to authorize qualified members of the Armed Forces to carry firearms on military bases and installations, and for other purposes. And this act may be cited as the Save Our Soldiers Act, or the SOS Act.

It does apply, would apply to all soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guard. It applies to all of our uniformed military. And it says, in general, any qualified member of the Armed Forces may carry a firearm on a military base or installation. Then it goes through to set forth how you go about applying for the permit to do that.

If we can trust them with weapons of mass destruction, we ought to be able to trust them with a pistol, with a firearm.

□ 1945

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this gets legs and that we will get this passed through the House with widespread bipartisan support. Especially in this election year, people seem to be more acutely attentive to what their constituents think, so that is why I know it would be a bipartisanly-passed bill if we will bring it up this year and then send it to the Senate.

Our friend from Nevada, Senator REID, may not want to bring it up; but then if he won't bring it up, then the only other alternative would be for voters to turn out members of Mr. REID's party, so he wouldn't be the Majority Leader.

Then we could get someone who would bring that bill to the floor, so that we don't have another attack at Fort Hood or another Navy Yard or somewhere else and have to go: Gee, what could we have done?

Some of the rest of us would repeat, for the umpteenth time: you should let people who are qualified to carry firearms carry firearms.

We have seen, over and over, killers go to where they know firearms are prohibited, like the Colorado shooter going to a theater farther away than one close because those that were closer allowed firearms to be carried inside.

It would be terrific if we could do that for our military, and I know there are some commanders who take the nod from our Commander in Chief and say: oh, we don't think that is a good idea.

But it is a good idea. It is something we should do, and it is time we moved in that direction.

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

THE HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL OF PAINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair rec-

ognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the United States House of Representatives in 1988, I have been immensely proud to be a part of New York's congressional delegation.

My colleagues from New York and I—both Democratic and Republican—have united many times to fight for causes that are critical for our State. In the wake of terrible tragedies, like September 11, 2001, and, most recently, Hurricane Sandy, we have come together to perform our most important duties as Members of Congress, which is our obligation to do what is best for the people of New York.

It is important, though, that we don't solely band together in times of tragedy; rather we must also gather in celebration of the people and occasions that make our Empire State a great State. That is why I am delighted to rise today in recognition of the Hudson River School of painters, the first school of art indigenous to the United States.

The Hudson River runs through my district and the districts of many of my colleagues, some of whom will be speaking here today as well; and we are very, very proud of that river and proud of what it represents.

The Hudson River School of Art is comprised of a group of 19th century painters, including Thomas Cole, Frederic Edwin Church, Asher Brown Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Sanford Robinson Gifford, Albert Bierstadt, John Frederick Kensett, George Inness, Worthington Whittredge, and Thomas Moran.

Today, these artists' paintings can be found in the United States Capitol, the National Gallery of Art, and the State Department, as well as the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, the Art Institute of Chicago, and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

Next to me are portraits of two of the Hudson River School's most celebrated painters, Jasper Francis Cropsey and Thomas Cole, the father of the Hudson River School.

Now, the artist who did these sculptures is Greg Wyatt, my friend who is with us today, whose primary medium of artistic expression is cast bronze, and I would like for everybody to see these because they are truly magnificent and represent the greatness of our State and the greatness of the Hudson River.

On the third easel—right here—is Cropsey's 1860 masterpiece "Autumn on the Hudson." It is truly beautiful, just as this portrait shows.

As its name suggests, some of the Hudson River School's most notable works portray the majesty of New York's Hudson River Valley. However, the Hudson River painters capture the grandeur of a variety of New York's national treasures, and, again, I am proud to represent part of the Hudson Valley.

From the Hudson Valley's lushness in Durand's "The Beeches," to the maj-

esty of the Catskills in Gifford's "A Gorge in the Mountains," to the tranquility of the ocean in Kensett's "Eaton's Neck, Long Island," the Hudson River School brilliantly encapsulated New York's diverse, yet unparalleled beauty.

I rise today not only to celebrate the Hudson River School's contributions to America's artistic canon, but also to the environment they so beautifully immortalize.

Hudson River School paintings helped Americans across the Nation understand the natural magnificence found across distant corners of the U.S. This understanding, in turn, helped nurture the idea that such magnificence ought to be preserved for future generations.

This idea culminated in 1916 with the creation of the National Park System and persisted into the 1960s when an environmentalist used Hudson River School paintings to demonstrate the need for legislation, such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, to protect America's stunning resources.

How glad we are that this Congress passed those laws. It follows then that the Hudson River School illustrates not only what art can do for the individual spirit, but also for the health of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the residents of New York and the United States might gain an appreciation for the Hudson River School and its tremendous impact on our Nation and its culture. To help show our appreciation, I have introduced House Resolution 480, honoring the Hudson River School painters for their contributions to the United States.

As a New Yorker, I am truly grateful to these artists for immortalizing the pristine beauty of New York's past. In the forthcoming speeches, my colleagues from New York will highlight their own appreciation for the Hudson River School and its invaluable contributions to our Nation.

I want to also add, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of people who have journeyed here from New York to celebrate these contributions and witness this Special Order.

Among those is our distinguished former colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Maurice Hinchey, my good friend. I welcome Maurice, his wife, and his daughter back to Washington and all the people here today, including Greg Wyatt, Barnabas McHenry, and so many other wonderful people.

I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in recognition of the accomplishments of the painters that are so prominent that are part of the Hudson River School of painting, and I do want to thank our colleague, Representative ENGEL, the gentleman from New York, for hosting this Special Order on the House floor to honor the 19th century Hudson River School of painting.

There are so many who cherish this institution, including, as was just mentioned, our former colleague, Representative Maurice Hinchey, who I see seated in the gallery, along with his family.

Certainly, he represented the Hudson River Valley region of New York in such fine fashion and with a great appreciation for the arts and for cultural education.

The school is also cherished by individuals like Barnabas McHenry who, as chair of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, understands the value of this great school; and Greg Wyatt who, as you have seen, is a sculptor and has produced great work as director of the Academy of Art, also at Newington-Cropsey Foundation, and at Hastings-on-Hudson; and so many who believe in the message that is sent forth by this great institution.

The Hudson River School of painting was the first uniquely American style of painting. The school's style of painting was popularized in the 1820s and lasted for much of the 19th century. You already heard many of the prominent painters listed by Representative ENGEL in his comments. Today, we are here to honor their contribution to our region, to our State of New York, and to this Nation.

The Hudson River School of painting was founded in upstate New York in the Hudson River Valley and the nearby Catskill Mountains. The Hudson River School's landscapes capture the natural and rural beauty of my home State of New York on canvas, including the majestic and mighty waters of that great region.

The Hudson River Valley has always had a special importance for our Nation. It was the pathway for early settlers to begin the westward movement that expanded our Nation's borders. To this day, we celebrate the Hudson River School of painting across the country and continue to do so in areas like Albany, New York, the capital region of New York.

At the Albany Institute of History and Art, one of the oldest museums in the country, many of the works from the Hudson River School artists are on display. Last week, I had the privilege of visiting the institute of history and art and made certain that I stopped by to view the several paintings that are on display by these magnificent artists.

One of the paintings that caught my eye and is near and dear to many is that of Jasper Cropsey's "Dawn of Morning, Lake George," which is pictured here beside me and captures the untouched beauty of Lake George.

Although the painting illuminates a quieter and distant time, many of the residents of the capital region continue to visit and enjoy the beauty of Lake George today.

Lake George is the largest lake in the Adirondacks and is within the Adirondacks State Park Preserve in upstate New York. The Adirondacks Pre-

serve was established in 1892 by the State of New York and covers more than 6 million acres of protected areas.

Cropsey's "Dawn of Morning, Lake George" captures the serenity that he imagined once existed and reminds us of the spectacular sight of nature, including our trees, the mountains, and the waters.

In addition to capturing the beauty of New York, over time, the Hudson River School artists began traveling more widely, eventually painting scenes throughout New England, the American West, Western Europe, north Africa, the Middle East, and South America.

The paintings of the American West were particularly popular. These realistic scenes of what was then, essentially, foreign land to most of the American people sparked the imagination and echoed the voices of the growing grassroots conservation movement, illustrating the need to preserve the wonders of our natural American landscape.

In fact, many landscapes of the Hudson River School were used to support the creation of the first national parks. Inspired in part by these paintings, the National Park System has been a significant part of our environmental inheritance, protecting some of America's most iconic and majestic places. I have always believed that our national parks embody the history and heritage that make America unique.

Personally, I grew up in Amsterdam, New York, in the heart of the scenic Mohawk Valley of New York. My upbringing instilled in me a strong concern for the health of our environment and an appreciation for the delicacy of natural ecosystems and our native wildlife.

As someone who believes that we must leave our children and grandchildren with a rich and enduring environmental inheritance, I am especially grateful for the role that the Hudson River School of painting served and will continue to serve in inspiring our Nation to preserve our land and to preserve our water.

For many generations to come, the American people will have the opportunity to view these breathtaking paintings and will be reminded why we must continue to preserve America's richness of natural beauty.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by urging our colleagues and the public to recognize the Hudson River School of painting and the legacy forged by its artists. While the school has many ties to my home State and our capital region of New York, we can all appreciate the contributions made to this mighty Nation.

I would also like to thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for his admirable work to promote and honor the Hudson River School of painting. Again, I thank him for this opportunity to proclaim the greatness of this great school of artists.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our next speaker, the Representative from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said:

All my life, I have dreamed of going back to my home on the Hudson River. It was the center of the world.

He was referring to his habit of, late at night, of remembering being a child, before he was stricken with polo, before he was President, before he was burdened with the awesome responsibilities of his office during a time of war.

□ 2000

Being a child in the Hudson River meant sledding down a hill behind Hyde Park and feeling totally free. And he remembered that, as a President, to forget the burdens of his office and to remember the miracle and dream of his youth. Those of us who are blessed to represent the Hudson Valley understand that the Hudson Valley writes its beauty on our personalities and on our very souls. It inscribes us with its timeless beauty. And as it flows on endlessly by, we are reminded of the fleeting nature of our service and of our very lives.

A group of artists, including Thomas Cole, Asher Brown Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, and Frederic Edwin Church, somehow by hiking, sketching, and experiencing the Hudson River Valley found a way to translate what it means to those of us who live, work, and raise our families there into these permanent, lasting images. And our own modern-day genius, Greg Wyatt, has found a way to capture them. So we pause here tonight to honor that.

Drawing inspiration from our natural environment, these artists began painting scenes and now sculpting images. From across New York and our country, Asher Brown Durand, one of the original founders of the school, has one of the most beautiful pieces anyone will ever create of Beacon, New York. It is called "Beacon Hills on the Hudson River." It was painted across the river in Newburgh in 1852. Today, my office in Newburgh looks out at that same image, at that same beauty.

Frederic Church was one of the first to capture Niagara Falls back in 1857. Within 2 weeks of its debut, his piece had lured 100,000 visitors to pay 25 cents apiece to view it.

Not only did the Hudson River School influence the modern-day environmental conservation movement, but these paintings actually inspired the establishment of our National Park System in the early part of the 20th century, which was, of course, formed by President Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt couldn't have spoken more true words when he said:

There are no words that can tell the hidden spirit of the wilderness, that can reveal its mystery, its melancholy, and its charm.

But, again, our painters from the Hudson Valley found that hidden spirit

and that charm that Franklin and Teddy Roosevelt both remembered.

Dating back 100 years, my neighbors in the Hudson Valley take great pride in our natural resources and protecting and conserving this unique home for us and for our children and for generations to come.

I want to take just a minute to recognize my predecessor and our former colleague, Congressman Maurice Hinchey, and his family who have joined us here tonight. When you follow Maurice Hinchey in the Congress, you have some very big shoes to fill. And I have heard a lot about Congressman Hinchey and his service, and I always enjoy the stories because it sets for me an example of what I want to do in this body.

After Congressman Hinchey sacrificed for his country as a Navy sailor, as my own father did, he became a respected State lawmaker, and he proudly served here for two decades. My neighbors in the Hudson Valley know that he worked tirelessly for them, for economic justice and equal opportunity, because he believed that this government should work for everyone, including someone like him who grew up in a working class family and spent some time working in a factory, because our country, as Congressman Hinchey understood, is better off when leadership like his supports ordinary Americans, people like him who served in our military, our veterans, our working and middle class families who struggle to put food on the table and pay the bills but who can also appreciate the beauty of the environment and the timeless wonder of places like the Hudson Valley.

Congressman Hinchey played a critical role in the modern environmental movement even before it was widely recognized as important. Back in 1996 when I was working for President Clinton, Congressman Hinchey was authoring legislation that the President signed into law that established the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area. Because of Mr. Hinchey's leadership, the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area currently links over 100 individual sites, from Saratoga to Westchester, while showcasing the Hudson Valley's unique role in American history and development.

I want to commend Barnabas McHenry who is with us here today who has dedicated so much of his life to that same mission. Because of their leadership, my children and my grandchildren will see and be able to treasure the Hudson Valley's unique and incredible scenic, historic, agricultural, and natural wonders.

Congressman Hinchey always made sure that we remember the rich contributions of the Hudson River School of painters. Congressman Hinchey knows, like many of us do, that there is no place in the country that compares to the Hudson Valley, and those of us lucky enough to live there are not surprised that it was the birthplace of

America's first and greatest school of art.

In closing, let me just say that not long ago, a friend of mine came over to my home, which is across from West Point and Cold Spring, and actually looks down the Hudson River towards Garrison and south towards the Bear Mountain Bridge. I walked him up to the property, and the sun was going down. A short while later after he left, he sent a note and he said:

Sean, I once saw a sunset like that in a Frederic Church painting, and I thought he made it up. But when I saw it with my own eyes at your house, I understood for the first time what inspired these great geniuses to try to capture the wonder and beauty that is the Hudson River Valley for all time.

We honor their success in doing so tonight, and we honor those who continue that legacy who join us here tonight. Thank you on behalf of a grateful Hudson Valley and a grateful Nation.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants in the gallery.

The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE FOUR PRINCIPLES OF CONSERVATISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized by you to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate this privilege to do so. It is something that I would encourage a lot of the Members to participate in and express the wishes of their constituents and their opinions here on the floor so that not only you can turn an ear and listen to this presentation here tonight, but also so that it inspires dialogue all across America.

We will remain a free country and we can remain a constitutional Republic if we have open debate and open dialogue and if the values of the American people remain consistent with our roots.

I would first, Mr. Speaker, start out with listening to the dialogue of the gentleman who spoke ahead of me, and I would note that his statement that there are people that went ahead of him and his family that are blue collar, it seems to me to be maybe a generation removed from the real America that most of it is blue collar. And I think it is important to note that this country that we are is not going to continue to prosper unless we have people whom people respect and honor and

who produce goods and services that have a marketable value here at home.

For those that get paid to pontificate—I, among them, okay—that is an important function also. For those who get paid to sit on the couch, that is not so important a function. But those that produce goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad are the ones that grow our economy. In the private sector, it allows us to be competitive with the countries around the world. I think of my neighbors, many of whom are engaged in agriculture and how we compete with the most competitive economy in the world and we compete in a favorable way and we set the pace. We set the pace in productivity. We set the pace in efficiency. We set the pace in quality and in food safety. That is the circle around my neighborhood that you can see in any direction looking out from my house.

I am proud of those neighbors who produce those goods and services that have a marketable value here at home. A lot of that, most of it is the kind of thing we would call blue-collar work. I am impressed by the professionals that come here to Congress.

I came from the construction world, hands-on, in the ditch, shovel in hand, grease gun, wrench, steering wheel, yes, pencil and calculator from the lowest guy on the totem pole to the guy who started a company to now a second-generation King Construction Company. We have been engaged in this economy for I believe this will be our 40th season that we are engaged in now.

You see the flow of the economy, and you have respect for those who put their hands, their back, and their mind to work every day. I appreciate, also, a great deal these values of America, the roots of who we are as a people.

I was observing this morning, as I was getting ready to leave my place, that there was an individual who was interviewed on FOX this morning in their morning show by Steve Doocy, and it was Mallory Factor, an author I happen to know, an individual I count as a friend. He laid out the four principles of conservatism, and I thought it was a useful thing. I took the notes down and put them in my pocket because I believe he is exactly and succinctly right that this country needs to be rooted in those principles of conservatism. Without them, we are cast adrift.

Here are the four principles that he laid out:

The first one is respect for the tradition and wisdom of our past generations. That is a fairly succinct way of saying our Founding Fathers got it right. They laid down a foundation, a foundation in faith, free enterprise, and fidelity that has been the foundation for America becoming the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. And if we are to stay that way, we need to remain respectful to the traditions and wisdom of past generations.

The second one is a rule of law. Mr. Speaker, you have heard me speak often and consistently about the rule of law. Lady Justice is often portrayed as blind. The statue of Lady Justice is of her holding the scales of justice, perfectly balanced scales of justice, weighed equally on either side. But Lady Justice is blindfolded because she doesn't see class or race or ethnicity or sex. She sees simply here is a human being before the court to be treated the same as any other human being, regardless of where they might sit in the social stratification by wealth, by race, by ethnicity, by sex, whatever the qualities might be. Whatever the qualifications might be, Lady Justice is blind, and the rule of law must apply to everyone equally. That is number two.

The third one is the belief in an individual freedom and liberty. And I will go a little further than Mr. Factor in that these rights come from God. Our Founding Fathers understood, articulated, and wrote: We hold these truths to be self-evident, all men—and that means men and women in the vernacular—are created equal, and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

It is an individual belief, the belief in individual freedom and liberty—not a freedom that is granted to you by government, not one that is bestowed upon you by the sovereign or the king, but this God-given individual liberty that comes from God that we then entrust from the people to the government. We loan our sovereign rights to the government to organize our society.

Government doesn't have the power. It is we the people that have the power, and we loan that to government. And if it is the other way around, if government grants rights, then government can also take those rights away. If that is the case, we would be similar to many of the other governments, many of the other civilizations, and we are not. We are the United States of America, founded upon four of these conservative principles.

All of these principles are conservative principles: the respect for tradition and wisdom of past generations, the rule of law, the belief in individual freedom and liberty, and the fourth thing is a belief in a law higher than man's law. That is God's law.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, those are the four principles of conservatism. A little tidbit of wisdom that came out this morning—and I made a little note and slipped it in my pocket—I think it is important that we here in this Congress reflect upon those values that made America great and what it is going to take to strengthen those values, restore those values, and carry America to the next level of our destiny.

When this Congress deviates from those principles, when this Congress deviates from the Constitution, when the Congress deviates from individual

rights, and when the Congress decides they can tax some people and transfer that wealth to other people and somehow be a leveler or some kind of a wealth transfer that resolves this class envy issue, then America is diminished because what it does is it diminishes the vitality of our people.

If you get out of bed and go to work every day and you know that Uncle Sam is going to get his share, the minute you punch that timeclock, Uncle Sam's hand comes out; and when he gets what he wants for the day, it goes in his pocket. Then the Governor's hand comes out, and he puts it in his pocket.

Then you have some other taxes to pay along the way, and when that is all done, some time in the afternoon, you get to actually work for yourself and your family.

Well, that is a little bit depressing to think you don't get to work even in the morning. If you go to work at 8 in the morning, you are taking your lunch break before you are getting anything for you and your family.

Now, what if the government is sitting there taking it all? What if it was we are going to confiscate all of the money you earn? Then we will deal it out to these other people, and you will get your government welfare check just like everybody else; and we will all have the same resources to work with.

We are all going to have the same amount of food, clothing and shelter, and recreation. We are all going to have the same health insurance policy. We are all going to drive an equal-value car, but some have to work, and those who don't want to don't.

Think about that. I have heard that. I have heard that debate on this floor. People will say—from over here on the leftist side of the aisle, they will say those that want a job should have a job, which implies that those who don't want to work shouldn't have to.

So if they are able-bodied and able-minded, then they should be contributing to this economy or have earned and stored up the wealth to sustain themselves, not tax the other person that is punching that timeclock or going to work for that salary because what happens is, pretty soon, the one who is being taxed to fund the one who is not working figures out that it doesn't pay so much to work.

It happens in the margins, so people start moving across from one side to the other; and over time, you will have good, smart, productive people who are smart enough to figure out that it doesn't pay for me to do this any longer, so they will drift over into maybe a part-time job, maybe work under the table, maybe some black market stuff, or they will tap into some of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs we have in this country and take their standard of living up above that they might have if all they did was work.

That is where this country has gone. The welfare program has grown so

great that it has discouraged some of our most productive people. It is a disincentive. It discourages me that, if we are maybe a generation removed, as I listened to the gentleman from the Hudson Valley, he is a generation removed from blue collar, I would like to think that we are always going to need blue-collar people.

We are always going to need for this country to have a middle class, a middle class that is growing in numbers and increasing in prosperity in relation to the productivity that they are putting out, and this country is always going to need to compete with the other countries in the world.

We can't just collapse down into the idea that we are going to be an economy that has professionals that live in gated communities that hire servants at a cheap rate, and then they will have the people that are a diminishing middle class and the unskilled and the low skilled that will make a meager wage, always keeping that meager wage down by a refueling of legal and illegal unskilled immigrants coming into this country that can only compete in the unskilled jobs.

The highest level of unemployment that we have—the double digit unemployment in this country are the people in the lowest skilled jobs. So how is it that almost every Democrat and a pretty respectable number of Republicans can leap to this conclusion, which is we need more unskilled workers, we need more of these workers to come in because it will grow the economy?

Well, just because you have somebody, if you bring in 1,000 people—and we know that we are going to have to educate the children especially and the youth, we will have to provide health care and housing and nutrition, the food, clothing, and shelter—as I said, 1,000 people could come in, and if one of them does a day's work, that contributes to the GDP, the gross domestic product.

So if the day's work of one in 1,000 contributes to the GDP, they, by their definition, say the economy is growing. The economy will grow if you have more and more immigration, and they don't say unskilled.

Well, we have an opening here for some skilled people to come into this country. We have an oversupply of unskilled. We have 101.4 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce—101.4 million, that is from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The numbers total this: those 16 and up who are of working age, plus those who are on unemployment today—officially signed up on unemployment—add those two numbers together, 101.4 million.

A third of our population is of working age and not in the workforce. Yes, some are retired, and some are handicapped, and some are homemakers, and some of them are in school; but a whole lot of them could actually be recruited to come into the workforce and

produce that good or service with marketable value and increase our GDP.

What is the cost to our society for putting more of the people—the 101.4 million that are not in the workforce, what is the cost to our society? What if we called 10 million in? What if we called 20 million in? What if we brought 30 or 40 million of the 101.4 million in and put them in the workforce? What does that do?

Well, a significant percentage of them are on welfare and unemployment, so they are off the welfare and unemployment rolls. That reduces the burden for the taxpayers. When they go to the workforce, they are in the productive sector of the economy. They take their wage. They pay their own payroll tax. That means they are paying their Social Security and their Medicare and their Medicaid, so we get a twofer.

We reduce the welfare rolls. We get more and more taxpayers. We bring Social Security into balance just simply by virtue of more people going to work, and we have less of a deficit in our entitlements—Medicare and Medicaid—because they need less of it.

That is what happens if you get this country going at the right direction. There are a number of ways to do that. You can't do it with a President who doesn't believe in work, for one thing; and when they learned, according to the CBO score, that ObamaCare would cost this economy the equivalent of 2.5 million jobs, in other words, 40 hours a week times—and that is 40 hours, not the 30 hours that are in ObamaCare—40 hours a week times 2.5 million workers, that is the reduced amount of productivity that comes because of the disincentives to work that are associated with ObamaCare.

That is the equivalent of 2.5 million jobs. What does the administration say? They say: well, that is going to be a good thing because, if you are a homemaker, now you get to make more home. If you are an artist, you get to paint more paintings. If you have hobbies, you get to pursue your hobbies; and if you are a parent, you get to spend more time with your children.

This is the first time, I believe, in the history of this country, that a President of the United States and his administration have taken the position that less work was good for America, which just goes to show you that human beings have an almost indefinite capacity to self-rationalize, Mr. Speaker.

That is what happened with the Obama administration. They have exercised their almost infinite capacity to self-rationalize on piece after piece of this. They moved their socialist agenda, and then they self-rationalize along the way, and now, we are watching as ObamaCare has been a mess. It has been a debacle, and we are watching these numbers.

The administration says we got 7.1 million people to sign up. That was

their goal of 7 million. Miraculously, they overshot it by a little bit. What we don't know is how many of those 7.1 million were insured before ObamaCare; how many decided that they would opt out of their existing policy and into an exchange policy; how many of them lost their insurance because of ObamaCare and had no choice, if they wanted to remain insured, but to opt into an exchange under ObamaCare; and what percentage of the 7.1 million were actually uninsured without affordable options and found their way onto an ObamaCare exchange and purchased insurance.

Once you go through all that, how many of them were not subsidized out of the 7.1 million?

What would be the point, Mr. Speaker, and if we look at a society that supposedly had 48 million people without their own health insurance policy, I really wasn't alarmed by that because I don't know where the right comes from to own your own health insurance policy, but we provided health services to everybody in this country, at a minimum, to those who show up at an emergency room.

So somehow, they twisted this around to everybody has a right, everybody needs to own their own health insurance policy.

I stood on this floor 4 years ago or so and made the argument that, of the 48 million—when you subtract from that those who qualify for Medicaid and, from that, those who make over \$75,000 a year and presumably could buy their own health insurance, those who qualify, those who are unlawfully present in the United States, and you subtract from the 48 million, down to the number of those who are uninsured, your 48 million became 12.1 million, which is 4 percent of our population in the entire health care system of the United States, the insurance system and the delivery system, is entirely redirected, transformed under ObamaCare, to try to get at that 4 percent number.

Meanwhile, it looks to me that we will have more people uninsured, not less. By the way, if you want to sign up in the rest of this year, sorry, you are out of luck; you missed the signup deadline. Now, except for some narrow conditions, you will not be able to get insurance in this country. It is a calamity. It is one of the calamities.

Another one of the calamities, in the time that I have remaining, is a reflection upon the hearing today where Attorney General Holder came before the House Judiciary Committee.

His testimony comes about once a year before the Judiciary Committee. It is our job to have oversight over the Justice Department. We have done that for a long, long time.

As each of the members of the panel questioned Attorney General Holder under oath, here is how I reflect upon this: I asked Eric Holder if he still held the position he did when I last questioned him, in that the Department of Justice is an independent department

that doesn't take directive from the President, and his job is to provide equal justice under the law.

He agreed with that statement. I think it is a proper way to frame the job of Attorney General, but to argue that the Attorney General is not politically influenced by the President of the United States is a pretty tough argument to make when you think of this, Mr. Speaker.

I take you back to 2008. This was in the last weeks—or, actually, the last months of the Bush administration. Senator Ted Stevens, for 40 years, represented Alaska in the United States Senate. There were charges brought against him that were evaluated and investigated by Federal officers of the FBI.

On October 27, 2008, Senator Ted Stevens was found guilty of charges of corruption brought against him. Eight days later, he lost his election to now-Senator BEGICH in Alaska.

In October of the following year, former-Senator Stevens was killed in a tragic plane crash, but here is the modern news, Mr. Speaker: on March 27 of this year, it is announced, in a little news story that hardly got any play, that at least one of the FBI agents, Mary Beth Kepner, has been severely disciplined, and that discipline has been imposed for—let me say violations during the investigation and the prosecution of Senator Ted Stevens.

Now, he is dead. He can't speak for himself. He was convicted in a trial that took place and was concluded 8 days before his election. He narrowly lost the election in Alaska. This prosecution, if it was investigated and operated in the fashion that would be reflected when you see the language that Mary Beth Kepner, one of the FBI agents, was severely disciplined, and that discipline has been imposed, what is the discipline? What did they do?

Do we think Eric Holder is prosecuting, now, Mary Beth Kepner for her involvement in the prosecution of Ted Stevens, which may or may not have, but likely did bring about a change in the election of the United States Senate, so that it gave the Senate a 60-vote Democrat majority, and they were able to cram through components of ObamaCare that they would not have been able to cram through otherwise?

This, you would think, would be worthy of at least a comment on the part of Attorney General Eric Holder to look into and see: Is it worthy of, now, investigation and prosecution? Or could you at least release a statement as to the acts that she committed and the investigation that you did? If the case is closed, tell us.

When you have FBI agents improperly conducting themselves to the extent that the Holder Justice Department severely disciplined them, you have to wonder if it didn't change the course of history.

□ 2030

You have to wonder, if the FBI had not conducted themselves in that fashion that brought about the severe discipline, would Ted Stevens have been reelected? Would that have changed the results in the United States Senate? Would we, maybe, perhaps, not be living under ObamaCare today if those actions had not taken place inside this Justice Department? You would think the Attorney General would look into that or at least have a comment. That is number one.

The second one would be the very aggressive overreach of the investigation of Aaron Swartz, and that topic is something that brought about his suicide, and there has been much dialogue in this country about that.

Another one that I brought up to General Holder is this: the investigation and prosecution of Conrad Barrett. Now, we have all, Mr. Speaker, heard about the knockout game in this country. It is when youth, generally speaking, will go pick someone and decide, I am going to punch them and knock them out in the street, and see if I can do it with one punch, and my buddies are going to see me do this. Sometimes it is videotaped, and we see this on television. In the cases that I have seen and in the cases that have been reported, it is almost always black on white crime. The knockout game appears to be black on white crime.

I fought against, as well as did LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, the hate crimes legislation because that just turns into a tool, and when you punish someone for what you think they think rather than for the overt act that they commit, you are getting into an area of law that allows for a lot of discretion on the part of the prosecution, and it may or may not result in more justice. I believe we ought to severely punish the people who are committing the overt acts, but we should not have gone down the road of the hate crimes legislation because that becomes a tool that can be used now to divide people against each other based upon whatever particular minority group we might be in.

You would think, with a country full of black on white crime and with a knockout game—something that has been all over the news for months now—that Eric Holder could find a way, if he wanted to prosecute a hate crime, to pick one of those African American youths who has gone in there and slugged and punched out someone on the streets who was targeted because of their difference in race. Instead, the Justice Department picked Conrad Barrett, a white guy who punched an African American, in order to play his side of the knockout game. If he is guilty of this, of course that is wrong, and he should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. We have States that can prosecute those kinds of assaults and violent acts, but it strikes me that the others didn't fit the profile of the Holder administration, so they went after the one exam-

ple of the white guy and the African American victim instead of all of the white victims and the African American alleged perpetrators. That stands out to me.

The next one is the prosecution of Dinesh D'Souza, who did the movie "Obama 2016." Yes, that hurt the administration. It brought some things out about where this administration is going, the Obama administration. He is no friend of the administration's, but it is alleged that he directed \$20,000 through friends to be given to a U.S. Senate campaign in New York. That is alleged. I don't know if it is true, but that is the allegation. Yet it must be true that there are thousands of Americans who have done a similar thing for a lot more money. The Holder Justice Department couldn't find them, but they found Dinesh D'Souza to target for prosecution.

They also targeted for Federal prosecution Governor Bob McDonnell, in Virginia, who has five former Virginia attorneys general who have vouched for the language of the law and who have said they believe the Holder Justice Department has stretched the limits of that. We shall see how that comes out.

Governor Chris Christie had a problem with the traffic being closed on a bridge, and it created a national furor, but within a week, the Holder Justice Department was investigating Governor Chris Christie for his use of the funds for the Sandy relief fund.

Now, how is it that the Holder Justice Department isn't going to look into the FBI's transgressions in the Senator Ted Stevens investigation, which brought about, I believe, a change in the result of that Senate election and a change in ObamaCare? How is it that they are not going to look into the overzealous prosecution of Carmen Ortiz and Aaron Swartz?

They are going to prosecute Conrad Barrett for a hate crime, and they are going to continue to prosecute Dinesh D'Souza, but it is just a coincidence that he produced "Obama 2016." They are going to continue to prosecute Republican Governor Bob McDonnell and Republican Governor Chris Christie while they let people off the hook, like the New Black Panthers in Philadelphia; James Clapper, who contradicted himself under oath, which would be, if proven, a perjury charge; Governor Jon Corzine, a Democrat from New Jersey, while there is \$1 billion missing in Global Crossing, and we can't find a way to investigate him; Lois Lerner, who is manipulating the IRS to persecute the President's political enemies, and the investigation has to take place by subpoena, in contempt of Congress, because the Holder Justice Department has turned a blind eye because the President has said there is not a smidgeon of corruption in the IRS; and exempting entire classes of people from prosecution, like illegal immigrants who haven't committed serious crimes. They are exempt from

prosecution and removal, and with marijuana, huge companies are exempted even though it is Federal law. With DOMA, Attorney General Holder has refused to defend DOMA before the Court.

Voter fraud instead, by the way, they prosecute. They bring action against States like Texas, which simply want voter ID, and they allege that Texas is imposing a poll tax and that it is a racist plot.

That is what we have, Mr. Speaker, in the Justice Department today. It is hard to call it justice. It is going to be hard to take this country to the next level of our destiny. These values that I have brought out in the beginning—these values of respect for tradition and wisdom of past generations, the rule of law, individual freedom and liberty, and a belief in a law higher than man's law—we must restore in this country if we are to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 404. An act to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5265. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Swap Data Repositories — Access to SDR Data by Market Participants (RIN: 3038-AE14) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5266. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges

and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0015; FV14-906-2 IR] received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5267. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Potatoes From Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0037] (RIN: 0579-AD78) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5268. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0002; FV14-932-1 FR] received April 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5269. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052-AD00) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5270. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael Ferriter, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5271. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2013 on the STARBASE Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5272. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-Research and Development Contracting (DFARS Case 2013-D026) (RIN: 0750-A110) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5273. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-Quality Assurance (DFARS Case 2013-D004) (RIN: 0750-AH95) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5274. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Performance-Based Payments (DFARS Case 2011-D045) (RIN: 0750-AH54) received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5275. A letter from the Vice Chairman and Under Secretary for Intelligence, Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense, transmitting certification that the EP-3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System II and the Special Projects Aircraft platforms meet all current requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5276. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Application of the Revised Capital Framework to the Capital Plan and Stress Test Rules [Regulations Y and YY;

Docket Nos.: R-1463 and R-1464; RIN: 7100 AE-01 and AE-02] received April 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5277. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III fund for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5278. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conforming Amendment to the Section 184 Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5772-F-01] (RIN: 2577-AC91) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5279. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Alternative Fueled Vehicle Credit Program Modification and Other Amendments [Docket ID No.: EERE-2011-OT-0066] (RIN: 1904-AB81) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5280. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment [Docket Number: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0003] (RIN: 1904-AC19) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5281. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D2 Bakers Yeast [Docket No.: FDA-2009-F-0750] received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5282. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Video Programming; Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking [CG Docket No.: 05-231] (PRM11CG) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5283. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Freedom of Information Act; Miscellaneous Rules received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5284. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 2014-001: Interim Guidance for Dispositioning 10 CFR Part 37 Violations with Respect to Large Components or Robust Structures Containing Category 1 or Category 2 Quantities of Material at Power Reactor Facilities Licensed Under 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52 (RIN: 3150-A112) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5286. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f)

of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 14-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5288. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 67th World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, as mandated in the 2004 Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, Pub. L. 108-235, Sec. 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5289. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5290. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Performance; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5291. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-305, "Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5292. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-306, "DC Promise Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5293. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-304, "Belmont Park Designation and Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5294. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5295. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5296. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5297. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's Fiscal Year 2013 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5298. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the

Board's FY 2013 Buy American Act report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5299. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pay for Senior-Level and Scientific or Professional Positions (RIN: 3206-AL88) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5300. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002 Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5301. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2013, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5302. A letter from the Deputy Commissioner for Human Resources, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5303. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD137) received March 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5304. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XD157) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5305. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Georges Bank and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 140113030-4109-01] (RIN: 0648-XD081) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5306. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD137) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5307. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 120416009-4095-02] (RIN: 0648-BB78) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5308. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2014 and 2015 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XC927) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5309. A letter from the Director, Administrative Offices of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Executive Summary of the 2013 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5310. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the PRO IP Act Annual Report FY 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5311. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a recommendation to modify the cost of the Poplar Island, Maryland, project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5312. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a recommendation for modifying the cost of the Illinois Shoreline Erosion, Interim III, Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State Line (Chicago Shoreline) project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting recommendations to increase the authorized total projected cost of the Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska flood risk reduction project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5314. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gross Combination Weight Rating: Definition [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0156] (RIN: 2126-AB72; Formerly RIN: 2126-AB53) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5315. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No.: SLSDC-2014-0001] (RIN: 2135-AA33) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5316. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Adoption of Certain Special Permits and Competent Authorities into Regulations [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0158 (HM-233C)] (RIN: 2137-AE82) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5317. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a proposed bill entitled the "Federal Aviation Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5318. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting

and Business Development, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for fiscal year 2012 on Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Development; to the Committee on Small Business.

5319. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the taxation of Social Security and Railroad Retirement Benefits for Calendar Years 2005 through 2009, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401 nt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5320. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Submission of Forms, the Finished Products Records for Distilled Spirits Plants, and Closures on Certain Distilled Spirits Products [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0004; T.D. TTB-119] (RIN: 1513-AB97) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5321. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Issuance of Opinion and Advisory Letters for Pre-approved Defined Contribution Plans for the Second Six-Year Cycle, Deadline for Employer Adoption and Opening of Determination Letter Program for Pre-approved Plan Adopters (Announcement 2014-16) received March 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5322. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 911(d)(4) Update (Rev. Proc. 2014-25) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5323. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Eligibility for Premium Tax Credit for Victims of Domestic Abuse [Notice 2014-23] received March 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5324. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Shared Responsibility for Employers Regarding Health Coverage [TD 9655] (RIN: 1545-BL33) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5325. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a joint report that describes activities related to the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) Budget Plan and Review for FY 2012-2017; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

5326. A letter from the Vice Chairman, World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's activities to date and the initial strategic plan; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

5327. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of a public hearing held on "China's Military Modernization and its Implications for the United States"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

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. AMODEI:

H.R. 4419. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require periodic review

of listings of endangered species and threatened species under that Act, to support protection and conservation measures for endangered or threatened species under that Act and to alleviate the need to list a species as an endangered or threatened species, to convey small parcels of National Forest System land and Department of the Interior land to generate revenues for such protection and conservation measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, 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 Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4420. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4421. A bill to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4422. A bill to authorize the President to establish the Veterans' Job Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed veterans and widows of veterans through the performance of useful public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4423. A bill to provide for no net increase in the total acreage of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4424. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a database that shall serve as a central location for information from investigations relating to human trafficking for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to improve the Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4426. A bill to promote the domestic development and deployment of clean energy technologies required for the 21st century; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4427. A bill to provide for a grants program to develop and enhance integrated nu-

trition curricula in medical schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit for microturbine property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REED, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act to ensure that certain facilities continue to be treated as alcohol-related facilities, notwithstanding the distribution of spent grains resulting from the production of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 546. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. LANKFORD):

H. Res. 547. A resolution affirming the vital role that prayer has played throughout the more than 200-year history of our nation, strengthening the fabric of our society, and recognizing May 1, 2014, as the 63rd annual National Day of Prayer; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H. Res. 548. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the mandatory annual ethics training offered to Members, officers, and employees of the House to include a specific program of training in the prevention and deterrence of sexual harassment in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 549. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the need to explore emerging technologies that are mobile and capable of supplying high volumes of sterile, pathogenic-free water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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.

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. AMODEI:

H.R. 4419.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Arti-

cle I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 4, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 4425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
To provide for a grants program to develop and enhance integrated nutrition curriculum in medical schools.

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

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 Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 4430.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 164: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 184: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 318: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 352: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 482: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 508: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 515: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 597: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 647: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 683: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 713: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 792: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 831: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 863: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 921: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 946: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 963: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1008: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1141: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1148: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1250: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1252: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. GRIF-FIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1318: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1354: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1428: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1461: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1462: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1579: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1648: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1812: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1852: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2131: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2146: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2202: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2203: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SIREs, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2221: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2240: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2288: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2291: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2364: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2366: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2377: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2548: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2782: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2805: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2827: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2870: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2901: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2939: Mr. HORSFORD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2996: Mr. TURNER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3012: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 3040: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3086: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3179: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 3199: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3211: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3344: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3377: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3382: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3383: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3408: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3461: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3465: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3489: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 3530: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3546: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 3576: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3610: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3658: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3698: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3710: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3717: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3833: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3836: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3930: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3963: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4031: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4035: Mr. HOLT and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4058: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4065: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 4080: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4103: Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4119: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4120: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 4148: Mr. SHIFF, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 4156: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BARLETTA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4166: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4188: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
H.R. 4213: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4225: Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4227: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4232: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4286: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4299: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4300: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4303: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 4305: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4315: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4318: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4319: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4320: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4342: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4357: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4370: Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4382: Mr. COLE and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4387: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4403: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4414: Mr. HIMES, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4418: Mr. PETRI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.J. Res. 34: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H. Res. 417: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 422: Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 456: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 494: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 509: Mr. ROYCE and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 525: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H. Res. 540: Mr. DUFFY, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 542: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014

No. 57

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, today make our lawmakers instruments of Your grace and goodness. Teach them how to be patient with themselves and each other. Forgive them when they permit impatience to lead them astray, preventing them from seeing the wonder and majesty of Your purpose for our Nation and world. Lord, renew in them the joy of belonging to You as they yield their hearts to You in trust and love. May no duty be left undone and no constructive words be left unsaid.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in morning business until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled. The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for our weekly caucus meetings, as we always do on Tuesdays.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2575

Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 2575 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2575) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification of a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EQUAL PAY DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Ralph Waldo Emerson said this: "America is another name for opportunity."

"America is another name for opportunity."

Today this body, the Senate, should put Emerson's words to the test as we turn attention to the question of equal pay. For working American women, millions of whom are primary wage earners for their families, the Paycheck Fairness Act represents a unique opportunity, a chance to better provide for themselves and their families.

It is unconscionable that American women currently take home an average of 77 cents for every dollar their male colleagues earn for doing the exact same work. Wage disparity is true regardless of whether a woman has a college degree, what job she holds or how many hours she spends at the office or factory or wherever it might be.

Consider this just for a brief moment: For a woman to make the same salary as a man in 1 year for doing similar work in America, she must work not only that year but also an additional 3 months and 8 days. That is why today, April 8, the eighth day of the fourth month, is Equal Pay Day. It represents the extra work American women have to put forth to provide for their families. This is an injustice and should not be permitted to take place in America. While President Obama and Democrats have made significant progress toward helping women achieve equal pay, there is still much for us to do.

Five years ago the very first law President Obama ever signed, the first act he performed in the Oval Office, was to sign the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Remember, this is the legislation based on the good woman who found out—after having worked at this place for so many years, having additional responsibilities than all the men—they were all getting paid much more than she. She was the boss getting paid less than the people who worked for her. Why? Because she is a woman.

The Lilly Ledbetter legislation is the biggest step Congress has taken on behalf of women to help them with their wages since the Equal Pay Act of 1963. The bill provides that the statute of limitations doesn't begin to run until someone finds out they are being cheated by their employer. The legislation helped address the pay gap, but women still suffer from discriminatory wage disparity.

The Paycheck Fairness Act goes a step further by providing protections for women in the workplace. This legislation addresses unequal wages by empowering women to negotiate for equal pay and giving employers incentives to obey current law.

I was happy to hear all the news accounts that I was able to be briefed on—along with those I listened to on public radio while I was doing my exercises—the detailed accounts about how

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2203

women are not treated fairly. The legislation we are working on enables women to fight against wage discrimination while also preventing retaliation against employees who discuss salary information. Before Lilly Ledbetter and even today if you discuss what someone else makes you can be fired. That is the way it is in most places in America. It would finally give much needed assistance to victims of gender-based pay discrimination.

Simply put, the Paycheck Fairness Act gives American women the fair shot they deserve. Unfortunately, efforts to address this issue have not been well received by Republicans. A similar bill addressing equal pay—despite a Republican filibuster—passed Congress and the Congress before that. Let's hope the third time is a charm for American women. Let's hope Republicans will finally do what is right.

In any other circumstance Republicans would be up in arms with this type of economic discrimination—I would hope. They should be up in arms in terms of equal pay for women also. Why is it that so many Republicans are content to allow women working the same hours in the same job to make less money than their male coworkers? It is hard to comprehend, since women make up nearly half the U.S. labor force and more than half of the people enrolled in college. We are finding that the majority of students enrolled in professional schools, law schools, medical schools are women. Is it reasonable to assume that women should be treated unfairly? Is it reasonable to assume that Republicans in this body have wives, daughters or sisters who are or will be affected by this wage disparity and shouldn't we do something about it?

I urge my colleagues to keep those loved ones—people such as my daughter and my many granddaughters—in their minds and in their thoughts when considering the question of equal pay for women. We will have the first vote the day after tomorrow. We will have this vote. To do otherwise would simply be unfair.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP KUDOS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to congratulate the Kentucky Wildcats for an extraordinary season. My home State has held on to the NCAA national championship trophy for the past 2 years, with the Louisville Cardinals claiming it last year and the Kentucky Wildcats winning it in 2012. John Calipari's young Wildcats started five freshmen who played like seasoned veterans and made an incredible run that captivated both our State and the Nation.

While the Commonwealth will now relinquish the trophy to Connecticut, I only ask that my colleagues, Senator MURPHY and Senator BLUMENTHAL, see to it that the trophy remains in pristine condition—pristine condition—as

my State will undoubtedly reclaim it next year.

JOB CREATION SOLUTIONS

Mr. President, America's middle class is struggling. They need serious job creation solutions, but that is not what they have been getting from the President. He seems more intent on staging campaign-style rallies to bemoan an economy he has been presiding over for the last 5½ years, not to offer solutions but more to do what he does best, which is to shift the blame to others.

Meanwhile, yesterday in the Senate Republicans were hoping the majority leader would finally work with us to pass a job creation package that contains ideas from many of our Members—legislation with provisions several key Democrats support as well—but that is not what the majority leader chose to do. Instead of focusing on jobs, he launched into another confusing attack on the left's latest bizarre obsession.

Think about that. The percentage of Americans in the workforce is almost at a four-decade low, and Democrats chose to ignore serious job creation ideas so they could blow a few kisses to their powerful pals on the left.

At a time when so many Americans are desperate—desperate for a good job, at a time of fewer opportunities, people are hurting, college graduates cannot find a job, working families cannot afford to pay their bills—what Americans need right now are real job creation solutions, not some tone-deaf, blame-deflection rally or some daily bout of shadow boxing on the Senate floor.

Some say this is all embarrassing, but there is one positive side to the Washington Democrats' never-ending political road show. It throws the divide between the two parties into stark relief. On the one side we have a Washington Democratic Party that simply has run out of ideas. When it comes to fixing the economy, they have tried just about everything their ideology will allow: taxing, regulating, spending, stimulating, you name it, and none of it has worked. So at this point they have basically dropped any pretense of doing anything serious on the economy. That is why we heard them essentially admit that their governing agenda is actually a political document drafted by campaign staff, that the proposals it contains are basically just show votes designed specifically not to pass. So that is one side of American politics: a party that is out of ideas, campaign-obsessed, and utterly beholden to the far left.

On the other side we have a Republican Party that is committed to getting our economy working for the middle class. We believe in the power of ideas, and we know that with the right forward-looking policies we can and will break through the stagnation of the Obama economy. The Republicans' focus is on offering more opportunity to the middle class and those who aspire to it. Our focus is on offering inno-

vative ways to generate the kind of stable, well-paying jobs that Americans actually want. We also know we can get more done as a country if both parties can work together to see these policies through and leave behind the sterile campaign theatrics that have been on daily display in the Senate under the Democratic majority.

I am asking our Democratic colleagues to consider dropping all the show votes, the blame deflecting, and the perpetual campaigning. What I am asking is for them to consider shifting from policies that don't work—in other words, what they have been trying for the last 5½ years—to ones that will. Every Senator was sent here to get things done for our constituents, and we can. We can pass a positive jobs agenda for the American people. All we need is for Washington Democrats to work with us for a change.

I have one other item. This morning IRS Commissioner Koskin will testify before the Finance Committee. I am sure Members will be reminding him of this, and I know several sent a letter yesterday too. But I would like to underline the point. Commissioner Koskin led Congress to believe that his agency will not be imposing anti-free speech rules before this November's election. It is a point he basically reiterated again just the other day, so Congress plans to hold him to what he has been leading the American people to believe.

Honestly, what he really needs to do is to stop the IRS from stepping on the First Amendment all together. He needs to stop this proposed regulation just as the Secretary of the Treasury told us he could do if he wanted. In fact, the House of Representatives recently voted to halt it too.

Remember, tens of thousands of Americans made their opinions known directly to the IRS about this regulation. It was an unprecedented response and nearly all of the comments were opposed. The comments came from straight across the political spectrum.

Commissioner Koskin needs to live up to what we told the Senate when we confirmed him when he led us to believe he would be an independent voice for reform. As I said before, Commissioner Koskin has a choice. He can be a hero—like the IRS commissioner who stood up to President Nixon—or he can be another pawn of this administration. Both Congress and the American people expect him to make the right decision.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to

speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my wife and I are blessed with a son and daughter who are good people, hard workers with good values. We basically believe the following: If they did the same job, they deserve the same pay—my daughter and my son. Most Americans agree with that. People should be judged on what they do, their performance, their productivity, not on their gender. That is at the heart of the issue pending before the Senate at this moment.

Tomorrow we will take a vote. It is a procedural vote, so it takes 60 Senators to vote to move forward on what is known as the Paycheck Fairness Act. We have 55 Democrats. The simple math tells you that unless five Republican Senators join us to move forward on this issue, that is the end of the story. It would be unfortunate if it is the end of the story.

The Paycheck Fairness Act amends the Equal Pay Act to discourage discrimination based on gender and to help narrow the pay gap in America. No. 1, the bill provides women the same remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are available to people today based on racial or national origin discrimination. No. 2, the bill prohibits retaliation against workers who disclose their wages. Think about that for a second.

Lilly Ledbetter worked in a tire factory in Alabama for years. Toward the end of her work life, she received an anonymous note that said: Lilly, you have been underpaid. You have been making less than the men do in the same job in this plant since you have been here. She was crushed. She thought she was a valued employee. No one ever questioned the quality of her work, and she was being paid less than the men doing the same job at her factory.

She filed a lawsuit, and it made it all the way to the Supreme Court—across the street. Not surprisingly, this conservative, business-oriented, Republican-oriented Supreme Court said: Sorry, Ms. Ledbetter. You should have reported that pay discrimination when it first started. Well, why didn't she? She didn't know. How could she know? Payroll information is not published—except perhaps for government employees. That payroll information was not available to her to file the lawsuit when it first occurred. When she found out about it, she filed the lawsuit across the street, and the learned Supreme Court said: Too late.

So we changed the law. The very first law signed by the President of the United States Barack Obama was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which said that Lilly Ledbetter and women just like her across America, deserve

an opportunity for equal pay for equal work. What we have before us today—this Paycheck Fairness Act—is an effort to make sure that law is strong and helps women across America.

No. 1, it says that women cannot be discriminated against in the workplace simply because they are women. No. 2, you can't threaten retaliation if one worker tells another what the pay is at that particular place of work. No. 3, it adds programs for training, research, technical assistance, and awards to recognize pay equity employers.

The Equal Pay Act was signed into law almost 50 years ago, but the pay gap between men and women in America is just about the same today as it was then. According to the U.S. Census Bureau—as we heard over and over—women earn 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. African-American women make 70 cents on the dollar, and Hispanic women make about 60 cents on the dollar.

In my State of Illinois, 37 percent of married employed mothers are their family's primary wage earners. Yet they face the same income disparity. It turns out to be a yearly gap of \$11,596 on average between men and women who work full time in my State. That is what the disparity in pay between men and women means in the State of Illinois. It is not just less take-home pay for women doing the same job, it means fewer Social Security benefits when they retire. They are not earning at the same level as men. They pay for this discrimination for a lifetime.

The National Partnership for Women and Families found that ending this wage gap would provide women in my State with additional earnings that would be the equivalent of 97 weeks of food, 13 months of rent, 7 months of mortgage payments or 3,000 gallons of gas. It is a big deal for a struggling family—particularly for a woman who is a struggling wage earner in Illinois.

Regardless of occupation, education, industry or marital status, pay for women in my State lags behind their male counterparts. Women in Illinois who work in business and financial management earn 72 percent of their male counterpart's salary. That is what is before the Senate.

Is it wrong? Yes, it is. Are we prepared to say so in legislation? Tune in tomorrow and find out whether five Republicans will join us to raise this issue of pay fairness for women across America.

I am not encouraged by the statement that was just made on the floor by the Senate Republican leader. He referred to this whole conversation about paycheck fairness and minimum wage increases—so that people who go to work every single day do not live in poverty—as “the left's latest bizarre obsession.” He said that we were blowing a few kisses to our powerful pals on the left with this legislative agenda. He called it tone deaf, blame deflection, and shadow boxing on the Senate floor.

The Senate Republican leader said the divide between the two parties is in

stark relief. He is right. He went on to say: We should drop any pretense of doing anything serious in this Chamber if this is what we are going to discuss.

How serious is equal pay for equal work to working people across America? I think it is critical. It is one thing for the Senate Republican leader to talk about job creation. We all want it. We are desperate for it. We are moving toward it in many different ways, but let's talk to those who are working and have jobs and whether they are paid fairly. Is that important to them? Of course.

Simply having a job may be important, but when you get to the heart of it, people want to be rewarded for good work. They don't want to work 40 hours a week, get up every morning, get on the bus in the dark, put their kids in their neighbor's house for daycare, head to their job, and at the end of the week realize they are still living in poverty. And that is what today's minimum wage does.

The women on those buses and the CTA trains that we see every morning in Chicago, with their shopping bags full of the basics so they can go to work and leaving their kids behind, want to believe they will be paid fairly for what they do. That is not much to ask.

According to the Republican leader, it shows the stark contrast between the two parties. It is a stark contrast. The Republican leader says that we want to work for a commitment to jobs and focus on the power of ideas. I want to focus on the power of an idea too. It is the idea of fairness and fair play. It is as basic as being an American, to believe that people ought to be treated fairly, and that when they do the same work they are entitled to the same pay. That is not too much to ask. In fact, we should demand it.

I suppose we are going to have a critical, historic vote tomorrow. I am hoping five—just five—Republicans will step up on behalf of working women across America and join us on this Paycheck Fairness Act. Without them, this idea will die for now, but it is not going to die forever. The American people have the last word. They will have it in the election. They can decide if this is important. They can decide whether—as the Republican leader said—this is just a bizarre obsession on the part of the left to think of fair pay for the same work. I think it is pretty basic to America.

This is our chance. Paycheck fairness and a minimum wage to keep people who get up and go to work every day out of poverty are fundamental to a good workplace and a workforce across America which is respected by the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

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

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

FORT HOOD SHOOTING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week the men and women at the Fort Hood Army post in Killeen, TX, witnessed a shocking act of violence as a gunman suddenly and inexplicably opened fire, killing 3 fellow soldiers and wounding 16 others. Yet, even as our attention has focused on the horror of this event, I think it is also important to talk about the very best of humanity demonstrated during this time of tragedy and crisis.

The men and women at Fort Hood saw the very best of humanity in the military police officer who confronted the shooter, for example.

They saw it in Private Jacob Sanders, who risked his own life in the hopes of saving one of the victims.

They saw it in SGT Jonathan Westbrook, who was shot and wounded by the gunman but still managed to radio Fort Hood officials and sound the alert so that others might be protected and safe.

They also saw it in SFC Danny Ferguson, who served a combat tour in Iraq and had recently gotten home from a second one in Afghanistan. Last Wednesday Sergeant Ferguson used his own body to prevent the shooter from entering a crowded room. He gave his life so that his fellow soldiers could keep theirs. He showed the kind of heroism that few of us could even imagine, the kind of heroism that defines our men and women in uniform.

So even as we mourn the terrible loss of Sergeant Ferguson, we want to also take a moment to celebrate his wonderful example and his wonderful life, just as we celebrate the remarkable lives of SGT Timothy Owens and SSG Carlos Lazaney-Rodriguez.

Sergeant Owens served his country in Iraq and in Kuwait. He also served as a counselor at Fort Hood. According to his mother, he counseled literally "hundreds of people." His brother Darrell described him as someone who "would help anybody who needed help."

Sergeant Lazaney-Rodriguez was a native of Puerto Rico, and he served multiple combat tours in Iraq. He too made a distinct impression on his friends and fellow soldiers at Fort Hood. One of them described him as "the epitome of what you want a leader to be in the Army."

As I mentioned a moment ago, as we mourn the loss of Sergeant Ferguson, Sergeant Owens, and Sergeant Lazaney-Rodriguez, we should take a moment to celebrate their lives and their service. All three of these men chose—they volunteered—to devote their lives to a noble cause—the defense of our country—and our memories of their work and their sacrifice will live forever.

Before I conclude, I wish to say one more word about Fort Hood, where I will be traveling to tomorrow with the President. Fort Hood is also known as The Great Place. They call it The Great Place. I had the honor of visiting the post last Thursday, and I will do so again tomorrow for the memorial, as I said. As we all remember, Fort Hood was also the scene of an earlier mass shooting in November of 2009. That was yet another day where we saw both the worst and the best of humanity. We saw the very best of humanity in people such as Michael Cahill, a civilian physician's assistant and retired soldier, and Army CPT John Gaffaney, both of whom charged the gunman—MAJ Nidal Hasan—and gave their lives in order to save the lives of others around them.

Over the last 13 years, the Fort Hood community has made enormous contributions to America's missions in Iraq and in Afghanistan, where more than 550 of their soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice. In fact, the last combat brigade to leave Iraq was a Fort Hood brigade—the Third Brigade of the storied 1st Cavalry Division.

I sometimes think about the fact that most Americans probably don't have a close friend or relative who has served in the Armed Forces. So in some ways the American people have become isolated to some degree from the realities of war and national security. For them the war in Afghanistan is something they read about in the newspaper or they hear about on TV, but it is not very real to them unless they have a family member or a loved one or a friend who has served.

For the families at Fort Hood and in the surrounding Texas communities of Belton, Copperas Cove, Harker Heights, Killeen, and Temple, it is something much different, something much more personal because it is a family member, it is a loved one, it is a friend who has served, and many of them have lost their lives in the process because they believed that keeping the American people safe was more important than their own personal security and safety.

I wish to take this moment to let the families and friends of the victims at Fort Hood know that—and, indeed, to tell all the good people at Fort Hood—your fellow Americans are thinking about you, we are praying for you and keeping you close in our hearts during this difficult time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UCONN VICTORY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to begin by remarking on the ex-

traordinary and remarkable triumph of the UConn men's basketball team last night—a victory that is beyond my words to describe—and the achievement it represents for those players, for the school, for coach Kevin Ollie, and for the entire university, particularly in the face of last year's disqualification—unfair and unjustified, in my view.

I am so proud of our team and the University of Connecticut for its steadfast and relentless pursuit of this national championship, which last night culminated in a huge and joyous triumph felt throughout Connecticut and, in fact, throughout the country.

I will be commenting in greater length and depth on how this achievement reflects on the University of Connecticut, what it means to college athletics, and what lessons we can take from this great triumph.

In the meantime, I am wearing my University of Connecticut tie with the emblem of the Huskies because last night's triumph is only a prelude to tonight.

UConn is rolling with momentum toward two national championships. The women, I believe, will prevail tonight, and I expect to collect on another debt—the debt owed to me already by my colleagues from Kentucky I think will be supplemented tomorrow—and I will ask that my Kentucky colleague, Senator PAUL, wear this tie, if only for a brief moment, to demonstrate who was the better team last night. They are both great teams, but Connecticut was the greatest.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here this morning on a very serious and important subject—the Paycheck Fairness Act. I thank my colleagues who were with me earlier today at an event we attended. The President is doing an event right now. He has announced he will require all Federal contractors to follow the rule that there should be no retaliation against people in the workplace who share information about their pay. It sounds like a basic principle of fairness but, unfortunately, the law has gaps that permit discrimination—gender discrimination, unequal pay for the same work. So today on Equal Pay Day, I am here to advocate for the Paycheck Fairness Act, which will help fill some of those gaps.

This issue is not a man's issue, it is not a woman's issue. It is a family issue. It is not about women, it is about paycheck fairness. So it is as much about men as it is about women. Right now 40 percent of all our families are supported by women either as the sole or primary breadwinner. That means the children in those families, and the men, depend on that income and on the fairness of their paychecks to keep a roof over their head and to keep food on the table.

Paycheck fairness is about a fair shot—a fair shot for every woman and

every person in American society. It is part of a larger agenda which includes raising the minimum wage, which we still have to do, and restoring unemployment insurance, which the Senate did yesterday but we still have to do in the House. That larger agenda about a fair shot goes to the core of the American conscience about what is right, but it also happens to be what is economically smart. Paying women equal to men for the same work means that women will come to jobs and they will work better in those jobs, more productively. Women have so much to contribute in jobs where they serve equally or better than men.

Unfortunately, the promise of the Equal Pay Act, signed in 1963 by President Kennedy, has yet to be achieved. That promise was that equality would prevail in the workplace. Yet 51 years later the disparities are glaring, the gaps between gender pay are unacceptable and inexcusable. Women make only 77 percent of every dollar earned by men. The disparity is even greater in certain professions. In the janitorial profession, among supervisors, and among CEOs, women make 70 cents or less on the dollar. The same is true among financial advisers and among product inspectors. So the disparities cut across all professions. In fact, in 97 percent of all professions, women make less on average than men. That is why we must work to change the law.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would accomplish a number of very simple straightforward goals. No. 1, it would enable workers to share information without fear of retaliation. Right now, a worker can be fired or demoted if he or she shares information about what they are making. The Lilly Ledbetter Act of 2009 advanced these goals and made some progress, but this threat of retaliation is real and completely unconscionable and it should be directly prohibited by law.

Second, the burden should be on the employer to establish that pay disparities are business related or job specific. Those disparities ought to be the job of the employer to justify, not the employee. After all, it is not the employee who makes those decisions, it is the employer. So the employer ought to be the one to present a justification based on objective and real business-related or job-specific factors.

Finally, the Paycheck Fairness Act provides for punitive damages. Only by establishing punitive damages can the evil and harm done by pay discrimination be effectively deterred. The economic penalty will discourage employers by providing real consequences for their discrimination.

This issue is really an American issue that has resonance coast to coast, job to job, and person to person, but mostly it has resonance among families. The estimates are that eliminating the gender pay gap will reduce poverty among families headed by single working mothers from 28.7 percent to 15 percent. It will reduce poverty,

most importantly, among children. It will give those children a leg up that they lack now. It will give their moms a sense of justified dignity and self-respect. It will make a practical difference in the lives of families, raising the self-respect and dignity of men as well as women. If they are the beneficiaries of false factors, simple gender discrimination, how can they justify the additional pay that they as men make?

Discovering and proving discrimination is a formidable, daunting, sometimes insurmountable challenge. Discovering it is difficult enough. That is why sharing of information is necessary. Proving it is sometimes virtually impossible without the kind of law the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide, the rights and making those rights real that can be achieved, ending systemic pay discrimination that undermines and disserves our entire society. It demeans all of us. It fails to give people a fair shot when that is the ethos, the core conscience of American economic profit. A fair shot is not only fair, it is smart. It will promote jobs and economic growth, which all of us deeply want and deserve.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLITICAL STRATEGY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, 2 weeks ago the New York Times published an article on the congressional Democrats' plan for the rest of the year. It boiled down to one thing: Campaigning. That is right; 8 months out from the election, Democrats in Congress have given up on legislating. Instead, they are going to spend the next 8 months focused on show votes, which will—and I quote from the story—“be timed to coincide with campaign-style trips by President Obama.”

While these votes will focus on “pocketbook issues” Democrats hope will appeal to voters, the votes are not designed to actually accomplish anything. The New York Times goes on to say:

Democrats concede that making new laws is not really the point. Rather, they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them.

The article goes on to say:

Privately, White House officials say they have no intention of searching for any grand bargain with Republicans on any of these issues. “The point isn’t to compromise,” a senior White House official said.

So that is where we are. The economy is stagnant, unemployment is hovering at recession-level highs, 10 mil-

lion Americans are unemployed—nearly 4 million of them for 6 months or longer—household income has fallen, health care costs are soaring, and Democrats have decided to give up doing anything about it so they can get reelected in November.

This political strategy was front and center last week when Democrats blocked all Republican amendments during the Senate debate of the employment benefits extension bill. Republicans wanted to offer a number of amendments that were focused specifically on job creation. After all, the only reason we are considering extending unemployment benefits for the 13th time since 2008 is because so many Americans still don’t have jobs. While unemployment benefits can provide limited short-term help, they do nothing to get unemployed Americans what they really want—steady, good-paying jobs with an opportunity for advancement.

Republicans thought that we should accompany yet another extension of emergency unemployment benefits with measures to make it easier and cheaper to create jobs for the millions of Americans currently searching for work. We proposed amendments to create jobs with measures such as reining in burdensome regulatory requirements and improving job training for people who are unemployed. Democrats, however, didn’t want to take any votes on Republican proposals, so they simply refused to allow amendments to be considered. That is not the mark of a party that is serious about helping the unemployed.

If Democrats were really serious, they would be focused on permanent relief through jobs rather than merely treating the symptoms of unemployment. Democrats brought up unemployment benefits not because they offer real, long-term help to the unemployed but because they think these benefits might win them a few votes in November.

They are planning to keep on doing the same thing. Soon Democrats plan to bring up a 40-percent minimum wage hike that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates will cost up to 500,000 jobs by the end of 2016. By the way, 57 percent of those job losses—according to the CBO—would be held by women. But that is not stopping the Democrats who hope that a minimum wage hike will gain them votes at the polls even if it hurts workers in the process.

This week Senator REID filed cloture on the motion to proceed to a similarly political bill, the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act. All Senate Republicans believe in equal pay for equal work. Paycheck fairness has been the law of the land since 1963. Democrats are playing politics with equal pay and attempting to distract from the real harm that their policies have done to women. Right now there are 3.7 million more women living in poverty than there were when the President took office. Since the President took office,

the poverty rate for women has increased from 14.4 percent to 16.3 percent. Income for female college graduates has dropped by over \$1,400, and the median income for women is down by \$733 since the President took office.

It would be nice if this legislation that is being proposed by the Democratic majority provided women with real economic help, but it is far more likely to line the pockets of trial lawyers. In fact, this election-year ploy would actually hurt women by increasing Federal regulations that would cut flexibility in the workforce for working moms and end merit pay to reward quality work.

If Democrats were really serious about helping women, they would work with us on bills to create jobs and to expand workplace opportunities for women as well as for men—bills such as Senator RUBIO's legislation to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow employers to give merit-based pay increases to good workers; or Senator COLLINS' bill to repeal ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule, which is reducing hours and lowering wages for many workers, particularly women, who make up 63 percent of those affected; or the bill proposed by Senator MIKE LEE, which would help employers balance work and family life by allowing private sector employers to give workers the choice of monetary compensation or comp time for the overtime hours that they work; or Senator MCCONNELL and Senator AYOTTE's bill, which would give hourly workers access to flexible work arrangements like comp time off and flexible credit hours; or my bill combining several of my colleagues' proposals to stimulate job creation and increase hours and wages through energy development, job training, and regulatory relief. Then, of course, there is Senator FISCHER's proposal to give women the tools and knowledge they need to fight discrimination at work.

Many of these proposals have passed the House of Representatives and are awaiting action by the Senate. These bills would create new jobs, open new opportunities, and help reverse the economic decline that women have experienced over the past 5 years. But Democrats don't seem to be interested in providing economic relief to women. They are interested in elections and scoring political points.

Democrats can go on campaigning for the rest of the year if they want. They can twist the legislative process for their own political ends and ignore the economic pain they have caused women and men. Meanwhile, the middle class in this country continues to fall further and further behind.

Republicans in the Senate will continue to propose legislation to create jobs and opportunities for Americans and help make up the ground that the American people have lost in the Obama economy. Democrats can still change their minds and join us, and I hope they will because the situation

has not gotten any better. We still have chronic high unemployment, lower take-home pay, and lower household income.

We have almost 4 million people who have been unemployed for more than 6 months. The labor participation rate—the number of people who are actually in the labor workforce today—is at the lowest level we have seen in 35 years, meaning there are millions of Americans who left the workforce. Those statistics are crying out for solutions that will do something about the need for jobs in our economy, that will do something about growing and expanding our economy, so those people who are unemployed can find the work they need to improve their standard of living and that of their families as well.

So I hope all of these issues I have mentioned—these are all amendments that have been filed by my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. So far there is no indication, no suggestion that any of these amendments are going to get an opportunity to be offered, to be debated, and to be voted on—amendments that actually would improve the outlook for not only men in this country but women as well, by growing the economy, expanding the economy, creating the types of good-paying jobs that will create opportunities for advancement for hard-working Americans.

If the Senate is going to continue to be a place where debate and amendments are shut down, blocked by the other side simply so they can have show votes designed to appeal to a political audience as we head into the midterm elections; if we aren't going to be doing anything to solve the real-world problems millions of Americans who are unemployed have, or millions of Americans who have been hurt by this economy, and millions of Americans who have seen their standard of living and their quality of life eroded by bad policies coming out of Washington, DC, that make it more difficult and more expensive to create jobs—that is what we ought to be focused on. Republicans come to the floor, as we did last week when we were debating unemployment insurance, with amendments designed specifically at growing the economy and creating jobs. At every turn we have been blocked from offering those amendments and, in turn, we are talking about nothing more than political rhetoric in an election year that does nothing to address the real problems of the American people. They deserve better. We can do better. I hope we will. I hope the Democrats will change their minds and join us and allow us to have that debate, to have those votes, and allow us to do something meaningful for middle-class families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EQUAL PAY DAY

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, today is Equal Pay Day. I mentioned that to someone earlier and they said: What does that mean? What that means is an American woman working full time in America today—I am talking about an average American woman working full time, year-round—had to work all last year and up to today of this year to earn what the average male made last year up to December 31. That is what Equal Pay Day is. Think about that. A man gets paid up to December 31, and a woman has to work all that year and up to today to get the same pay.

It is shocking that in 2014 that is still happening in America—shocking—because we passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963. In 1963, a woman made about 60 cents on the dollar for what a man made. Today, it is 77 cents, so I guess we can say we have made some headway. So 1963, 1973, 1983—in 40 years, we have gone from 60 cents to 77 cents.

What we found out, through our committee hearings of the committee I am privileged to chair, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, is that a lot of employers in this country are not abiding by some of the provisions of the Equal Pay Act. I compliment Senator MIKULSKI, who is a member of our committee as well as the Chair of the full Appropriations Committee, for her leadership in bringing this bill, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to the Senate.

When we passed it in 1963, 25 million female workers, as I said, earned about 60 cents on the dollar. Now it is 77 cents. Again, the deficit and what it means for a lifetime of earnings is startling. Over the course of a 40-year career, women, on average, earn more than \$450,000 less than men. And get this: Women with a college degree, or more, face an even wider gap of more than \$700,000 over a lifetime compared with men with the same higher education. So, again, the consequences are enormous, impacting not just women but their families as well, and not just impacting women during their working lives, but keep this in mind: When a woman is making that much less, then a woman is getting that much less in her retirement, in her Social Security, or maybe her 401(k), or a defined benefit, whatever it might be. So women get whacked twice during their working life and then when they retire because they have made substantially less than men.

Again, I congratulate Senator MIKULSKI for bringing this bill forward and for her indefatigable work on this issue. It is time to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. It is simple, common-sense legislation to make sure we have procedures and processes that are in place, to make sure the Equal Pay Act, passed in 1963, has some teeth, so employers can't just skirt around it anymore, and so there will be avenues for women to take to make sure they are not discriminated against in terms of pay.

For example, right now it can be a violation of company policy if a woman wants to talk to another person about what their salary is. Some companies say employees can't do that. This bill says, yes, employees can do that. Employees can talk to someone else. They don't have to tell—we don't force anybody to tell what their salary is—but an employee can make inquiries and can discuss it with other fellow employees, and an employer cannot retaliate against an employee for doing that. That is a huge step forward, by the way: a little bit of transparency, a little bit of knowledge that a woman can have to understand whether she is being discriminated against in her employment.

Of course, we have a good deal of anecdotal evidence and many examples of employers retaliating against women for discussing salary information. So this bill is long overdue and we need to pass it.

We can't just stop there on this paycheck fairness bill. We have to pass it and then we have to do a few other things. We have to tackle the more subtle discrimination that occurs when we systematically undervalue the work traditionally done by women. The fact is millions of female-dominated jobs—jobs that are equivalent in skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions to similar jobs dominated by men—pay significantly less than male equivalent-type jobs. For example, why is a housekeeper worth less than a janitor? Think about it: Eighty-four percent of the maids such as those who clean our rooms in hotels—are female; 75 percent of janitors are male. While the jobs are equivalent in terms of skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions, the median weekly earnings for a maid are \$399. For a janitor, it is \$484.

Truckdrivers—a job that is 96-percent male—have median weekly earnings of \$730. In contrast, a childcare worker—a job that is 93-percent female—has median weekly earnings of \$390. Why do we value someone who moves products more than we value someone who looks after the safety and well-being of our children? I am not saying that truckdrivers are overpaid; I am just saying that jobs we consider “women's work” are often underpaid, even though they are equivalent in skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. Quite frankly, some of the jobs women do, such as nursing or home health aides, require a lot more physical effort than being a truckdriver. Maybe in the old days truckdrivers had to be strong to muscle those trucks around. Now everybody has power steering and power brakes and everything else. A person doesn't have to be some big, heavy-weight giant to drive trucks anymore. But to be a nursing aide, if you are rolling people who weigh over 250 pounds and doing other things, that can take quite a bit of effort. So why are nursing and home health aides paid so much less than truckdrivers?

That is why in every Congress since 1996 I have introduced the Fair Pay Act, which would require employers to provide equal pay for equivalent jobs. My counterpart in the House is Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and together we have introduced it in every Congress since 1996. It requires employers to provide equal pay for jobs that are equivalent in skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions, but which are dominated by employees of a different gender, race, or national origin.

People may say maybe that is a stretch. Well, in 1983, the legislature of my State of Iowa, working with a Republican Governor, passed a bill stipulating that the State of Iowa could not discriminate in compensation between predominantly male and female jobs. They had to pay equivalent wages. So they hired Arthur Young & Company and they evaluated 800 job classifications in State government and, finally, in April of 1984, determined that 10,751 employees should be given a pay increase. Since 1984 in Iowa we have had that equivalency.

In Minnesota, our neighbor to the north and the neighbor of the Presiding Officer to the east, they went even a step further. Minnesota at that time passed a bill providing for equivalent pay not only in State jobs but clear down to the local level. That was in Minnesota. So it can be done. The women in this country are currently being paid less not because of their skills, not because of their education, working conditions, or responsibility, but simply because they are in what we call female-dominated jobs. This bill would make sure they receive their real worth. It will make a huge difference for them and their families who rely on their wages.

What my bill would do basically is require employers to publicly disclose their job categories and their pay scales. They wouldn't have to publish what every employee is making; they would have to say here are our job classifications and here are the pay scales in those job classifications. So it would give women information about what their male colleagues are earning or anyone who is in that pay scale, so they can negotiate a better deal for themselves in the workplace. Right now, women who believe they are a victim of pay discrimination must file a lawsuit and endure a drawn-out legal discovery process to find out whether they make less than the man working beside them, but with statistics readily available, this could be avoided. The number of lawsuits would go down if employees could see upfront whether they are being treated fairly.

Several years ago our committee had Lilly Ledbetter come and testify before our committee. We had provided her with a copy of the Fair Pay Act that I have been introducing since 1996, and she took a look at it and its description. I asked her, if the Fair Pay Act had been law when she was hired,

would it have obviated her wage discrimination case. She said with the information about pay scales the bill provides, she would have known from the beginning she was a victim of discrimination and could have tried to address the problem sooner before it caused a lifelong drop in her earnings and before she had to go all the way to the Supreme Court to make things right.

So, again, it is time to get done and put some teeth in it, but it is time to take the next step, because the biggest gap right now between what women make and what men make—among the various known reasons for the gap, like education, race, union status, and work experience—is occupation; that is, the number of women who are in what we have traditionally known as women's jobs—housekeepers, maids, child care workers, nurse assistants, and so on. It is time to take the step that my State and Minnesota—and there are other States; I just mentioned those two because I am familiar with them—have taken to address this problem of equivalency.

The next thing we need to do to make sure Equal Pay Day is not today but is December 31, like when men get paid for a full year, is to raise the minimum wage. Hopefully, we will be voting on that soon to raise the minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10.10 an hour.

Again, the majority of low-wage workers are women because of the trends I just mentioned. Jobs primarily held by women are undervalued and underpaid and most of the low-wage workers are women. So again we have to raise that, and we need to raise tipped wages.

Tipped wages right now are \$2.13 an hour. It has not been changed since 1991. Who are most of the tipped workers? Women, and many of them are providing income for their families, for their children. I said this the other day to a group and they were astounded. They thought I must be wrong about it, but I am not wrong. Do you know how someone gets classified as a tipped worker? A lot of people do not know this. How does someone get classified as a tipped worker? Under the law, if their employer says they make more than \$30 a month in tips, they can be classified as a tipped worker. Think about that, \$30 a month.

Let's say if someone works 5 days a week and they are working 20 days a month, that is \$1.50 a day. If they get \$1.50 a day in tips, they can be classified as a tipped worker and they can pay them \$2.13 an hour—unconscionable.

It has not been raised since 1991. Our minimum wage bill, which we hope to have on the floor shortly, would raise that tipped wage over 6 years from its present level to 70 percent of the minimum wage, and then it is indexed for the future.

So there are three things we need to do: pass the Paycheck Fairness Act championed by Senator MIKULSKI, address and pass the Fair Pay Act, and

raise the minimum wage. If we do those three things, Equal Pay Day will not be today, it will be December 31 for everybody.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I see the time has come to recess for the caucuses, but I just wish to say that today is another important day. Today is the 150th anniversary of the date that Abraham Lincoln signed the law authorizing the institution we now know as Gallaudet University in Washington, DC. That was 150 years ago today. What began on April 8, 1864, as a school with just eight students has flourished into the world's first and only institution of higher education dedicated to deaf and hard-of-hearing students, renowned internationally for its outstanding academic programs and also for its leading research into the history, language, and culture of deaf people.

I take pride in the fact that it was Senator James W. Grimes of Iowa, then-chair of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who initiated that legislation allowing the school to confer degrees. Dr. T. Alan Hurwitz, who is now the current distinguished president of Gallaudet, was born and raised in Sioux City, IA, not too far from the Presiding Officer's State of North Dakota. In fact, Dr. Hurwitz's father and my brother were classmates at the Iowa School for the Deaf. We are proud of the many Iowa students, including a recent intern in my office, Joseph Lewis, who are graduates of Gallaudet.

It is a wonderful school. If you have never been there, you ought to go and take a look at it. They do fantastic work at Gallaudet, attracting people from all around the globe to go there. In 1894 it was named after Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, and then in 1986 it was conferred university status by the Congress. Again, 150 years ago today, on April 8, 1864, Abraham Lincoln signed it into law.

In 1864, the school was known as the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb and Blind. It was inspired by the work of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, who had traveled to Paris to study the successful work of French educators who pioneered the use of a manual communication method of instructing the deaf—in other words, sign language. In 1894, the name of the institution was changed to Gallaudet College in honor of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. In 1986, by act of Congress, the college was granted university status.

My brother Frank was deaf from an early age. During his childhood, in the 1940s and 1950s, most Americans had very backward, ignorant attitudes toward deaf people. It pained me to witness the brazen discrimination and prejudice that he faced on a daily basis and I promised that if I ever got into a

position of power, I would change things to prevent that kind of discrimination in the future.

As it turned out, I did rise to a position of power. I was determined to make good on my promise to pass legislation to end discrimination against people with disabilities, and an unexpected event gave a huge impetus to my legislative ambition.

In 1988, Gallaudet University was hiring a new president. At that time, the school had never had a deaf president. There were three candidates: one was deaf and two were hearing. The Board of Visitors selected a hearing president.

To the students at Gallaudet, who believed passionately that the time had come for a deaf president, this was unacceptable. They rose up in a movement that came to be known as Deaf President Now. They organized protests. They boycotted classes. Some 2,000 Gallaudet students marched from their campus to the U.S. Capitol Building. They demanded a president at Gallaudet who could relate to them in a way that no hearing person could.

I had the privilege of speaking to them. I told them, "You are my heroes." They are still my heroes because they kept up their protests until they won. Gallaudet got its first deaf president, I. King Jordan.

But that is not all those students won. The protests by the students at Gallaudet struck a chord with other people with disabilities all across America. Those students were like a spark that ignited a brushfire.

They rose up and said: Enough. No more second-class citizenship. No more discrimination. And other people with disabilities took up the same rallying cry.

As the chief Senate sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, there is no question in my mind that the students' successful protests at Gallaudet were one of the key reasons why we were able to pass the ADA 2 years later.

Today, Gallaudet University is a diverse, bilingual university dedicated to the intellectual and professional advancement of deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals through American Sign Language and English. I have always been an admirer and supporter of Gallaudet. I respect it as a place that opens doors and creates opportunity. At Gallaudet, the focus is on ability, not disability, and, as with all schools, sometimes it is on extraordinary ability, such as Adham Talaat, the academic all-American defensive end who helped to lead the Gallaudet football team to a 9 and 1 record this past season or faculty member Dr. Laura-Ann Pettito and her Visual Language and Visual Learning Center, where she and her graduate students map the brain to better understand how we decode auditory and visual language or 2011 graduate James Caverly, who starred in the play "Tribes" about a hearing family with a deaf son.

Gallaudet aims not only to educate but also to empower, and this is an incredibly important gift to give to the men and women who attend Gallaudet. I join with my colleagues in the Senate in saluting this remarkable institution on its 150th anniversary.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 p.m. will be controlled by the majority.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise today to speak on paycheck fairness, the bill we will be voting on tomorrow in the Senate. During the next hour 11 Democratic women will be coming to the floor to speak. I am not going to introduce each one. We want to get right to the issue. Rather than talking flowery talk about each other, we want to talk about the need for paycheck fairness.

I ask unanimous consent that each Senator be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am the leadoff speaker. I want to be very clear on why we are on the Senate floor. We believe women need a fair shot to get equal pay for equal work. We want the same pay for the same job. We want it in our lawbooks, and we want it in our checkbooks. We want to finish the job we began with Lilly Ledbetter 5 years ago.

Five years ago, one of the first bills that we passed in the Obama administration was the Lilly Ledbetter bill. We reopened the courthouse doors to women who wanted to seek redress for the way they were treated unequally in the workplace. But we need to finish the job. That is what paycheck fairness does.

What does "finish the job" mean? Well, right now in the United States of America, there is a veil of secrecy—a veil of secrecy. Where is it? In the workplace. Right now, in companies and businesses, employees are forbidden to talk about the pay they receive with another employee. In many places, when an employee seeks redress, she is retaliated against. Last but not at all least, there are loopholes

that many employers use to justify women being paid less. They invent excuses, and they call them business necessity explanations. Well, we are on the floor today to say we want to end the soft bigotry of low wages for women. Equal pay for equal work. No secrecy. No retaliation. No loopholes. No way. Today is the day for equal pay.

We are on the floor today because it is Equal Pay Day. What does that mean? It means the women of the United States of America have to work in many instances 15 months to earn what a man doing the same job, with the same experience and the same seniority, earns in 1 year.

Now, we are not against the guys. There are many men who do jobs they hate so their daughters can have the jobs they love. After working to ensure that they have a good home and a good education, they see their daughters are paid less.

We all know there is a generalized wage suppression going on in the middle class—another topic and another debate. But right now we are on the job and we want to be paid for what we do. It is hard to believe that women are almost half of the workforce and yet during that time, as we make up 50 percent of the workforce, we still make only 77 cents for every dollar a man makes; African-American women earn 62 cents; Latino women 54 cents—almost half. This is a disgrace.

We need to change the law. That is what we seek to do by bringing up the Paycheck Fairness Act. Our President has tried to do his part. He supported the Lilly Ledbetter bill. Today we were at the White House, where he took an Executive order step to ban retaliation against employees who work for Federal contractors. So we are going to start being a model employer by banning retaliation not only within the Federal Government but with our Federal contractors. He also then called upon the contractors to submit data, information, so that we would know what are the gender differences that are going on on the very contracts we have.

When we signed the Equal Pay Act—it was in 1963 under Lyndon Johnson—women made only 59 cents. You know what. That was 50 years ago. In 50 years we have gained 18 cents. Well, that is not the way to go. The way to go is to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. What we want to do is make sure that, as I said, there is no retaliation, no excuses.

We hear this all the time: Oh, the guys do harder jobs; they are the breadwinners. But so are many women now who are heading households or who are single breadwinners.

The other important thing is that no longer will women be limited in pay to just backpay when they have been discriminated against.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. My time is up. I am so into this bill. I have been at this leg-

islation for a long time. But what I have now is hope. Help is on the way. Reinforcements are here.

Now I turn to Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and then Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL and Senator CANTWELL, in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her incredible leadership on this issue.

I come to the floor today in support of equal pay for equal work. I honestly cannot believe we are still arguing over equal pay in 2014. Congress first moved to solve this problem more than 50 years ago when the Equal Pay Act was signed into law.

In 1963 women were earning 59 cents on the dollar for every dollar earned by a man. Today women earn only 77 cents on the dollar compared to what a man earns.

Women are taking a hit in nearly every occupation. Bloomberg analyzed census data and found that median earnings for women were lower than those for men in 264 out of 265 major occupational categories. In 99.6 percent of all occupations, men get paid more than women—99.6 percent. That is not an accident; that is discrimination.

The effects of this discrimination are real and they are long lasting. Women, for example, borrow roughly the same amount of money as men to pay for college, but according to the American Association of University Women, these women make only 82 cents on the dollar compared with men 1 year after graduating. So women take out the same loans to go to college, but they face an even steeper road to repay those loans.

Unequal pay also means a tougher retirement. The average woman in Massachusetts who collects Social Security will receive about \$3,000 less each year than a similarly situated man because the benefits are tied to how much people earn while they are working.

This is a problem—a big problem—and women are fed up. Fifty years and a woman still cannot earn the same as a man for doing the same work. Women are ready to fix it, but it is not easy.

Today some women can be fired just for asking the guy across the hall how much money he makes. Earlier today the President issued Executive orders to stop Federal contractors from retaliating against women who ask about their pay and to instruct the Department of Labor to collect better data for the gender pay gap. Good for him, and good for women working for contractors. Now the Congress should extend these protections to all women.

The Senate will soon vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. This is a commonsense proposal: No discrimination and no retaliation when women ask how much the guys are getting paid. We will get basic data to tell us how much men and women are getting paid for key jobs.

So there it is. It is basic protection, basic information—a fair shot. That is essentially what this bill does.

Sure, sometimes men are paid more than women. Employers can pay different salaries based on factors such as skill, performance, expertise, seniority, and so forth. The Paycheck Fairness Act does not touch any of that. It simply provides the tools that women need to make sure salary differences have something to do with the actual job they are doing and not just the fact that they are women.

Several States have already adopted similar rules. Businesses in these States continue to thrive without any explosion of lawsuits. This bill is about good business, a level playing field for men and women, an equal chance to get the job done, a fair shot for all of us.

America's women are tired of hearing that pay inequality is not real. We are tired of hearing that somehow it is our fault. We are ready to fight back against pay discrimination.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and all of my colleagues who are speaking on the floor today for their leadership on this important proposal. I urge the Senate to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act to strengthen America's middle-class families and to level the playing field for hard-working women.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, every once in a while it is probably healthy for all of us to sit back for a moment and reflect on why we are here. What is the Senate supposed to be about? Why do we come to the Senate? Why did our Founding Fathers lay out a Constitution that had these branches of government?

In the branch of government in which we reside, we are called the legislative branch. So what is that about? I think what the Founding Fathers wanted us to do is to make our laws reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a simple step toward making our laws reflect two of the most important values we have in the United States of America.

I guarantee you that if you walked up to any of my colleagues who intend to vote against this and said, do you believe in equality and justice, they would say, of course we believe in equality and justice.

Then why would you not support this legislation, because it is just that simple. We are just trying to make the laws of this country reflect the American ideals of equality and justice.

Well, they say, there are laws on the books.

Well, here is the deal. You cannot get justice if you do not have the facts. If the facts are a secret, a protected secret, then justice is always going to be elusive and equality is going to be something to which we give lip service,

not something we will truly enjoy in this country.

So this is just a step to say to American business: Let's understand why two people doing the same job have two different levels of pay. Explain it to us.

What is so evil about that? What is so evil about expecting a business to be able to explain why a man and a woman with the same experience, the same credentials, and the same work output are paid differently. If there is a good reason, then there is no litigation, there is no rush to the courthouse. But if there is not a good reason, that is where that justice comes in. That is where a woman has an opportunity to go into the hallowed halls of our courts—the envy of the world, I might add—to have a fair shot at justice.

The notion that someone can be fired for trying to get the facts about their own compensation, the notion that retaliation would somehow be embraced by my colleagues who do not intend to vote for this legislation I do not understand. I know they are trying to explain to the American people that this has something to do with us having a love affair with America's trial lawyers. I have never heard more rubbish in my life. It is not the trial lawyers whom we care about. It is the women. It is the single moms.

It is the women who have this sinking feeling in the pit of their stomach that they are getting paid less, that they are helpless because they can't get at the information. When they do, they have the entire burden of proof of showing that somehow they weren't inferior to their male colleagues.

There is absolutely no possible reason that any of us would be trying to help lawyers with this. It is their clients, guys; it is the women of America. It is the women of America who want the laws to reflect our values, equality, and justice. This is a simple step. It is nothing to be afraid of.

Frankly, the only thing anyone who opposes this bill should be afraid of is the wrath of American women across this country who are sick and tired of being told it is none of their business what their colleague is getting paid and: By the way, I don't have to explain to you why you make less even though your work output has been superior to your male colleagues. It is time and it is about our values.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I join my colleagues and thank the Senator from Missouri for her statement as somebody who has been involved in basically making sure the law is implemented and upheld too. I appreciate her views.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership in advocating for equal pay for equal work. She has been a champion for many years and she is insistent now that we pass this legislation, and that is why we are here, because

we want our colleagues to understand how important it is to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and end the discrimination many women face in America. This is a critical issue, not only for women but for men because, obviously, the households of America deserve to have both people making equal pay.

The message from the American people is clear: They want Congress to focus on the most important economic issues of the day; that is, jobs. And certainly having a job that pays you equally for the work you do with your coworkers is critically important.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is exactly what we should be working on, ways to strengthen the pocketbooks of many Americans.

While we have made progress over the past five decades since we passed the Equal Pay Act, we still have a long way to go. In my State, the State of Washington, women are paid 78 cents for every \$1 that men earn for the same work. That amounts to an average wage gap of \$11,000 per year. The truth is that many women are the breadwinners in their family, and they should be paid as breadwinners. They should not face discrimination.

Today women make up 48 percent of the workforce in the State of Washington, and these families are very important to our economy. On average, mothers in Washington provide 41 percent of their household income, and nationally 40 percent of women are the sole primary breadwinners for their households. This is an important issue for our economy. Think of the boost they would get, the boost we would see if they were paid equally.

Right now one-third of those families headed by women in Washington live in poverty, so closing the wage gap means they would be able to afford 82 more weeks of food, according to the National Partnership for Women & Families. It would mean better economic freedom, it would mean the ability to buy more essentials, and it means their families would be better off.

But, more importantly, people need to realize that not only does this pay gap affect women's ability to support their family, the pay gap also reduces their ability to save for the future. From around the age of 35 through retirement, women are typically paid about 75 to 80 percent what men are paid, and over their lifetime a woman in Washington will earn \$500,000 less than her male counterpart. That is money that can be saved and invested for the future. So we must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act to end this disparity because this act will require employers to provide justification other than gender for paying men higher wages than women for the exact same job. It protects employees who share that information with others from being retaliated against, and it provides victims of pay discrimination

with the same remedies available to victims of other discrimination, including punitive and compensation damages.

This is important legislation. It is important legislation that will end the discrimination women are seeing in the workplace.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will also help eliminate the pay gap to help these families who are struggling in our economy. But just in case people get the wrong idea, I want to make sure people are clear. Even in fields such as engineering and computer science, women earn, on average, only 75 percent of what their male counterparts earn. A woman with a master's degree will only make 70 cents for every \$1 of her equally educated male counterparts.

It is time the Senate end the pay discrimination by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act. That is why I have been happy to sponsor this legislation and work with my colleagues. I want young women growing up today to know this is not an issue they are going to have to deal with in the future. They will get equal pay.

I thank my colleagues. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will help us in invoking cloture and providing the votes we need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I am proud to join this fight for paycheck fairness, an effort led by the dean of the women in the Senate, the first Democratic woman ever elected to the Senate in her own right, and the longest serving woman in Congress today—Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI.

This is the same fight many of our own mothers and grandmothers fought, equal pay for equal work. The promise made by the Equal Pay Act 50 years ago, literally half a century ago, continues to be broken every single day in this country.

When that happens, it doesn't just hold back women individually, it holds back entire families. It holds back the entire American economy.

Today women make up more than half of America's population and nearly half the workforce. Women are outearning men in college degrees and advanced degrees and a growing share of primary household earners. But to this day men are still outearning women for the exact same work. On average, women earn 77 cents for every \$1 a man earns and even less for women of color. African-American women earn 69 cents on the dollar and Latinas earn just 58 cents on the dollar.

In the years leading to the Equal Pay Act, only about 11 percent of families relied on women as the primary wage earner for kids under 18—just 11 percent. Today 40 percent of primary or sole wage earners are women: 40 percent of families with kids under 18 who rely on women to pay the bills, balance

the family finances, make the tough choices around the kitchen table, and provide for their kids.

But you would not know this by looking at America's workplace policies. They are stuck in the past. They are stuck in the "Mad Men" era. Congress and State capitols have simply failed to keep up with the pace of the new economy and the face of the modern American workplace.

This has to change. How can two-income families and sole female-bread-winning households get ahead when they are shortchanged every single month? If we want a growing economy and a thriving middle class, pay women fairly. It is that simple. When women earn equal pay, America's GDP could grow by up to 4 percent. It is common sense, and it is the right thing to do to strengthen our economy and to strengthen our families.

So today, on Equal Pay Day, let's get this done. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and give America's women the fair shot they deserve to earn their way ahead in today's economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I rise to speak about the importance of closing the pay gap for women. I am a cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act—an important bill—and I am so honored to be here with my colleagues and the leader of the women in the Senate, Senator MIKULSKI.

Today is Equal Pay Day, but it also marks the week where things are finally warming up in my State after a long deep-freeze. We look as though we are going to have 70 degrees. The snow will melt, the flowers will bloom, and the message we are all here to bring is it is time to stop freezing the women of America out of this economy. The women of America want to be treated fairly.

Now all the work we are doing—whether it is the minimum wage bill or the unemployment compensation—is stuck somewhere in a deep freezer over in the House of Representatives, somewhere between the frozen peas and the chocolate ice cream, and it is time to thaw out the freezer in Washington, DC, and help the women of America. That is what this bill is about, that is what the minimum wage bill is about. People deserve a fair shot at the American dream.

I thank again Senator MIKULSKI and I thank her for her leadership in the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. In 2009 we passed that bill to make sure that workers who face pay discrimination based on gender, race, age, religion, disability, or national origin have access to the courts. In doing so, we restored the original intent of the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Pay Act. Now it is time to prevent that pay discrimination from happening in the first place.

We all know women have made great strides in this economy. We have made

great strides in this body. We now have 20 women in the Senate but, of course, we are still only at 20 percent. The Fortune 500 now has 23 women CEOs, but I still think anyone who looks at this knows there are great strides that have been made but great progress ahead.

Despite all this progress, women in this country still only earn close to 80 cents for every \$1 made by men. This pay gap has real consequences for American families. Two-thirds of today's families rely on a mother's income either in part or in entirety, and in more than one-third of families the mother is the main breadwinner.

As Senate chair of the Joint Economic Committee, we released a report this week that shows lower wages impact women all through their working lives. I think that is something people don't always think about, the fact that if women consistently make less money, and then you retire, and you are actually going to live longer than men, you have a lot less money to retire with in the first place.

In fact, women who retire have about \$11,000 less per year than men. That is very significant when you look at the age range where women will be in retirement.

The other piece we don't always think about—unless you are in their position—is women in the sandwich generation, women who are taking care of aging parents at the same time they are taking care of children. That is happening every single day in this country as women are having to take leave from work or leave their job to take care of an aging parent while they are still struggling to afford to send their kids to college, to send their kids to daycare.

This legislation will build on the promises of the Equal Pay Act and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It will give women new tools and protections to guard against pay discrimination and will help reaffirm that basic principle that all women deserve equal pay for equal work.

I am hopeful we can get this done for the people of this country. It was the late Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota who said: "We all do better when we all do better." I still believe that is true, and so do my colleagues who join me today.

We need to focus on this bill. We need to unfreeze some old beliefs, and we need to bring a little Spring into the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, Senator MIKULSKI and I were just whispering to each other about how far we have come since the day Anita Hill came to the Hill and we couldn't do much to help her, but we organized and recognized that women had to be here in numbers sufficient to make a difference and clearly, today, we are.

My colleague Senator MIKULSKI is our dean of the women. All she is basi-

cally saying, with all of us as an echo chamber, is this: Women deserve a fair shot. It is long past time for us to stop shortchanging half of the country and their families.

I want to show us a chart that looks at what happens to a woman in a year when she gives up \$11,000 because she is not being paid, for the same job, the same amount a man is. What could that \$11,000 do?

She could buy a year of groceries, she could provide a year of rent, a year of daycare, she could buy a used car, and she could afford community college. That is 1 year. Look at what happens over the course of a lifetime when because a woman is not getting her fair share, the equal amount that she deserves, she is only getting 77 cents on the dollar. It is \$443,000. What could she do with that? Pay off her entire mortgage, send three kids to the University of California—a great school, I might say—and buy 8,000 tanks of gas.

What is the point of all of this? It is to show that the dollars women are not getting could be going into the community, could be making sure their families are taken care of, and would make all the difference in the world. Now, I was a little startled to see some of my Republican friends on the other side—Republican Members of the House—say this is demeaning to women. That is what I got out of a news report—that women don't need this. Would they have said that about children? Did children need protection against child labor? The answer is yes. Did workers need protection from a 14-hour day when they were being exploited? Yes. Did we need to make sure people in hazardous workplaces, such as chemical companies, have appropriate protective gear? Yes. Did we need to make sure there are fire exits in a crowded factory, after we saw a horrific fire called the Triangle fire? Yes. Now we need to make sure that women get equal pay for equal work.

This is just part of the continuum of bending that arc of history toward justice. That is what is happening here under the leadership of Senator MIKULSKI and all of us who stand on her shoulders. I have to say it is a great day. It is a great day to hear my colleagues come to the floor and speak as one. We are speaking not only for the women of America, who make up more than half, but for their families.

That is the point. Two-thirds of women are either the sole head of household or they share in providing for the economic well-being of their families. This is a matter of justice. It is a matter of fairness. It is a matter of a fair shot. I am proud to stand with my colleagues.

I hope and pray we will get the 60 votes necessary. There is a filibuster going on, as usual. We need a supermajority. But I would say to my colleagues on the other side that too many women have to be super women. So give them a supermajority. They are super women who are holding down

not one job but two jobs. So please help us. Let's celebrate tomorrow with a great vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to start by expressing my deep thanks and appreciation to Senator MIKULSKI for her tremendous leadership in the fight for equal pay and for bringing the Paycheck Fairness Act to the forefront of the debate this session.

The role of women in our families and in our economy has really shifted dramatically over the last few decades. Today 60 percent of families rely on earnings from both parents. That is up from 37 percent in 1975—60 percent. Women today make up nearly half the workforce, and more than ever women are likely to be the primary breadwinner in their families. Women are making a difference in our economy, in board rooms, lecture halls and small businesses.

But despite the important progress we have made since the Equal Pay Act passed now 50 years ago, including passing the Lilly Ledbetter Act in 2009—thanks again to Senator MIKULSKI—giving women more tools to fight against pay discrimination, women's wages have not caught up with the times. Across the country today women still earn 77 cents on the dollar, on average, to do the exact same work as men. It would take a typical woman until today to earn what a man would earn doing the same work in 2013.

That difference really adds up. In Seattle, in my home State, last year women earned 73 cents on the dollar—73 cents on the dollar—compared to their male counterparts. That translated to a yearly gap of \$16,346. Nationwide, over a typical woman's lifetime, pay discrimination amounts to \$464,320 in lost wages. That is not only unfair to women, it is bad for our families, and it is bad for our economy.

At a time when more and more families rely on women's wages to put food on the table or stay in their homes or build a nest egg for retirement or help pay for their children's education, it is absolutely critical we do more to eliminate pay discrimination and unfairness in the workplace. The Paycheck Fairness Act would tackle pay discrimination head on. It would ramp up enforcement of equal pay laws and strengthen assistance to businesses to improve equal pay practices. I hope we can all agree that 21st century workers should be compensated based on how they do their job, not whether they are male or female.

I hope to be able to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act as quickly as possible for working women and their families in this country, but we can't stop there. We need to build then on these critical reforms with other steps toward giving women a better and a fairer shot at getting ahead. One out of four women in the United States today would benefit from raising the min-

imum wage. That is 15 million American women who are making the equivalent of about 2 gallons of gas per hour. It is clearly time to raise the minimum wage and give working women in the country some much deserved relief.

There are other ways we can, and should be, updating our policies to help working women and their families make ends meet. For example, thanks to our outdated Tax Code, a woman who is thinking about reentering the workforce as the second earner in her family is likely going to face higher tax rates than her husband. That would come in addition to increased costs that she would then have with child care and transportation and the possibility of losing tax credits and other benefits as her household income rises. All of this means struggling families will experience higher tax rates than what many of the wealthiest Americans pay. This can discourage a potential second earner, such as a mom who is talking about reentering the workforce and returning to her professional career.

I recently introduced the 21st Century Worker Tax Cut Act, which would help solve this problem by giving struggling two-earner families with children a tax deduction on the second earner's income. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that change alone would cut taxes by an average of \$700 for 7.3 million families next year.

The 21st Century Worker Tax Cut Act would also expand the EITC for childless workers and lower the eligibility age so that people without dependents and young workers just starting out can benefit from the credit.

By the way, this has bipartisan support. It builds on work incentives from the EITC and is paid for by getting rid of wasteful corporate tax loopholes that both Ways and Means Chairman CAMP and Democrats agree ought to be closed.

Opinion leaders from across the political spectrum have said this bill would provide much-needed relief to workers and families. One conservative commentator wrote in the *National Review* that the 21st Century Worker Tax Cut Act is "a serious proposal that has the potential to better the lives of a large number of workers." A *New York Times* editorial columnist says it would be "a huge benefit to low-income childless families and two-earner families."

So I am hopeful that here in Congress we will see similar support on both sides of the aisle for a bill that would help women and working families keep more of what they earn.

We have come a long way in terms of the opportunities women have in our country today, but there is no question we have a lot more work to do. If we take these steps I have talked about, and that others here are talking about, we will do much to break down the very real barriers that still exist today. We will help working women and their families, we will strengthen our econ-

omy, and we will expand opportunity for the next generation of women who enter the workforce.

So I am here today to urge my colleagues to support the Paycheck Fairness Act and then build on that step by continuing to help level the playing field for American women and their families.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, this isn't only a women's fight, though we reserved this time. There are many good men in the Senate who will stand shoulder to shoulder with us, and I know the Senator from West Virginia would like to have 2 minutes before he presides. I yield him 2 minutes. Actually, I should yield him 77 percent of what we got, but he is for equal pay and so gets equal time as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. That would be 1 minute and 45 seconds, I say to the Chairwoman.

I thank the chairwoman for what she does and how well she has been leading this charge for all of us. As a proud husband of a brilliant and talented woman, my wife Gayle, and as the father of two daughters and the grandfather of six granddaughters, all of whom are gifted and make great contributions to our country, I believe it is past time women earn the same amount as men in the workplace. We need to correct this unfairness to make sure women are paid what they deserve.

As we join together today to celebrate Equal Pay Day in the year 2014, it just defies common sense that working women in West Virginia earn only 70—not 77 but 70—cents to every dollar a man makes. Too many families are working too hard to make ends meet, and especially in families where women are the breadwinners.

In West Virginia there are more than 81,000 family households headed by women. About 36 percent of those families, or nearly 29,200 family households, have incomes that fall below the poverty level. Eliminating the wage gap would provide much needed income to women whose wages put food on the table, pay the bills, and maintain a respectable quality of life for their children and families.

Growing up I was blessed to be raised by two strong, hardworking women—my grandmother, affectionately known as Mama Kay, and my mother. By example, both of these wonderful ladies taught me that women can work just as hard, if not harder, with more responsibilities, and they should get paid the same as a man. As a matter of fact, they probably should get overtime. There is no reason why they shouldn't have received the same pay for the same job as men, and that certainly resonates today.

Since I joined the Senate, I have been proud to have cosponsored the Paycheck Fairness Act. The very first vote

I took in the Senate was for paycheck fairness. Until Congress passes this truly commonsense bill, I will continue to fight for paycheck fairness because the bottom line is people should earn the same pay for the same work, period, no excuses.

As a former governor, most of my decisionmaking was made around good strong women who sat down and gave me the facts and nothing but the facts, and I appreciated that.

It shouldn't matter whether you are a man or a woman. You should be treated fairly no matter what, no matter where you are or what you do.

I thank our chairman, and I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Senator HEITKAMP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Thank you so much. I want to thank our great friend and great leader from the State of Maryland for continuing her hard work. I wonder if she ever wakes up in the morning and wonders when it is ever going to be done. When are we going to see justice? I am sure she has learned over the years that until you stand up every day and live a life where you are trying to make positive change in America, it doesn't get done. She is somebody who has never given up.

It is interesting that North Dakota, as West Virginia, is one of those States where women earn less than men, and below the national average less than men. When we look at the national average and 77 percent, that is a horrible statistic. But what is really horrible is if you live that statistic.

Not one person in this body lives that statistic. We are all treated equally. It doesn't matter what gender we are. If we are Members of Congress, we are treated equally. Imagine the outpouring of sympathy and support if we got 77 percent of a male's salary. We would think that was atrocious. We would think how could that possibly happen in America. But it happens every day in America.

It happens every day for working women who are supporting their families, women who go to work 40, 50 or 60 hours to support their families and to improve the economies of their State. And they keep spinning their wheels. They keep working at trying to change this and don't seem to get any further ahead. How many of us could take a 25-percent reduction in salary? That is really what we are asking every woman in America to do—not across the board but certainly on average—asking every woman in America to take a 25-percent reduction in her salary. That is not fair, and it should not be the facts of 2014. It should not be the way things are.

There has been a lot of discussion around the opportunities for women, and obviously we have grown. You cannot see 20 women in the Senate and not think that we are making some progress. But we have to think not only about women in professional occu-

pations but women who are school cooks and janitors, such as my mother. The women who are working every day at the diner to put food on their family's table and food on the tables of their patrons.

So when we are talking about this, I must also mention the need for an increase in the minimum wage, which is a topic for further discussion on the floor. I would like to remind my fellow Senators that the current minimum wage, which is overrepresented by women in terms of the number of people earning minimum wage, is less than 9 percent of a congressional salary. We have people in this body who think that the salary they receive is inadequate, but we expect people to work 40 hours a week for the minimum wage. Even if you had two minimum wage jobs—think about it—working 40 hours a week on two of those minimum wage jobs, you still would make less than \$32,000 a year working 80 hours a week. That is the story of many women in this country.

When we were growing up and women were in the workforce, it used to be they were working for that extra income. There was this excuse given over and over: She is just supplementing the income, and the man is the breadwinner. She is earning a little extra so she can buy a refrigerator or whatever it is.

That is not the reality of today. The reality of today is that more women are the primary or the sole breadwinners for their family. We have to correct this problem.

I have listened to the debate on the other side saying there are other ideas on how to do this. This won't promote or give a way forward for change. These are the same people who think if you just maintain the status quo, somehow things will magically change in the Senate. After 20 or 30 or 40 years of this struggle, what would suggest to us that we are going to get parity if we don't take some pretty proactive action here in the Senate and in the Congress to say that what a woman does is valuable and it is at least as valuable as what a man does in the exact same job. That is who we are in this country. We are gender neutral, and that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to maintain gender neutrality, maintain a good economy because we know if we put more money into women's family budgets, that money is going to go out and grow our economy even more.

The bottom line is this. Let's have a little sympathy in this body for people who earn less than 20 percent of what a Senator earns. Let's give them a show of support, a thank you from a grateful country for the hard work they put in every day. Let's tell them that the words in the Constitution and the promise of equality are still not realized, but we can work together to make that a reality in their lives.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to start by thanking Senator MIKULSKI for organizing us today and much more importantly for her leadership over the years on this issue. We are so proud to have her as our dean.

I come to the floor today on Equal Pay Day to stand and speak about an issue that impacts women and families in every State across this country. Today I rise to give voice to the belief that we need to be working together across party aisles to build an America where hard work is rewarded and where there is a fair shot for everyone to realize their pursuits and dreams.

In America today the growing gap between rich and everyone else is at its largest point in 100 years. The absence of upward mobility for hard-working families demands action because if we cannot close this gap we might someday talk about the middle class as something we used to have, not something that each generation can aspire to.

As I have traveled through my home State of Wisconsin, they have told me that the powerful and well connected seem to get to write their own rules while the concerns and struggles of middle-class families often go unnoticed here in Washington. They feel as if our economic system is tilted towards those at the top and that our political system exists to protect unfair advantages, instead of making sure that everybody gets a fair shot.

I rise to give voice to the fact that there is paycheck inequality for hard-working American women across this country and that it is time we do something about it. Working women make up over 50 percent of our workforce, and they are working harder than ever to get ahead. And they deserve to get ahead. Many are working full time, and many are working two jobs to make ends meet. Yet far too many are barely getting by, and far too many women and children are living in poverty. The least we can do is level the playing field and give women a fair shot at getting ahead because they deserve equal pay for equal work. It is simply unfair that women are paid on average 77 cents for every dollar paid to a man. This reality is holding women back, and it is holding our entire economy back.

I am proud to join my colleagues today to deliver a call for action to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and give women equal pay for equal work. This legislation will help close the paycheck gap for women, it will help create upward mobility for women, and it will help strengthen the economic security of millions of families across our country.

Let me take the time to tell you just one story of one woman. Shannon is a single mother of three from Two Rivers, WI. Shannon is working hard to

support her family, but the pay gap is holding her back. Shannon has continued her education to advance her career as an interpreter in a school, but she faces the grim reality that women teachers are often paid less than their male counterparts.

In fact—and this is so hard to believe—statistics collected by our Department of Labor make it clear that women earn less than men in almost all occupations commonly held by women. Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act will help close the pay gap and provide Shannon and so many others with financial freedom for their families.

It would help Shannon manage issues that working moms face every single day—unexpected car problems, children outgrowing their pants and shoes, the anxiety of not being able to save a little bit from their paycheck to someday send their children to college. To put this in the simplest terms possible, it would give Shannon a fair shot at passing on a stronger future for her children.

Today women working full time in Wisconsin go home with \$10,324 less a year than their male counterparts. In Wisconsin, 31 percent of households headed by working women have incomes that fall below the poverty level. This is simply wrong, and it is our job to work together to change that. Millions of American women get up everyday to work hard for that middle-class dream: a good job that pays the bills, health care coverage you can rely on, a home you can call your own, a chance to save for your kids' college education, and a secure retirement. But instead, gender discrimination is holding women and their families back. Eliminating the pay gap will make families more secure.

Nearly 60 percent of women would earn more if women were paid the same as men of the same experience with similar education and hours of work. The poverty rate for women would be cut in half. It is wrong for us to ignore the gap between the economic security that American women work so hard to achieve and the economic uncertainty that they are asked to settle for. With a record number of women in the workforce today, the right thing to do is to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and empower women with a fair shot at equal pay.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act because it would strengthen families and our economy by providing working women with the tools they need to close the gender pay gap. It will show the American people our commitment to working together to provide a fair shot for everyone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act. I would like to first commend the senior Senator from Maryland for her fearless

and tireless leadership on this issue. She has been a protean force when it comes to this issue and many others. I deeply admire and respect her.

This week I held my annual roundtable with the Women's Fund in Providence. We talked about equal rights, equal pay, and economic opportunity and justice with women who are creating jobs and fighting inequality every day.

Today, as my colleagues have pointed out, we mark Equal Pay Day. Women would have to work until April 8 of this year just to earn what men did as of December 31 of last year. Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act will move us one step closer to being able to commemorate Equal Pay Day on December 31 each year for both men and women, and that is what we should be striving for.

This year we are marking the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act and the war on poverty. We have come a long way, but our efforts to form a more perfect, more equal union must continue forward. When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963, women were earning an average of 59 cents on the dollar compared to men.

No matter how you slice it, median annual earnings, weekly earnings, by level of education or occupation, there is still a gender gap in pay today.

The Women's Fund of Rhode Island issued a report showing that gender discrimination in pay is even more striking for minority women. In Rhode Island African-American women make 61 cents for every dollar that a white male makes. For Latinas the figure is 51 cents. This gender discrimination pay gap affects women at all educational levels.

According to the Council of Economic Advisers, women are more likely to complete college—that is right. Today women are completing college more than men. In 2012, 25- to 34-year-old women were 21 percent more likely than men to be college graduates, but this is not closing the earnings gap. To all those who say it is all about education, and these people have more education, that is wrong. It is not.

Women who earn advanced degrees start off on a relatively even footing—people with a Master's or a Ph.D. But again, over the course of their careers the wage gap widens in favor of men. The National Partnership for Women and Families reports that women with Master's degrees are paid 70 cents for every dollar paid to men with Master's degrees, and women with Master's degrees earn less than men with Bachelor's degrees.

Equal pay for equal work is not only an issue of equity. It has real economic consequences. Families rely on women's income. Data analyzed by the National Partnership for Women and Families show that women are the primary or sole breadwinners in 40 percent of families. If we eliminate gender discrimination in pay in Rhode Island,

a working woman would have enough extra money to buy 74 more weeks of food for her family, to make 6 more months of mortgage and utilities payments, or to pay 11 more months of rent. That just doesn't help the woman; it helps the family.

One of the best tools in fighting poverty is to close the pay gap. The Paycheck Fairness Act will help fulfill the promise of the Equal Pay Act by improving the remedies available to women facing gender discrimination. These are commonsense and fair improvements for our mothers, our daughters, our sisters, our fathers, our sons, and our brothers.

We must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. We believe everyone deserves a fair shot, and that includes equal pay for equal work. I urge my colleagues to come together to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, and with that I will yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, almost 51 years after the enactment of the Equal Pay Act, women now make up almost half of the workforce; however, gender-based wage discrimination is still pervasive. Statistics show that there is a significant difference in the pay of men and women performing the same or substantially similar jobs, regardless of the education level or type of occupation. Looking at the average pay for women, women get paid about 77 cents for every dollar earned by similar male workers.

The experience of women in the workforce is better in California but not by much. According to the most recent census estimates, in California, the average pay for a woman working full time, year round is \$41,956 per year, while the average for a man is \$50,139. This means that, on average, women in California are paid less than 84 cents for every dollar paid to men. Put another way, this amounts to a yearly gap of \$8,183 between full-time working men and women in the State. Over the course of a career, on average, women stand to lose \$434,000 in income and thus enjoy fewer Social Security, pension, and retirement benefits.

Latina women face greater disparities in the workplace as they are paid approximately 54 cents for every dollar paid to men. Women of color fare similarly.

As a group, full-time working women in California alone lose over \$37.5 billion each year due to the wage gap.

According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, if the gender-based "pay gap" were eliminated, a working woman in California would have enough money for approximately 59 more weeks of food, 4 more months of mortgage and utilities payments, 7 more months of rent, or 2,103 additional gallons of gas.

A Redondo Beach resident wrote to me, "I know that at my current age, I have been paid hundreds of thousands of dollars less than my colleagues, though I am also paying my rent . . .

supporting my kids, and trying to figure out how I can possibly pay for colleges for them. If I had been earning a fair wage, I could afford college, and healthcare, and would have some retirement savings, all things that I cannot currently do.”

She is absolutely right—it is estimated that it takes a woman 4½ more months of work to earn the same as her male counterpart earns in just 1 year. Yet she still must pay for the same monthly expenses as her male colleagues. In Redondo Beach, her monthly expenses can be crippling.

A single adult with two children living in Redondo Beach spends monthly around \$536 in food, \$767 in child care, \$451 in medical care, \$1,420 in housing, and \$639 in transportation, not to mention taxes. Considering that over 1.7 million households in California are headed by women, over 500,000 of whom fall below the poverty level as it is, denying California women equal pay for equal work adds to their burden and affects their families.

This is not just a problem for low-income women and families. The pay gap exists across the spectrum of education levels and occupations. According to the 2012 S&P 500 CEO Pay Study, although companies run by female chief executive officers performed better on average than those run by men—looking at the total shareholder return for their companies—those female CEOs were paid an average of about \$500,000 less per year than their male CEO counterparts. And the pay gap is wider for women with higher education, making it more difficult for them to pay off their school loans.

Congress tried to address the problem by passing the Equal Pay Act in 1963, which amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, making it illegal for employers to pay unequal wages to men and women who perform substantially the same work. However, as is reflected in wage data statistics and in the stories shared by women across the country, while the Equal Pay Act was a step in the right direction, more needs to be done to clarify the law.

Congress recently had to correct the courts on how to interpret pay discrimination laws in line with their original intent by passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. Through Lilly Ledbetter, Congress amended title VII of the Civil Rights Act to clarify the timeframes in which employees could bring a claim against employers who engage in pay discrimination.

But according to recent studies, Congress needs to strengthen the law further in order to effectively close the pay gap between men and women across the spectrum. The disparity in pay between men and women is the same as it was in 2002. If we keep going at this rate, without congressional action, women will not reach pay equity until 2058.

The Paycheck Fairness Act therefore provides Congress with an opportunity

to eliminate this unfair pay gap. It will reasonably update the Equal Pay Act by eliminating loopholes used for far too long in courtrooms; strengthening incentives to employers to prevent pay discrimination through remedies available under current law to victims of race-based and national origin discrimination; improving wage data collection so that we can better evaluate the pay gap; and by strengthening education, training, outreach, and enforcement efforts to close the pay gap.

This bill also importantly provides that employers are prohibited from retaliating against employees who share salary information with their coworkers. Nearly half of all workers in the United States are strongly discouraged or even have workplace policies against the sharing of salary information. This secrecy makes it extremely difficult for employees to detect pay discrimination and contributes to the pay gap. For example, Lilly Ledbetter was paid less than her male coworkers for almost 20 years but did not realize it because a company policy prohibited her from discussing her pay with her coworkers. She discovered the pay discrimination only when someone sent her an anonymous note.

Under the Paycheck Fairness Act, employees would therefore generally be protected from retaliation when they discuss or inquire about their wages or the wages of another employee. They would also be protected from retaliation if they make a charge, file a complaint, or participate in a government or employer-initiated investigation. These antiretaliation provisions would generally not protect employees such as payroll or HR personnel who have access to wage information as an essential function of their job. Rather, the antiretaliation provisions would enable employees to learn about their employers' wage practices without being afraid of losing their jobs. With such information, employees will be better suited to close the gender pay gap for themselves and others.

I recognize the concerns of business owners who maintain that amending the Equal Pay Act will open them up to liability and risk harming their business. I have heard concerns that employers fear that this bill will infringe on their private business practices should it become law.

After considering and reconsidering the effects of this legislation with the concerns of business owners in mind and after consulting with experts in employment and labor law, I came to the conclusion that this bill is necessary to level the playing field and does not have to necessarily affect business practices so long as those business practices do not discriminate against women.

As under the current law, employers would not be helpless or defenseless—they can proactively conduct an internal pay-equity analysis to ensure equal pay for equal work before government intervention. In fact, the bill provides

for a 6-month waiting period from the time of enactment, and the Department of Labor would assist small businesses with compliance.

Should a claim arise, employers have affirmative defenses that they can raise to justify pay differences, such as if the wages are set based on a seniority system; a merit system; a system that measures earnings by quantity or quality of product; or a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience, which is job-related and serves a legitimate business interest.

I am not in the habit of supporting bills that advance women just because I am a woman. I am supporting this bill because I believe in advancing equal rights and uplifting millions of families who rely on a woman's paycheck in order to eat.

I am not alone in hearing stories about paycheck disparities in California. My colleagues have heard similar stories from women in their States. We also know that women are critical to driving this economy, and by ensuring equal pay for equal work, the entire economy benefits.

With the knowledge of pervasive inequality still today in pay among men and women and considering that the majority of Americans support the government taking steps to enable women to get equal pay for equal work, it is our duty to vote in favor of cloture and for swift passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator for those comments.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 556 and 502; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; further, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for weeks Republicans have been trying to get Democrats to focus on the one issue Americans say they care the most about, and that is jobs and the economy. Everyone agrees we are in the midst of a jobs crisis in our country. Republicans are saying: Here are some concrete things we can actually

do about it. But Democrats have completely shut us out. If government isn't part of the solution or if it doesn't drive a wedge between one group of people and another, they are just not interested.

Here is one idea that I proposed and Democrats have brushed aside: How about helping workers better balance the demands of work and family by allowing them time off as a form of overtime compensation? This is an idea that is tailored to the needs of the modern workforce. It is something a lot of working women say they want, and it is something government employees have already enjoyed for years. What we are saying is to give today's working women in the private sector the same kind of flexibility working women have in the government.

Everybody is familiar with the idea of getting paid time-and-a-half for overtime work. What this bill would do is give people the choice of getting a proportionate bump in time off for overtime work. So if you work an extra hour, you can get an hour-and-a-half off work. This should be a no-brainer. This is a concrete proposal to help men and women adapt to the needs of the modern workplace and for the workforce to adapt to the modern workforce. This is not just a way to help workers, it is a way to especially help working women. Flexibility is a major part of achieving work-life balance, especially for working moms. That is what this amendment is all about.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2199, that all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill and that it be in order for me to offer amendment No. 2962, and then for the majority leader or his designee to offer an amendment, and then it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request I would like to put forward as well. I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2199, that all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill, and that it be in order for me to offer amendment No. 2964, and then for the majority leader or his designee to offer an amendment, and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion with the following amendments on the Republican side in order: McConnell amendment No. 2962, Fischer amendment No. 2963, Alexander amendment No. 2965, and Lee amendment No. 2966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would my friend give the subject matter of those three amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from South Dakota state the subject matter of those amendments?

Mr. THUNE. The McConnell amendment has to deal with flexibility in the workplace and comp time, the Fischer amendment has to do with anti-discrimination in the workplace, and I believe the Lee amendment also deals with comp time flexibility in the workplace.

The Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, is here, and I think he can speak to his amendment. Most of them deal with the pending business, S. 2199, which is the Pay Equity Act that the majority leader expects to get a cloture vote on later. We simply ask to have an opportunity to offer amendments that pertain to that bill, on issues we think are important in addressing the issue that is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, is the Alexander amendment, which the Senator from South Dakota suggested, the 350-page amendment that was offered last week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if I may respond to the majority leader, the answer is no. The Alexander amendment, I say to my friend from Nevada, is a pretty simple amendment. It talks about giving working parents more flexibility so they can go to soccer games and piano recitals; in other words, to be better parents.

A few years ago Captain Kangaroo, Robert Keeshan, and I—along with some other people—started a company. After our company merged with another company, it became the largest worksite daycare company in America. What we found out was that the greatest value working parents with young children wanted was flexibility. Our fear is that this proposal, which is called paycheck fairness, would actually limit the flexibility of employers can give to working parents so they can go to their children's activities.

My amendment is a very simple amendment. It is only a paragraph or two, and it simply restates the law and makes it clear that if you run a dry cleaner with three people in it, you don't have to hire a lawyer to define a job for an employee with a child in such a way that that employee can go to the piano recital or soccer game. Instead of being about more litigation, it is about giving more flexibility for working parents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Before my friend from South Dakota leaves the floor, 2964 is the big one?

Mr. THUNE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I am happy to see a number of Republican colleagues come to the floor. We have been talking about this issue for days now and to discuss, I thought, the subject of equal pay for women. But there has been no talk about equal pay for women. The closest of anything in that regard that has been suggested has been a bill that says if you have to work overtime, then you have a choice of going home or doing the overtime.

The reason we don't have laws like that is because the employer can take advantage of the employee because the employee is at the beck and call of the employer, and I think most labor laws would protect against that now.

I am surprised we have literally heard no one come to the floor except on the one occasion—and I could have missed it—where the Republican Senator made the statement that Senator MIKULSKI's legislation was a trial lawyer's dream. The women who have come to the floor to talk about this—and the men who have come to talk about this today, including the Presiding Officer, and I heard his statement—are simply trying to say we need to be sure this is a fair shot for the middle class, and in this instance it is women. But the Republicans always want to change the subject. Why don't we have a debate on whether women are entitled to have the same pay as men?

The Senate is debating the motion to proceed to the equal pay bill, so the question before the Senate is whether we should even begin debate on this matter. If Senators wish to offer amendments, they would have to begin the debate.

I am always happy to talk about amendments, but the amendment of my friend from South Dakota is nothing that is reasonable. What that amendment does is offer lots of amendments. I think if we look closely at this 350-page amendment, we might even find the kitchen sink in it. It has everything else in it. It is really a perfect example of trying to divert attention from the subject at hand. This is not a serious effort to legislate equal pay for equal work.

My colleague's unanimous consent request would also allow for a potentially unlimited number of amendments. We have been there before, and we know that does not work. Providing an unlimited number of amendments is just another way of saying they want to filibuster the bill, which they have done so artfully over the last 5 years.

My door remains open to further discussions, but I object to the requests that have been made, including the one that I anticipate from my friend from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Is there anything pending? I want to make sure there are no pending requests for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I think what we just heard was a number of our Members have amendments they are going to talk about and offer when we get on the bill—and I assume we will at some point—so we can debate and vote on them. We are talking about an issue that is important to people across this country, and we have amendments that we think would improve, strengthen, make better the bill that is going to be on the floor that has been described as the Pay Equity Act by the Democrats.

We actually think there is a better way to do this. We think there is a way that actually would improve the wages, provide better job opportunities, and better opportunities for advancement for women.

This morning the majority leader quoted Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, “America is another name for opportunity.” I could not agree more with that statement. The American dream is to work hard and achieve upward mobility. Americans want good jobs, and they want to earn a fair wage. But the current Obama economy is doing everything it can to hurt the American dream.

The economy is stagnant. There are 10 million Americans who are unemployed—nearly 4 million for 6 months or longer. Household income has fallen. Right now there are 3.7 million more women living in poverty than there were when the President took office. I will repeat that. There are 3.7 million more women living in poverty today than there were when the President took office. The median income for women has dropped by \$733 since President Obama took office. That is why this body should be focused on enacting policies that lift the government-imposed burdens that impede job opportunities and economic growth.

I have offered an amendment—and I just asked unanimous consent to be able to have it debated and voted on when we get on this bill—that actually is focused on enacting policies that lift the government-imposed burdens that impede job opportunities and economic growth. It is called the Good Jobs, Good Wages, and Good Hours Act. It would help return America to a place where there are good job opportunities.

My amendment would help create good-paying jobs by reining in burdensome regulatory requirements, shielding workers from the damaging effects of ObamaCare, approving the Keystone XL Pipeline, and providing permanent tax relief to employers that are looking to expand and hire.

Republicans could not agree more that women should have equal opportunities and pay in the workplace. Unfortunately, the legislation our friends on the other side are pushing will not accomplish that goal. Their legislation would increase Federal regulations that would cut flexibility in the workplace for working moms and end merit pay that rewards quality work.

The Democrats seem to be trying to change the subject of how their ideas

are actually hurting women in the workforce. Of those affected by the Democrats’ ObamaCare 30-hour workweek that is reducing wages, 63 percent are women. So that policy of going to a 30-hour workweek that was defined as such in ObamaCare, 63 percent of the impact of that is being felt by women. Of the roughly 500,000 jobs that CBO projects will be lost by the end of 2016 thanks to the Democrats’ 40-percent minimum wage hike, 235,000 of those—or 57 percent—would be jobs that are held by women. Disproportionately, these policies are going to hurt women.

The poverty rate for women has increased to 16.3 percent from 14.4 percent as of when the President took office. So the poverty rate is higher. We have women who are living in worse economic conditions than when the President took office. If the Democrats were truly serious about fixing that problem—if they are truly serious about helping women—they would work with us on bills to create jobs and to expand workplace opportunities for women and for men as well. That is exactly what my amendment does. It addresses the problems created by ObamaCare, it includes a provision pushed by Senator COLLINS that would restore the 40-hour workweek I mentioned earlier, and it will finally repeal the job-destroying medical device tax for which Senators TOOMEY, HATCH, and COATS have been tirelessly fighting.

My amendment ensures that veterans and the long-term unemployed are not punished by the costs of the ObamaCare employer mandate in that legislation. Senator BLUNT has raised that issue in the Senate on behalf of veterans, and in the House a similar bill passed by a margin of 406 to 1.

My amendment also provides permanent, targeted tax relief to millions of small businesses. Small businesses create 65 percent of all new jobs. Yet this administration has done little more than punish them with more regulations and higher taxes.

The amendment also halts harmful EPA regulations until the EPA conducts additional analysis of the impact those existing rules would have on jobs.

It is time this body recognizes that the policies the other side is advancing are not achieving the outcomes they claim will occur. We need to renew our commitment to helping all Americans, including women, find job opportunities that allow them to achieve the American dream. We need to return this country to a place where America truly is another name for opportunity.

Earlier today the President and CEO of the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, Karen Kerrigan, wrote an article that says this proposal I am speaking about “offers a set of really good policy proposals to help women entrepreneurs and women in the workforce.”

That is why I sought unanimous consent to have this amendment debated

and voted on, along with many of my colleagues, including the Senator from Nebraska Mrs. FISCHER and the Senator from New Hampshire Ms. AYOTTE, who are here to speak about amendments they want to put forward as a part of this debate. I asked unanimous consent earlier for those amendments to be considered as well and once again that has been blocked by the majority leader. That is the wrong way to deal with an issue of this consequence.

If we want to help people—if we want to create jobs and grow the economy, which ultimately helps lift all the boats, improves the standard of living for middle-class families, women and men—the best way to do that is to get a growing, vibrant economy instead of a stagnant economy, which is what we have today, with too many who have been unemployed for a long period of time.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will come to the conclusion that if we are going to debate this issue, we need to debate it in a comprehensive way that takes into consideration all of the ideas out there, including those that will be offered by my colleagues this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I strongly affirm the principle of equal pay for equal work. Both the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which were passed on a bipartisan basis, have helped increase career opportunities for women and ensure they receive equal pay for equal work. That is a principle we strongly support.

Women have made progress. They now hold more than half of all managerial and professional jobs—more than double the number of women in 1980—and women comprise a majority in the five fastest growing job fields. According to the Department of Education, women receive 57 percent of all college degrees, 33 percent more than in 1970.

We believe—the reports prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor recognize—that commonly used wage gap statistics don’t tell the full story. Factors including differences in occupation, education, fields of study, type of work, hours worked, and other personal choices shape career paths and they shape earning potential. Moreover, salaries alone don’t account for total compensation. Still, some women continue to struggle with gender-based pay discrimination, directly impacting a woman’s livelihood, financial future, and her job security. With 60 percent of women working as the primary breadwinners, lost wages detrimentally impact families as well as single women.

We fully agree that gender-based pay discrimination in the modern workplace is unacceptable. We just have different ideas from some of our colleagues about the best way to combat this. Prevailing concern among women with wage discrimination indicates

that there is more work to do. That is why I have worked with Senator COLLINS, Senator AYOTTE, and Senator MURKOWSKI to file an amendment to modernize key portions of that 51-year-old Equal Pay Act.

Our proposal prevents retaliation against employees who inquire about, discuss or disclose their salaries. It reinforces current law which prohibits pay discrimination based on gender, and it requires employers to notify the employees of their rights, but we don't stop there because I believe we need a solution that addresses both discrimination and the opportunity gap or the need to provide both men and women with good-paying jobs.

Our amendment consolidates duplicative job training programs and it provides Federal grants to States for the creation of industry-led partnerships. This program is meant to provide to women and men who are underrepresented in industries that report worker shortages with the skills they need to compete. Such industries include manufacturing, energy, transportation, information technology, and health care. Importantly, no new spending is appropriated.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are blocking consideration of what I believe is this very commonsense amendment and a number of other Republican amendments that would also help with job creation.

This is nothing more than election year politics. I find it very disappointing. As women and as lawmakers, we believe our proposal to directly address discrimination in the workplace is reasonable, it is fact-based, and it is a great approach. More government and more lawyers will not lead to more pay for women.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to praise my colleague from Nebraska for her leadership on the important amendment she has just described, the Workplace Advancement Act, which will address legitimate issues to ensure that laws we have had in place for half a century, including the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act, are enforced and that women are informed of their rights in the workplace to ensure what we all believe in, which is that women should be paid the same for the same job. Frankly, as a woman, I would like the opportunity to outperform and to be paid more.

One of the concerns I have is about what I view the majority leader meant when he came to the floor and said that this was an important issue to them. If this is such an important issue, why didn't they have a markup in the HELP Committee where everyone could offer their amendments to deal with this legitimate issue that I believe my male and female colleagues feel is important? Why is it that when we have brought legitimate amendments to the floor, including my col-

league's amendment, the Workplace Advancement Act, as well as a provision that would allow greater flexibility for employees with comp time—the same that is enjoyed by those in the public sector—and my colleague from South Dakota who has a strong amendment to help create a better climate for job creation and more opportunity in this country—if this is such a serious issue, which I agree this is an important and serious issue, then why is it these amendments are being blocked? Why is it we are not having a legitimate debate? Unfortunately, what I fear is that an important and legitimate issue is being turned into a political ploy of election-year politics.

I share the sentiments of my colleague from Nebraska. I am very disappointed by this. In fact, one of the concerns I have about the bill pending on the floor—the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act—is that it will actually have the impact of reducing flexibility for working families. It could have the impact of reducing the ability of employers to award merit pay.

I had the privilege of serving as the first woman attorney general in my State. Before I went to the attorney general's office, I worked at a private law firm. I have had the opportunity, in the position in which I serve, to meet incredible women leaders in the health sector and in the business sector. There are many instances, frankly, where women, based on merit, have outperformed their male colleagues. So what we don't want to do is create and pass a law that actually reduces the opportunity for employers in the workplace to reward merit because women want the opportunity to earn more than men when they do a better job, just as my male counterparts want. That is one of my concerns about the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act.

That is why I very much appreciate what I think is a better approach by my colleague, which reinforces the enforcement of laws that have been in place, that rightly prohibits discrimination based on sex in the workplace, including discrimination based on people being paid differently even though they are performing the same job, where there are no merit differences. That is wrong. It is unacceptable. The ideas of my colleague from Nebraska are very good and I would hope the majority leader would allow a vote.

I would also like to discuss the amendment that was offered by Senator MCCONNELL, of which I am a co-sponsor, that would provide working families with more flexibility in the workforce. In fact, what it would do is allow the same options currently available to those in the public sector to working families in the private sector. It would allow workers—if they want to; and it is their choice—to receive comp time instead of overtime pay so they can have more time off if they want and they choose. This is all voluntary. So if they want more time off to go to that soccer game, if they want

more time off to have time to care for their children or more time to care for an elderly parent, then private sector employers will have the same ability to enter into those agreements voluntarily with their employees, to give their employees more flexibility in the workplace.

What we know is that today nearly 60 percent of working households have two working parents. I happen to live in one of those households, and we struggle in our household to get to all the events we want to get to for our children. I have a 9-year-old and a 6-year-old, and this is a huge challenge that so many parents face.

So the Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act, which is an amendment Senator MCCONNELL offered earlier, that I am a proud cosponsor of, would provide this needed flexibility for employees, workers, and let them decide with their employer whether they would like to receive more comp time. Right now public sector employees have the right to do this. They have this flexibility. It seems we should provide the same legal framework allowing private sector employees this type of flexibility, with more and more families trying to balance both parents working and challenging circumstances in the workplace.

In fact, some companies, such as Dell, Bank of America, and GE already provide flexible workplace arrangements to their salaried employees who are exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. What this would do is allow these types of agreements to other employees, to have access to the same kinds of benefits, if they choose. It is their choice. This is giving families more flexibility, more opportunity to deal with the challenges so many of us are dealing with in terms of balancing work and family and wanting to be good parents, wanting to be good at our jobs.

It seems to me this is a commonsense amendment, and I am disappointed the majority leader would also block this amendment, as well as the excellent amendment offered by my colleague from Nebraska, and, obviously, the amendment that was offered—a very good amendment—by my colleague from South Dakota to deal with this underlying issue of creating a better climate of opportunity for women and men throughout this country.

I believe this is a serious issue. But if it is a real serious issue—which I think we all share a feeling of on both sides of the aisle—then why is this being treated more like a political ploy instead of having a legitimate debate on the floor? Why didn't this go through the regular committee process, where people can offer their amendments and have a markup that can improve and make sure we are addressing the underlying issue?

To me, it is disappointing that the Senate continues to operate in this way because this is not the first time I

have come to the floor or my colleagues have come to the floor with a legitimate amendment that is relevant to the bill that is pending on the floor, yet have been blocked by the majority leader on an important issue.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has an amendment he is going to speak to in a moment. I just want to say one thing. I appreciate the observation made by the Senator from New Hampshire Ms. AYOTTE with regard to this going through a regular order process. If this were a serious discussion, there would have been an opportunity to have a debate at the appropriate committee, the HELP Committee.

You just heard great presentations by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Hampshire on amendments that they would like to have considered and debated and voted on—substantive amendments that address what is at the heart of this issue. I think we all understand what this is about. I mentioned this morning on the floor the New York Times story from a couple weeks ago about what the intention is with regard to these issues. Again, this is from the New York Times story, and I quote: “to be timed to coincide with campaign-style trips by President Obama.” “Democrats concede,” the Times reports, “that making new laws is not really the point. Rather, they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them.” The article goes on to say—and I quote again:

Privately, White House officials say they have no intention of searching for any grand bargain with Republicans on any of these issues. “The point isn’t to compromise” . . .

That is reporting from the New York Times, and quoting a White House official with regard to this.

This is clearly designed as a political ploy, as my colleagues from New Hampshire and Nebraska pointed out. If we were serious about this, there would be an open process where we could consider amendments—amendments that improve and strengthen the legislation that is before us—and actually it would be a better approach to addressing the issue that is before us; that is, to try to create better salaries, better wages, better opportunities for women. I say that as somebody who is the father of two adult daughters who are both in the workplace. I want to see them have every opportunity to advance themselves and to maximize the potential they have. But we cannot do that if we have policies coming out of Washington, DC, that make it more difficult, more expensive to create jobs, that throw a big wet blanket on our economy, and stifle the growth we need to create those types of opportunities for all Americans.

The Senator from Utah is here. He is going to speak to his amendment. But I think it is very clear what this is about; that is, simply trying to score a

political point rather than have a serious, meaningful, substantive debate about solving an issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, for his leadership in this area. I agree with his comments and support those statements, along with the other actions taken by my colleagues from New Hampshire, Kentucky, and Nebraska, in addition to others.

I too had an amendment I wanted to present in connection with this legislation. I too offered that up and identified reasons why this is both relevant and germane to the legislation at hand. Unfortunately, the majority leader saw fit to block this, to object to it, to refuse altogether to allow the U.S. Senate—which is supposed to be the world’s greatest deliberative legislative body—to consider these or any of the other amendments that were presented along with them.

We are not asking for passage by unanimous consent. We recognize some people might not share our views. We recognize there might be a diversity of opinion within the body. We nevertheless believe, as U.S. Senators, we are entitled to have these amendments considered because they are relevant, because they are germane. We also think they should be considered because they would benefit the American people.

This is the sort of thing we are supposed to do. It is what we do. What we are supposed to be doing as Senators is to be offering amendments and voting on amendments to make legislation we consider better. You see, the amendment process can make a bad bill good or at least better, and that is exactly why we have an obligation to consider amendments.

It is important to point out here that one of the reasons why I ran this amendment in the first place has to do with the fact that one of the struggles facing working families today is the constant struggle moms and dads feel as they try to juggle the work-life balance. Parents today need to juggle work, home, kids, community, and other obligations they face.

For many families, especially families with young children, the most precious commodity parents have is time. But today Federal labor laws severely, and I believe unfairly, restrict the way moms and dads and everyone else can use their time. That is because many of those laws were written decades ago—decades ago—before the Internet existed; decades ago, when a number of demographic factors were aligned much differently than they are today, when a number of social trends operated much differently in our economy than they do today. Because of these laws—these same Buddy Holly-era, Elvis-era laws—because of these same antiquated laws that need to be updated, an hourly employee who works

overtime is not allowed to take comp time, not allowed to take flextime. Even if she prefers it, her boss cannot even offer it without violating Federal law.

Today, if a working mom or a working dad stays late at the office on Monday or Tuesday, and instead of receiving extra pay wants to get compensated by leaving early on Friday and spend the afternoon with the kids, that kind of arrangement could well be violating Federal law. That sounds unfair, especially to parents, and it is unfair, especially to parents and their children and everyone else.

It also seems like the kind of arrangement that should not be prohibited by Federal law but ought to be perfectly acceptable. But how do we know that for sure? Well, we know that for sure because Congress gave a special exemption from that very law—the law I just described a moment ago—that is available only for government employees. This is unacceptable. The same work-life options that have been made available by Congress itself to government employees should be available to the citizens they serve.

In May of last year, the House of Representatives responded to this deficit in existing Federal law by passing the Working Families Flexibility Act, sponsored by Representative MARTHA ROBY of Alabama, to equalize the comp time rules, existing within a government employment context, for all workers. Last fall, I introduced companion legislation in the Senate proposing to do exactly the same thing.

Now, today, I would like to offer an amendment that is modeled on this same legislation to end this flextime discrimination, this comp time discrimination against private sector workers. You talk to any working mom or any working dad and they will tell you they need more time.

Now, Mr. President, as you well know, we cannot legislate another hour in the day. If we could, I am sure it would have been done by now, and, frankly, I am a little surprised someone has not tried it. But we know mathematically it will not work. It would not do any good. But what we can do is to help working people so they can better balance the demands they face—the demands of family and work and community and every other demand they face. We can ease some of this pressure by removing an unnecessary, outdated, and manifestly unfair Federal restriction on utilizing comp time in the private sector.

There are real problems in this world. There are bad things that can be and must be prohibited by Federal law. But the fact that working parents would prefer, quite understandably, to spend more time with their families is not one of those things that needs to be prohibited, nor is it one of those things that we should allow to continue to be prohibited, especially when it is prohibited in a patently unfair discriminatory fashion—one that inures to the

benefit of government employees, inures unfairly to the detriment of everyone else.

Congress needs to stop punishing America's moms and dads for wanting the same fair treatment that government employees are able to receive through comp time and flextime programs. The United States of America deserves to have amendments like this one, and other amendments, that would make our laws less intrusive, less oppressive, less unfair, that would lead to the development of a more fair, just economy, and a more fair, just system of laws.

We are never going to be able to get there if we are not even allowed to debate and discuss and vote on it, consider, much less pass, amendments. It is time to restore the Senate to what it was always intended to be, which is the world's greatest deliberative legislative body. That cannot happen when amendments like this one are categorically blocked from consideration. We must end this. We must do better. We can and we must and we will.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, last October families and communities across our country were forced to endure a completely unnecessary government shutdown. Coming after years of budget uncertainty and constant crises, the shutdown hurt our workers and threatened our fragile economic recovery. It shook the confidence of people across the country who expected their elected officials to come together to avoid such a needless and self-inflicted crisis. It was a dark time here in Congress. I think many of my colleagues regret letting the tea party minority push us into that.

When the shutdown finally ended, I sat down with House Budget Committee chairman PAUL RYAN in a budget conference that many of us had been trying to start for months. We worked through the issues. We compromised. We reached a 2-year budget deal that rolled back the devastating cuts from sequestration. We prevented another government shutdown and restored much needed certainty to the budget process.

That budget deal was a strong step in the right direction, but it was not the only step Congress needs to take to create jobs and economic growth. It was not the only step we need to take to ensure that we do not lurch to another avoidable crisis because if Congress does not act, we are headed toward another crisis in just a few months—not a budget crisis this time

but a construction shutdown that could ramp up when our highway trust fund reaches critically low levels.

It will get worse and worse if we do not solve the problem. So I have come to the floor today to call on my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to work together to avert this looming crisis and to do it in a commonsense way that gives our States the multiyear certainty they need to plan projects, to invest in their communities, and to create jobs.

Since the mid-1950s our Nation has relied on the highway trust fund to support transportation projects that create jobs and keep our economy moving. The fund helps to repave our roads so they are not pockmarked with potholes. It helps congestion on our Nation's highways, and it helps repair bridges that are outdated and unsafe.

But as soon as July—just a few months from now—the Department of Transportation predicts the highway trust fund will reach a critically low level. If this is not resolved, construction projects to improve our roads and our bridges could shut down and leave workers without a paycheck.

We are already seeing some consequences from this crisis. In Arkansas, 10 construction projects, such as building highway connections and replacing bridges, have already been put on hold. The State of Colorado wants to widen a major highway to ease congestion between Denver and Fort Collins, but officials say that with this funding shortage in the highway trust fund, that project could be delayed. These are not isolated cases. States from Vermont to California might have to stop construction in its tracks because of this highway trust fund shortfall.

This crisis will also cut jobs. As we all know, construction is at its peak in the summer months. But without funding States may have no choice but to stop construction and leave workers without a job. That is going to hurt communities with needless delays on the very improvements that would help our businesses and spur economic growth.

This is unacceptable. It is unnecessary. Congress needs to work to avoid this construction shutdown. There is no reason—none—to lurch to another avoidable crisis when workers and families across the country are struggling. We need to ensure that construction can continue this summer. We need to support workers. We need to deliver a multiyear solution for the highway trust fund.

Fortunately, we can solve this in a way that should have bipartisan support. President Obama and House Republican DAVE CAMP, who chairs the House Ways and Means Committee, have proposed using corporate revenue to shore up the highway trust fund. That approach makes a lot of sense. By closing wasteful corporate tax loopholes, we can support improvements to our roads and bridges that benefit ev-

eryone—including our big businesses, so they can move their products quickly and efficiently—and make our broken Tax Code a bit fairer in the process. We can start by taking a close look at the tax loopholes House Republicans have proposed closing in Chairman CAMP's recent plan.

Replenishing the highway trust fund with revenue by closing wasteful corporate loopholes will provide multiyear funding so we can provide our States with the certainty they need to plan. That kind of certainty has been absent for a long time. It has forced States to hold off on bigger projects that will help create jobs and long-term economic growth.

I am very hopeful that Democrats and Republicans can work together to restore some certainty to States around our country. I know bipartisan support is possible, especially on an issue as important as this one. Since the highway trust fund's inception under Dwight D. Eisenhower, Republicans and Democrats have come together to invest in this national priority. Under Democratic and Republican Presidencies—from President Clinton to President Reagan to President Clinton—we updated and supported the highway trust fund. Even 2 years ago in a hyperpartisan election year, Congress reached a bipartisan agreement so that we could continue to build the roads and bridges and transit systems our communities need. In the past Republicans and Democrats have stepped up to support our workers and make sure we can invest in our transportation systems that put workers on the job and help businesses move their goods and help our economy grow.

There is no reason to wait until the last minute to get this done. The threat is growing on our construction sites and for jobs across the country. We have to give our States and our communities the confidence that Congress will not push them into another crisis.

Six months ago our communities and families endured a needless government shutdown. Americans are sick and tired of the dysfunction of Washington, DC, and constant crises. There is no reason for Congress to put them through anything even remotely similar, especially over transportation projects that will benefit our families, our communities, and our economy.

We must act to prevent a construction shutdown this summer. Let's build on the common ground that Democrats and Republicans share on this issue. Let's work together to show the American people that Congress can act to support our workers, families, and communities. Let's prevent a construction shutdown and give the highway trust fund some certainty. We need to make sure our States can keep investing in jobs and economic growth at this critical time.

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.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask that all time be yielded back.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NEIL GREGORY KORNZE TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

NOMINATION OF FRANK G. KLOTZ TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Neil Gregory Kornze, of Nevada, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time has been yielded back.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Neil Gregory Kornze, of Nevada, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management?

The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'YEAS' (71 total): Alexander, Ayotte, Baldwin, Begich, Bennet, Blumenthal, Blunt, Booker, Boxer, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Chambliss, Coats, Collins, Coons, Corker, Crapo, Donnelly, Durbin, Feinstein, Flake, Franken, Gillibrand, Hagan, Harkin, Hatch, Heinrich, Heitkamp, Heller, Hirono, Hoeven, Isakson, Johnson (SD), Kaine, King, Klobuchar, Landrieu, Leahy, Levin, Manchin, Markey, McCaskill, Menendez, Merkley, Mikulski, Murkowski, Murphy, Murray, Nelson, Portman, Pryor, Reed, Reid, Risch.

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'NAYS' (28 total): Rockefeller, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Stabenow, Tester, Udall (CO), Udall (NM), Walsh, Warner, Warren, Whitehouse, Wyden.

NAYS—28

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'NAYS' (28 total): Barrasso, Boozman, Burr, Cochran, Cornyn, Cruz, Enzi, Fischer, Graham, Grassley, Inhofe, Johanns, Johnson (WI), Kirk, Lee, McCain, McConnell, Moran, Paul, Roberts, Rubio, Scott, Sessions, Shelby, Thune, Toomey, Vitter, Wicker.

NOT VOTING—1

Coburn

The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON KLOTZ NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Klotz nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I believe we are done with the voting at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in legislative session.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I would like to talk for a moment about the critical importance to women and families across Michigan and the country of ending pay discrimination against women so women will finally get equal pay for equal work.

I was so proud to see so many colleagues on the floor earlier today, including the distinguished Presiding Officer, speaking about the importance of women being able to earn a full dollar instead of 77 cents on every dollar.

Part of giving everyone in this country a fair shot to get ahead is not only making sure they are getting paid a fair wage, which we are fighting to make sure happens, but also to make sure they are not getting paid less simply because of their gender. If somebody is working 40 hours a week, they ought to be paid the same for 40 hours a week if it is the same job. That is what the Paycheck Fairness Act is

really all about. It gives everyone, regardless of their gender, the tools they need to help end gender discrimination in pay and hold those engaged in discriminatory behavior accountable. That is really what it is all about, and we will have a chance very soon to vote.

I hope we would all agree that discrimination because of gender or for any reason has no place in our society. Yet too many Americans rightly feel they are trapped in a rigged game where heads, the privileged and powerful win, and tails, everybody else loses.

When it comes to pay, we know the system is rigged against women. Today, in 2014, women still only make 77 cents for every dollar compared to a man doing exactly the same work. That is the national average. It is even worse in many places around the country. Frankly, it is even worse for women of color, with African-American women getting paid even less and Latinas doing worse still.

My colleagues and I have been speaking on the floor today not just because we are voting on the Paycheck Fairness Act tomorrow but also because today is what we are calling Equal Pay Day. April 8 is the day women finally catch up. When you look at all the work that was done during the whole calendar year of 2013, and then add January, February, and March through April 8, that is how long it has taken women to make the same income as a man in the same job who worked last year. A woman has to work 1 year, 3 months, and 8 days in order to earn the same amount as a man who has worked 1 year. That is just not right, and that is what this debate is all about.

Some people say we are just talking about pennies on the dollar and dismiss the issue as nonsense or worse. Those pennies add up—hour after hour, day after day, week after week, year after year.

In my home State of Michigan, pay discrimination robs the average working woman and her family of more than \$13,000 in wages every single year—\$13,000 out of their pocket just because they are a woman rather than a man in the same job. While these women are working for discounted wages, they certainly don't get a 23-percent discount on their gas. They don't pay 23 cents less on every dollar at the grocery store or when the rent or the mortgage comes due.

In fact, I have a chart to show what the average working woman and her family in Michigan could buy with the \$13,000 a year she has worked hard every day to earn but never sees in her paycheck. She could buy just over 2 year's worth of food for her family. She could pay for almost a year on her mortgage and utility. Can you imagine that? Mortgage and utility payments go right out the window because she is not getting equal pay for equal work. She could buy almost 3,500 gallons of gasoline for her car. That is enough gas for me to drive back and forth from Detroit to Los Angeles more than 16

times. That is how much a woman loses in her pay every year because of discrimination and lack of equal pay for equal work. But gender discrimination is not just about numbers on a page. In fact, it is not about numbers on a page. It is about real women who are working hard, who have suffered and continue to suffer, because we have not given women and their families the tools they need to make sure they can get equal pay for equal work. That is what this is about: knowing what your coworkers in the workplace are making so you can find out whether you are being paid fairly—the information, the tools women need.

Let's be clear. Women aren't the only ones paying the price for wages lost and benefits denied. Gender discrimination in pay costs everybody in the family. The cost of gas is for everybody in the family. The cost of food is for everybody in the family. The inability to buy some extra sports equipment or clothing or pay for the cost of college affects everybody in the family. I hear far too many stories about this problem from my constituents in Michigan.

Linda from South Lyon wrote to tell me her story. Not only does she make less than her male counterparts, but a senior executive even bragged to her that he hires women because he can pay them less. This is 2014, and we have an executive who thinks it is OK to even say that.

Last week I met Kerri Sleeman, an engineer from Hancock, MI, who came to the Senate to testify about her story. I have to say, in Hancock, MI, we still have 20 feet of snow. This is the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. One has to be tough to live in beautiful Hancock, MI, and have a lot of great winter clothing. But it is an absolutely gorgeous place.

Kerri was working for an auto parts supplier that was forced into bankruptcy in 2003. As with the company's other employees, she had to be involved in the bankruptcy process to get her last paycheck and the other wages she was owed. One day she received an update from the bankruptcy court about the claims against her former company and she made a shocking discovery: All of the men she had been supervising had been paid more than her—all of them. All of them. An engineer in Hancock, MI.

Kerri said: It was heartbreaking. It was embarrassing. It was infuriating. And it will affect me for the rest of my life.

Can my colleagues imagine it? First, she is out of a job. She has to go to court just to get her paycheck, and then, adding insult to injury, she finds out she has been discriminated against for years without even knowing it. Kerri lost out on thousands of dollars in pay and benefits simply because she is a woman. As is the case for most people, she could have used that money. She said she would have used it to help pay the copay for her husband's heart surgery, which instead she had to

put on her credit card. Her story underscores why we need to pass this vital legislation before the Senate.

Kerri not only lost out on her pay at her job week after week, month after month, she will lose out on Social Security benefits for the rest of her life as well. This is not fair. It is not how things should work. Kerri deserves a fair shot, and she has not been given it.

We have heard other stories such as Kerri's before, and one of those was that of Lilly Ledbetter, who worked hard at a Goodyear tire plant and was discriminated against for nearly 20 years. She did not realize, again, that she was being paid less. Just as with Kerri, she will never get the Social Security benefits she would have earned if she hadn't been paid less for just being a woman. The law that bears her name—the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act—was a huge step in the right direction. But today more than 50 years after we passed the Equal Pay Act—imagine, 50 years ago we thought we dealt with this; 50 years ago, the Equal Pay Act—and 5 years after we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, we still have so much work to do to make sure women are actually receiving equal pay for equal work.

It was a great day when the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act became the very first bill President Barack Obama signed into law after he took office. I wish to thank the President for today signing two Executive orders that will help protect the employees of Federal contractors from pay discrimination. As the President has said, he doesn't want his daughters or anyone's daughters to be paid less just because they are women. I agree. I know the Presiding Officer does as well.

Now we must do our part here in the Senate to make sure all Americans have the tools they need to protect themselves from this form of discrimination and hold those responsible accountable.

This is not about special protections. In fact, I find any language—any discussion of “special protections”—so offensive, as I know women in Michigan and across the country do: somehow protections because we want to go to work and know we are being paid the same as the person next to us, who just happens to be a man, and we are women. This is simply about treating all Americans fairly. That is exactly what Democrats are committed to. We want to make sure everybody has a fair shot to get ahead. It has to start with equal pay for equal work. That means paying a fair wage, paying men and women what they earn, and it means if a woman works 40 hours a week, she should get paid for 40 hours a week, not for 30 hours or 31 hours.

The difference in pay simply because of gender discrimination really is the difference. That \$13,000 I talked about earlier is the difference between whether a woman is able to fully benefit from her work and have what she needs to put food on the table and gas in the car

and tuition for her son or daughter to be able to go to college, and all of the other things we want for our families.

What this chart shows just isn't good enough. We want the full dollar, because 77 cents on every dollar is not enough. If we truly reward work, it shouldn't matter if a person is a man or a woman. A person's work should be equally rewarded for the same jobs. It is time the Senate come together—and we are going to have a chance to do that—to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. It is right for women and their families. It is right for our economy. It is simply the right thing to do.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FAIR SENTENCING ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, there are reports that after we return from either this break or the next, the Senate may take up the so-called Fair Sentencing Act, so I rise today to start discussing this bill with my colleagues, particularly those who do not serve with me on the Judiciary Committee.

Over the past 30 years, this Nation has achieved tremendous success in cutting crime. There are fewer victims who suffer fewer physical and financial injuries. Neighborhood safety has improved, reducing fear and helping economic growth. These gains have been hard won. Congress played a major role, enacting mandatory sentencing guidelines, mandatory minimum sentences, providing assistance to law enforcement, and building more prisons. The mandatory guidelines, combined with abolishing parole, led to lengthier sentences, and what is fair about it all is that we have fewer disparities in sentencing. No longer would the sentence depend on whether the criminal faced a tough or a lenient judge, and factors such as the defendant's race and income could not be taken into account.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court, applying novel readings of the Constitution, struck down mandatory sentencing guidelines. As a result, Federal judges are departing downward from the guidelines, issuing shorter sentences and injecting more disparity into the system. States are reducing their incarceration rates. While there are probably multiple contributing factors, crime rates recently have been rising. The only means left for Congress to ensure that criminals are sentenced to appropriate sentences then is mandatory minimums, now that the Supreme Court has judged sentencing guidelines as being unconstitutional.

Those convicted of the manufacture, sale, or possession with intent to distribute, and importation of a wide range of drugs, including heroin, cocaine, PCP, LSD, ecstasy, and methamphetamine may have their sentences cut in half or even more from the current mandatory minimums.

Supporters of the bill say it allows for shorter sentencing only for “non-violent offenders.” I am going to prove the bill does more than that. The term

“nonviolent offenders” is highly misleading. First, that phrase conjures up people in jail for simple possession, and this bill does not apply to simple possession at all, for any drug.

Second, the types of offenses the bill applies to are violent. Importing cocaine is violent. The whole operation turns on violence. Dealing heroin also involves violence or the threat of violence.

Third, the crime for which the defendant is being sentenced might have been violent. The mandatory minimum sentence would be cut even if the criminal’s codefendant used a gun.

Fourth, the criminal himself could have a violent history. Although the bill does not apply to a drug crime for which the defendant used violence, it does apply to criminals with a history of violence. That is, the bill would permit a shorter mandatory minimum where the defendant was not violent on this occasion, but was in the past. Supporters of the bill never acknowledge that it would apply to drug dealers with a history of violent crime.

Other provisions of the bill expand the safety valve that allows judges to impose mandatory minimum sentences on offenders with minimal criminal history. The bill’s proponents never identify which violent offenders who fail to qualify for even the bill’s expanded safety valve should be able to receive the bill’s shorter mandatory minimum sentences.

And don’t pay attention to the smoke screen that the bill leaves the maximum sentence alone. Judges are not sentencing anywhere near the maximum today. The whole point of the bill is to allow judges to ignore current mandatory minimums for serious offenses such as heroin importation and cocaine dealing, and sentence defendants to half the minimum they are now receiving.

We know from the experience of the States that when mandatory minimum sentences are reduced, judges use their greater discretion only to sentence the same or more leniently, even when the drug offender has a history of violence. For instance, the State of New York changed its drug sentencing laws to give judges more discretion. Judges began in the overwhelming majority of the cases to sentence offenders to the now lower minimum sentences. New York judges have sentenced drug offenders—even offenders with prior felony convictions—to the lower minimums. Do we really want offenders such as these out on the streets earlier than is the case now, and while out there on the street to prey on our citizens? That is what they will do.

Although supporters of the bill claim it will reduce costs, what it will really do is shift costs from prison budgets to crime victims.

As Professor Matt DeLisi of Iowa State University testified before our Judiciary Committee, juvenile drug use is the best predictor of chronic offending and that, in his words, “drug

users offend at levels 3–4 times greater than persons not convicted of drug crimes.” He stated that criminal justice research shows that “releasing 1% of the current Bureau of Prison population would result in approximately 32,850 additional murders, rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, auto thefts, and incidents of arson.”

So the empirical data are clear. Lower mandatory minimum sentences mean increased crime and an increased number of victims. Why would we, then, vote to increase crime and create more crime victims?

Various police organizations answer that question by coming out against this bill.

The National Narcotic Officers’ Association has written—and I will give you a fairly long quote:

As the men and women in law enforcement who confront considerable risk daily to stand between poison sellers and their victims, we cannot find a single good reason to weaken federal consequences for the worst offenders who are directly responsible for an egregious amount of personal despair, community decay, family destruction, and the expenditure of vast amounts of taxpayer dollars to clean up the messes they create.

End of quote from the National Narcotic Officers’ Association.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association has also come out against the bill. They stated:

It is with great concern that the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association views any action or attempt . . . that would alter or eliminate the current federal sentencing policy regarding mandatory minimum sentencing.

The mandatory minimum sentencing standard currently in place is essential to public safety and that of our membership.

End of quote from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

Law enforcement is telling us that this bill would be bad policy and create more crime victims, but it is also saying that were this ill-considered legislation to pass, the safety of police officers, who safeguard us, would be jeopardized. How can we possibly do that to those who bravely protect us—our law enforcement people?

The bill is particularly misguided in light of current conditions concerning drug use. We are in the midst of a heroin epidemic right now. Deaths from heroin overdoses in Pennsylvania are way up. In the State of Vermont, the Governor devoted this year’s entire state of the State message to the heroin problem. Cutting sentences for all heroin importation and dealing makes no sense at all considering the concerns of these Governors and other State leaders and law enforcement people.

Now let’s turn to what the Obama administration thinks. Typical of its pattern of disregarding the law across a large range of areas, this administration refuses to charge some defendants for crimes they duly committed if doing so would subject them to mandatory minimum sentences. Typical with this administration’s pattern of dis-

regarding the law, it is not taking action in most situations where States have enacted laws decriminalizing marijuana, even though that is contrary to Federal law. Do you think the Obama administration would stand silently by if a State enacted laws that allowed guns, rather than drugs, to be sold inconsistently with Federal law? Well, of course not.

According to a story this week in the Washington Post, one of the reasons for the heroin epidemic is that marijuana decriminalization is leading growers to produce more heroin for importation into this country. That is because the availability of marijuana is rising and consequently the price is falling. So there is money available to be spent elsewhere. So many who used to grow marijuana now can make much more money cultivating opium poppies for heroin export to this country. But the administration supports this bill, which allows judges to lower mandatory minimum sentences for heroin importation. Doesn’t that boggle the mind?

My conservative colleagues who rightly oppose the administration’s lawlessness in so many areas should think twice before supporting the administration here. They should oppose a bill that gives judges additional authority only for lowering sentences for dealing, manufacturing, and importing LSD, heroin, cocaine, ecstasy, and methamphetamine.

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys has courageously disagreed with the public opinion of their employer, the Department of Justice and Attorney General Holder. The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys—and, remember, these people are on the Federal payroll enforcing and prosecuting under Federal law—this organization has written in opposition to the bill:

Mandatory minimums deter crime and help gain the cooperation of defendants in lower-level roles in criminal organizations to pursue higher-level targets.

They have been demonstrably helpful in reducing crime.

End of quote from the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys.

So why on Earth, then, would we cut sentences for sellers and importers of the worst drugs now plaguing our cities, our suburbs, and even rural areas?

Not every mandatory minimum sentence may be set at the perfect level. We should and can have a discussion concerning lowering some sentences and maybe even raising others—others that probably should be raised, such as for child pornography, terrorism, sexual assault, domestic violence, and various fraud offenses.

We can reduce jail time but not sentences. Many States have done this for inmates whose risk assessments and behavior in jail, including successful completion of programs proven to reduce recidivism, earn our confidence that these people, out of prison, are

less likely to reoffend. But we should not cut sentences up front for serious offenders such as heroin dealers. We should not do so where these offenders have a history of violence. We should not drastically cut the only tool we have to reduce sentencing disparities among judges.

The mislabeled Fair Sentencing Act is the wrong answer to the problems we face. I hope the Senate will not take up this bill, but if it does, my colleagues should take a clear-eyed look at this very dangerous bill and oppose it, as I will.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. More than 50 years ago, President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, making equal pay for equal work the law of the land. Yet wage discrimination still persists. Today women continue to be paid just over three-quarters of what their male counterparts receive for performing the same work. More women than ever before are graduating from college, but over the course of their careers they will each make an average of \$1.2 million less than a man with the same level of education.

Unfortunately, that is not unique. Across a wide array of industries and with all different occupations, well-qualified women continue to earn an average of 77 cents for each dollar that our male counterparts earn, regardless of performance or educational background. Pay discrimination hurts women, it hurts families, and it hurts our economy.

Back in the early eighties, I served on New Hampshire's Commission on the Status of Women. During that period I chaired a task force on women's employment in New Hampshire, and we wrote a report about what we found. Sadly, we found a lot of discrimination against women in employment. At that time women were only making 59 cents for every \$1 a man earned, but the conclusion of our report was this was not only an issue for the women, it was an issue for their spouses, for their families, and for the economy of New Hampshire. The same is true today.

In 2011, women were the sole or primary breadwinner in more than 40 percent of households with children. Equal pay for these women is not solely about a fair paycheck. It is also about paying for a visit to the pediatrician, it is about being able to afford the prescription their children need, it is also about paying the heating bills during a long winter or providing Internet access so their kids can do their homework. There is a lot the average woman could do with the extra \$10,000 she

would earn each year if it were not for pay discrimination.

As Governor, I signed a law to prohibit gender-based pay discrimination in New Hampshire and to require equal pay for equal work. In the year before that law was signed, women in New Hampshire made 69 percent of their male colleagues' wages. Today, in New Hampshire, they make 78 percent, so we make about 1 penny more in New Hampshire than national average. But at this rate, my granddaughters—some of whom are still in grade school—will enter and leave the workforce before we achieve equal pay for equal work. The estimate is that if we continue at this rate, it will be 2056 before we achieve equal pay for equal work.

Today on Equal Pay Day, I call on Congress to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act so that all of our daughters, granddaughters, their husbands, families, and their children can get a fair paycheck. This commonsense legislation would update the Equal Pay Act to require that pay differences be based on legitimate business reasons, and it would protect women so they can't be penalized by their employers for discussing their salaries. Pay discrimination is not fair, it is not right, and it needs to end.

I urge all of our colleagues to support the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank Senator SHAHEEN for her leadership on these issues and so many other issues in the Senate. I listened to the Senator's comments and I fully concur in the information the Senator has brought forward, that paycheck fairness is not just a matter of fairness for women, it is a matter of fairness for our country. Not only will women benefit, our economy will benefit and our country will benefit by making sure that equal pay for equal work is what happens in our country.

I thank the Senator, and I yield.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank Senator CARDIN of Maryland and point out that I know this is an area where he also has worked very hard over many years. It is the kind of issue that men and women should be able to agree on. This is something that is not fair for women, but it is also not fair for their husbands and their sons. I know the Senator feels that way. Because when your wife isn't getting what she deserves, then you and your family are also hurt as a result.

Mr. CARDIN. It is not just my wife, I also have two beautiful grandchildren, granddaughters, and they are going to do just fine, but I want to make sure they are treated fairly in the workplace—and I want all people treated fairly in the workplace.

I thank Senator SHAHEEN. As I said, equal pay for equal work. Paycheck fairness is truly an American value. I thank all our leaders here. I particularly want to acknowledge Senator MI-

KULSKI, my colleague from Maryland, for her extraordinary leadership on pay equity issues, on this particular issue of paycheck fairness, and for the work she has done throughout her whole career as a real leader on gender issues.

As Senator SHAHEEN pointed out, today is Equal Pay Day, and the reason for that is women, on average, earn about 77 percent of what a man earns for doing the same work. We are not talking about different work, but we are talking about doing the exact same work that women are discriminated against in the amount of compensation they receive. So on average women have to work 3 additional months every year to earn the same amount of money a man earns for doing the same work. That is not right and it needs to change.

Today I was at the White House with the President and some of our colleagues. Lilly Ledbetter was there. I know the Presiding Officer recalls that Lilly Ledbetter has been one of the real leaders on pay equity. She worked at Goodyear for over 20 years, and after being there for two decades she found out from one of her coworkers—who anonymously passed along information to her about what people were making—that for 20 years she was receiving less compensation for doing the exact same work her male counterparts were doing. She had no idea about this. There was no justification for the difference. So she decided she would do something about it, not just for herself but for those who are in the workplace and should be treated fairly.

So she filed an action and she took this case all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States, but guess what the Supreme Court did. They said: Lilly Ledbetter, you are right. You were discriminated against. You were paid less because of your gender, but guess what. Because it has been going on for so long, you don't have any remedy. Now that is absolutely ridiculous, that 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court.

That cost Lilly Ledbetter hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost compensation as a result of that discriminatory action. So Congress took action and changed that, and I was proud to be part of the Congress that cast that vote. It was the first bill signed by President Obama shortly after he took office, and I remember the pride we all had that we were able to take a major step forward on behalf of an enforceable right for women to be paid equal pay for equal work.

But the job wasn't done. Tomorrow we can take another giant step forward by advancing, and I hope enacting, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I hope colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this legislation so we can continue to make progress down this road of equal pay for equal work.

In the White House today President Obama took action on his own. As he has said he would, he used his Executive power to do what he can to advance the cause of equality in this

country. So he signed two Executive orders. The first is what we call the sunshine executive order that will require Federal contractors to allow their employees to share information about their salaries. They can no longer take retaliatory action because coworkers share their salary information. The second Executive order will require contractors to provide information to the Department of Labor as to what their salary and compensation amounts are based on gender so there can be a record to make sure employers that are doing work for the Federal Government and that are benefiting from the U.S. taxpayers are doing the right thing as far as equal pay for equal work.

These are two very important changes the President has instituted through the use of the power of the White House. We can do something permanent about it by the passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act. That is our responsibility, and I hope we will get that done. It will make a better America. As we pointed out, yes, it is about women being treated fairly in the workplace, it is about my two granddaughters being treated fairly in the workplace, but it is also about our economy and it is about our values. It is all of the above.

I might also mention that it affects retirement security. Because women aren't paid as much, they do not have as much money when they retire. They are more strapped when it comes to how they spend their money. They have less money available for their retirement security. Women over the age of 50 receive only about 56 percent of what men of similar age receive in pension benefits because they haven't earned as much. A good part of that is because they are not being paid fairly in the workplace. Paycheck fairness will certainly help.

We want to give a fair shot to every woman in this country. Many are the sole support for their families. Eliminating the wage gap will provide \$450 billion of additional income into our economy. You know what that goes for. It goes to buy a new car or help pay for their children's education. It provides the wherewithal so women can go out and pay their rent, their mortgage payments, the wherewithal to take care of their families. They can even put money away for retirement so they have the security they need after they retire. It helps to grow a middle class in this country, and that is what we all should be about.

So paycheck fairness helps give women a fair shot of equal pay for equal work. It requires employers to demonstrate that wage disparities between men and women holding the same position and doing the same work are not related to their gender. That seems simple enough. Doing different work, obviously the pay is different. Same work, why is there a difference?

The bill ensures the remedies available to victims of gender discrimina-

tion are similar to the remedies available to those who are discriminated against based upon their race or national origin. We have in place a way we can correct this. We know how to use those tools. Let us also use them for those who have been discriminated against in their pay because of their gender.

The legislation updates the Equal Pay Act to make it more in line with class action procedures available under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This gives us an effective remedy to take care of a class of workers who have been discriminated against in the workplace, and it also prohibits employers—this is very important—from punishing or retaliating against workers who share salary information.

That is what the President did today with the stroke of his pen for those companies that do business with the Federal Government. We can make it universal in the workplace. We can shine a light on what is happening. As former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis observed: "Sunlight is said to be the best disinfectant." We strive for greater transparency in our government because we know that will help provide a better government. So we allow our workers to share information without fear that they will be discriminated against or that actions will be taken against them by their employer.

Our mission as Senators is clearly written in the first few words contained in the preamble of the Constitution. Our mission is to "form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

Paycheck fairness is essential for our carrying out that mission. I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. 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 GOVERNOR MICHAEL O. LEAVITT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, this week the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce will honor my friend, the former Governor of Utah, Michael Leavitt, with our Giant In Our City Award. I would like to take this opportunity to honor my fellow Utahn, whose example as a public servant is instructive for all those who wish to make a difference.

Mike Leavitt, who is a native of Cedar City, was the 14th Governor of the great State of Utah. He was handily elected to three terms as Governor, a feat that only one other Utahn has ever accomplished. In 2003, during his third term, he was nominated by President George W. Bush and confirmed by

the Senate as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. After just over 1 year at the EPA, Governor Leavitt was nominated and confirmed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, where he served through the end of the Bush administration. He is the coauthor and author of several books, and he has most recently served on Mitt Romney's campaign as the head of Governor Romney's transition team.

These accomplishments alone are enough to warrant praise and admiration for Governor Leavitt, but I would like to underscore the way in which he served in these positions to explain the virtues of leadership and service. It has been said those who lead best lead by example, and Mike Leavitt is one of those best leaders. He has continuously focused on efficiency, relationships, professionalism, and improvement. These qualities are not only cultivated in Mike Leavitt personally, but they are also fostered in all those with whom he works.

Governor Leavitt's efforts to make government work for the people—as government always should work—stands as one of his greatest accomplishments. Such accomplishments often require innovation and entrepreneurship, which Mike Leavitt learned prior to his governorship as the president and CEO of the Leavitt Group. An example of this innovation is the emergence of a new kind of education in the mid-1990s. When many in the education sector were skeptical of the possibility of online learning, Governor Leavitt proposed a new idea for a competency-based online university. He worked to gain the support of other Governors, and after many months of preparation, Western Governors University was established. This institution was part of Governor Leavitt's mission to expand access to and reduce the cost of higher education. Today WGU is recognized as one of the most innovative and affordable universities in the country.

Governor Leavitt encouraged his fellow Utahns to avoid focusing on what is wrong with America, a lesson we as Senators would do well to follow. He reminded Utahns to focus on what is right with America, as he believes wholeheartedly in the greatness of our Nation. He once said: "In the history of mankind, there has never been a nation as admired, as willing and as capable of inspiring and fulfilling hope." The dignified competence of that statement is needed in these Halls and needed around the world today.

Utah was an example of such dignified confidence in 2002 when the State hosted the Winter Olympics. Governor Leavitt's precision in preparing the State for the games produced a tremendous success not only for Utah but also for our country. Working on the issues that are constitutionally reserved to the States and to the people, Governor Leavitt oversaw the expansion of Utah's transportation network and managed facilities and lands with great care. He

sought out skilled leaders to help in this grand effort, and thousands upon thousands of Utahns volunteered countless hours to make the 2002 Olympics one of the most successful Olympic Games in history.

Multiple volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could be filled with examples of service and leadership exemplified by this great Utahn, especially from his years leading the EPA and HHS. However, in the interest of brevity, I will simply say that this country needs more citizens like Mike Leavitt. We need men and women who are able to focus on the details and simultaneously think on a macro scale. We need leaders who believe in our founding principles and who make important decisions with those very same principles in mind. We need leaders who will make government more efficient, more responsive, more deliberate, and more meaningful. Such meaningfulness may often require less from the Federal Government. When action is required from us in this body, let prudence, love for country, love for our fellow beings and dedication to principles, displayed so admirably by Governor Mike Leavitt, be our guide.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

FORT HOOD

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to speak about the tragic shooting last week at Fort Hood. The shooting claimed the lives of three innocent people. One was a son of Illinois, and 16 others were wounded.

As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I often begin subcommittee hearings by quoting the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey. At his speech at the National Press Club 2 years ago, General Dempsey spoke about the number of challenges facing the military, from Afghanistan to sequestration, and the need to take care of our troops when they transition to civilian status. General Dempsey said: "No matter how well we address the other challenges"—and I quote him—"if we don't get the people right, the rest of it doesn't matter."

His words reflect a basic truth. More than weapons systems or stockpiles of ammunition, the strength of our military and the security of America depend on the men and women who volunteer to risk their lives for us.

Investigators are still trying to understand what happened as an Army specialist went on a shooting rampage at Fort Hood. Press reports speculated on a host of possible motives, from mental health difficulties following a recent deployment, grief over the death of his mother, and even financial pressure. As we wait for the answers to this tragedy, we are grateful for the discipline and bravery of the military policewoman who confronted the shooter and cut short what could have been an

even worse tragedy. We are grateful for the military chaplain who shielded bystanders and helped them reach safety.

In my State of Illinois, we are mourning Army SGT Timothy Owens. He is from downstate, my neck of the woods, born in Effingham, IL, and dreamed of being a soldier since he was a little boy. He used to wear camouflage and bomber jackets with sunglasses to look like a soldier, in hopes that someday that would come true.

He went to high school in Rolla, MO, where he met Billy, the young woman who would later become his wife. They were married just last August.

After high school Tim and his family moved back to Effingham where Tim worked and taught tae kwon do in the local gym. In 2003 Tim Owens decided to pursue his life long dream. He enlisted in the U.S. Army. Sergeant Owens served proudly in Iraq and Afghanistan, and he recently signed up for 6 more years. His tours in Iraq and Afghanistan gave him special understanding and empathy for other soldiers who faced difficulties when they returned home. He used his skill and compassion in his work as a counselor at Fort Hood helping veterans deal with post traumatic stress disorder and other mental health challenges. It was a heartbreaking irony that Sergeant Owens was killed when he tried to persuade the shooter at Fort Hood to lay down his weapon. Sergeant Owens was 37 years old.

I offer my deepest condolences to Sergeant Owens' friends and family, especially his wife and his parents. Tim Owens served America honorably, and I know they are proud of him.

We also pray for the families of the other soldiers who lost their lives last week at Fort Hood and all those who were injured. Losing soldiers on friendly soil seems almost incomprehensible. Yet this is not the first time we have seen this sort of senseless death at a U.S. military facility. It is not even the first time we have seen it at Fort Hood.

Tomorrow at Fort Hood President Obama will lead a memorial service to honor those who died last week. As we remember the soldiers who were lost and pray for those who were wounded, we also need to ask ourselves if there is more that we can do to protect the members of our military and their families.

In the speech 2 years ago, General Dempsey said the vast majority of servicemembers end up stronger from the experience that they served. He said: "They are disciplined, they are courageous . . . they have a sense of purpose." They are men and women we should be very proud of, and we are.

There are also a few who for some reason or another need help. Some may bear invisible wounds from war. As we wind down our involvement in Afghanistan, our task as a Nation is to get all of the people right, as General Dempsey reminded us. Servicemembers and veterans who are struggling with

health issues, including mental health issues, need to get the care that is necessary to bring them back to a full participation in life.

Military families shouldn't have to struggle to put food on their table or a roof over their heads. A grateful Nation can do a lot better than that. No member of the military who risked his or her life overseas should have to worry about losing his or her life on a military base in America. In the midst of the tragedy last week many people at Fort Hood acted nobly and courageously, but something went terribly wrong.

We owe it to our servicemembers and their families to understand how this terrible loss happened so we can work to make sure it does not happen again.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you very much.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I am now here for the 64th time to ask my colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change. It was almost exactly 2 years ago in April 2012 that I began speaking on the floor every week that the Senate is in session.

I have tried to make a compelling case for my colleagues. First and foremost I have relied on the overwhelming scientific evidence and the near unanimity of the scientific community.

Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that the increase of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere due to human activities is driving unprecedented changes, and, of course, they are changes that Americans see all about them in their lives now. If 97 doctors told you that you needed surgery, who among us in our right mind would heed the advice of the three doctors who said they were unsure and we should delay the treatment?

I have talked about global warming. I have talked about the weirding of the weather—heat waves, extreme downpours, drought, shifting seasons. I have talked at length about the devastating toll on our oceans, which hold such peril in my home State, Rhode Island, the Ocean State. Our oceans are warming, rising, and becoming more acidic, and all of that is undeniable. It is measurable. It threatens our coastal communities and marine species alike.

I have described the potential for deep economic disruption in industries such as fishing and farming or inundation or wildfire. I have looked at the threat to human health. I have conveyed the deep concerns of corporate

leaders who understand that climate change is bad for business and of faith leaders who appeal to our moral duty to conserve God's creation and to spare those who are most vulnerable to catastrophe. I have answered the claims of those in this Chamber who deny the reality of climate change and the need for action, and I have called out the network of fossil fuel propaganda that seeks to mire this Congress in phony manufactured doubt.

I have been joined by colleagues who share my commitment to rouse this Congress from its oil- and coal-induced slumber, including the historic all-night stand on the floor that reached hundreds of thousands of Americans. But unfortunately, it seems we still have some ways to go. I could stand here until I am blue in the face supplying the Chamber with reasoned arguments and scientific facts on climate change, and some here in Congress would ignore it because they reject information from scientists and they ignore empirical evidence.

So maybe it is time to bring in some muscle—the American military. Climate change threatens our strategic interests, our military readiness, and our domestic security in many ways. It is a serious national security issue. Don't take my word for it. Our top military commanders and strategic planners at the Department of Defense say so.

Four years ago the Department of Defense released the Quadrennial Defense Review, clearly linking for the first time climate change and national security. The 2010 review concluded that the effects of climate change can contribute to increases in regional instability driven by demand for food, water, and natural resources, and to extreme weather events which will increase the need for humanitarian aid and disaster relief, both within the U.S. and abroad.

Then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen put it this way. I will quote him:

The scarcity of and potential competition for resources like water, food, and space, compounded by the influx of refugees if coastal lands are lost does not only create a humanitarian crisis, but it creates conditions of hopelessness that could lead to failed states and make populations vulnerable to radicalization.

That is the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Last year 9 retired generals and admirals joined 17 former members of the House and Senate and several former cabinet level officials and issued this warning. They said:

The potential consequences to climate change are undeniable, and the cost of inaction, paid for in lives and valuable U.S. resources will be staggering.

The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review was released last month in tandem with the Department of Defense budget request, and it is just as straightforward in its warnings on climate change.

I will quote:

Climate change poses another significant challenge for the United States and the world at large. . . . Climate change may exacerbate water scarcity and lead to sharp increases in food costs. The pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.

The second installment of the current Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessment report, released just last week, echoes what our own military leaders are already telling us. According to the report, "Climate change can directly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts such as poverty and economic shocks."

In response to our changing climate, the Department of Defense is conducting a comprehensive assessment of the risks to U.S. military installations. This is not a trivial effort and it is not being undertaken without cause.

The Pentagon is also working with other nations to strengthen the network of humanitarian assistance for disaster response. The reach of our military stretches to every corner of the globe and so do the effects of climate change. Our commanders recognize the need to adapt in every theater.

Much has been made of the U.S. military and diplomatic pivot to the Pacific region. While ADM Samuel J. Locklear, commander, U.S. Pacific Command, has called climate change the biggest long-term security threat in the Pacific because it "is probably the most likely thing that is going to happen . . . that will cripple the security environment, probably more likely than the other scenarios we all often talk about." The head of our Pacific command is describing this as the most likely thing to happen to cripple the security environment.

The threat extends from pole to pole. Former Supreme Allied Commander and Commander of U.S. Forces in Europe James Stavridis is wary of the ongoing reduction in Arctic sea ice. He states, "This will present potential problems, from oil spills, dangers to wildlife, search and rescue for commercial shipping and tourist boats, and open zones of maneuver for the navies of the Arctic nations to interact."

Our American military leaders are clear in sounding this alarm. In Congress some of us are taking these warnings seriously. The Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I lead with Congressman WAXMAN, invited national security experts to share their perspective on climate change. Retired Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Stephen Cheney is CEO of the American Security Project, founded in 2005 by former Senators John Kerry, Chuck Hagel, Gary Hart, and Warren Rudman. He stressed that climate change is not a new issue within national security issues and that the United States must engage the world on this issue, which of course

we cannot do while we are paralyzed by false denial.

Retired Army BG Gerald Galloway spoke of the risk extreme weather events pose to military installations. He said:

When communities and installations are unaware of their vulnerability to these events, the results can be disastrous. A failure to be prepared shifts the military's focus from maintaining a constant level of readiness to dealing with each of these climate change impacts as they occur. Both floods and increased temperatures can bring training to a halt or restrict critical movements.

This message was echoed by retired Army CPT Jon Gensler, who described the difficulty of maintaining our readiness, particularly in responding to ever-increasing requests for disaster-related humanitarian assistance.

The consensus is clear from the people to whom we have entrusted our national security: Climate change is a serious threat to national security and to global security for which we need to plan and prepare. That is the message Secretary of State John Kerry brought to an audience in Jakarta, Indonesia, earlier this year. He said:

In a sense, climate change can now be considered another weapon of mass destruction, perhaps the world's most fearsome weapon of mass destruction. . . . The fact is that climate change, if left unchecked, will wipe out many more communities from the face of the earth. And that is unacceptable under any circumstances—but it is even more unacceptable because we know what we can do and need to do in order to deal with this challenge.

Yet Congress sleepwalks, refusing to listen, refusing to speak of it, refusing to act when duty calls us to act, when history calls us to act, and when decency calls us to act.

I have a book in my office written by Geoffrey Regan. It is entitled "Great Naval Blunders: History's Worst Sea Battle Decisions from Ancient Times to the Present Day." It is an interesting book to read. It is a long history of episodes of folly and error that have ended in disaster. It contains the account of a fleet of British naval ships docked at harbor as a great typhoon bore down on them. The ships' captains knew the typhoon was so strong that it would tear the ships loose from their anchors and wreck them. They knew their only safe strategy was to up anchor, head out of the harbor, and try to weather the storm at sea, but none of the captains wanted to be the first ship to leave the port so they all stayed and the typhoon swept down and they were destroyed.

Regan calls this "an error of judgment that will forever remain a paradox in human psychology." We can make those kinds of errors of judgment, and for those captains and crews, the error was fatal. Facing certain destruction, those sea captains refused to take the action that they knew was necessary to save their ships, to save themselves, and to save their crews.

I think of that story as we stand in the Senate unable to respond to what

is looming down on us from climate change. The science could not be clearer. It is grownup time around here, and we need to take it seriously. The fact that one side of the aisle can't even use the word "climate change" is a terrible sign.

John Wayne, a great American actor whom we all know, had a number of wonderful roles in his life. One of John Wayne's roles was to play Sergeant Stryker in the movie "Sands of Iwo Jima." In that movie, Sergeant Stryker had a memorable phrase: "Life is tough, but it's tougher if you're stupid." We have all the information in front of us that we need to avoid being stupid. Collectively, that is what we are being. Similar to those captains, knowing what is bearing down on us, we are somehow unable to take the action that will protect us, our country, and will protect our children and future generations. There is no better way to describe it than through the words of Sergeant Stryker: "Life is tough, but it's tougher if you're stupid."

It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be

United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Charles E. Schumer, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bernard Sanders, Cory A. Booker.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DAVID WEIL TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 613.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jon Tester, Barbara Boxer, Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, John D. Rockefeller IV, Carl Levin, Bill Nelson, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, this week, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 649; that there be 1 hour for debate, with 15 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and 45 minutes under the control of the Republican leader or his designee; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, on Wednesday, April 9, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 507; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING CORPORAL WILLIAM F. DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a fallen soldier from my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Nearly 64 years after being killed in the Korean war, Army CPL William F. Day's remains were finally returned home last week.

Corporal Day was 25 years old when he was deployed to the Chosin Reservoir in North Korea. On November 29, 1950, his company was overwhelmed by enemy forces and began a fighting withdrawal from their position. Three days later, Corporal Day was reported missing in action.

Gloria Shonrock, Day's daughter, was only 4 at the time and has lived her life not knowing the location of her father's final resting place. Unbeknownst to her at the time, Day's remains were contained in one of 208 boxes given to the United States by North Korea between 1991 and 1994. Two years ago, Shonrock provided her DNA to the Department of Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office, which they were able to use to identify her father's remains.

Now, over 60 years after being reported missing in action, Corporal Day is back in his old Kentucky home. Day was laid to rest yesterday in La Center, KY, next to his mother, Mattie Day, in a funeral with full military honors.

Corporal Day made the ultimate sacrifice in giving his life for our country. That his remains were returned home after so many years is a remarkable testament to our Nation's commitment to leaving no man behind. I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring this fallen hero.

The Paducah Sun recently published an article chronicling the incredible story of the discovery and return of Corporal Day's remains. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

[From The Paducah Sun, Apr. 3, 2014]

LA CENTER KOREAN WAR VETERAN COMES HOME

(By Leanne Fuller)

Army Corporal William F. Day, of La Center, was reported missing in North Korea on Dec. 2, 1950. After a long and winding search of nearly 64 years, his remains were brought home Wednesday.

Day's daughter, Gloria Shonrock—along with her husband, Ernie Shonrock; other relatives, and two military liaisons—brought the veteran's remains from Nashville, Tenn., to Morrow Funeral Chapel in La Center Wednesday. They were escorted from Nashville by Patriot Guard Riders, Shonrock said, and welcomed into Ballard County with an escort of firetrucks, ambulances and police vehicles.

Shonrock was four when her father was reported missing. While Shonrock's mother didn't talk about Day often while she was growing up, the absence was still felt.

"I'd sit at the recess and cry because I wanted my daddy and—you know—you grow out of that, but you still want your dad," she said.

Shonrock said she has been searching for information about her father since 1992, a search that took her from her home in Erie, Colo., to Washington, D.C., and La Center.

Day's remains were found among 208 boxes of remains North Korea gave the United States between 1991 and 1994. In a recent announcement of the identification of Day's remains, the Department of Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office (DPMO) said the boxes were believed to contain remains of 350 to 400 U.S. servicemen.

However, the remains were heavily commingled, which made identification difficult.

Two years ago, Shonrock provided DNA to help identify her father's remains. Five years ago, she said, her uncle, Herman Day, and her father's niece, Mattie Terrell, also provided DNA.

In the search for her father, Shonrock attended yearly DPMO conferences in Washington and various cities across the country. At last year's conference, she said, X-ray records had been found that could possibly be used to identify the remains.

"And between the DNA and those X-rays, they found my dad," Shonrock said.

Scientists from the Joint POW/MIS Accounting Command and the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory used the DNA and X-rays to identify Day's remains, which were located in Hawaii before they were flown to Nashville. Shonrock said Day was the 100th person identified from the remains contained in the 208 boxes.

"It's been hell sometimes, and good other times," Shonrock said of the long process. "And then it's been hell again because you have to deal with the government, and you sit there and hurry up and wait."

Among the good that came out of her search is that a military office in Colorado helped connect Shonrock with relatives on her dad's side of the family.

"I had an aunt in Washington, and I had this aunt and uncle here in Kentucky," Shonrock said. "And I've been here many times to see them."

On Monday, Day will be buried in La Center—with full military honors—next to his mother, Mattie Day. Day's name is among those listed on the veterans monument at Ballard Memorial High School, and before the funeral a memorial service will be held in his honor at the school.

According to the DPMO, Day was assigned to Company C, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 31st Regimental Combat Team in November 1950, deployed east of North Korea's Chosin Reservoir. The 31st RCT, known as Task Force Faith, was engaged by "overwhelming numbers of Chinese forces." On Nov. 29, 1950, what was left of the task force began fighting a withdrawal to positions near Hagaru-ri, south of the reservoir.

"Personally it's a closure that I don't have to worry about where he's at anymore," Shonrock said, "or whether he's in a ditch in Korea in the frozen area where he passed away, or . . . where he's at: because he's been in Hawaii since 1992-94."

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I regret having missed the April 7, 2014 vote on passage of H.R. 3979, as amended, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014.

Had I been present, I would have voted for the passage of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014 to support the 16,000 Louisianians awaiting the extension provided by this legislation.

TAYLOR CONFIRMATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I support the confirmation of Gen. Frank Taylor to be the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis at the Department of Homeland Security, DHS.

General Taylor has a long and distinguished career in national security, starting with his 31 years in the U.S. Air Force, most of which was spent in

counterintelligence. In his final assignment for the Air Force, General Taylor led the Air Force Office of Special Investigations where his office provided independent investigations of fraud, counterintelligence, and major criminal matters.

In 2001, he was named Coordinator for Counterterrorism, the top counterterrorism position in the State Department, where he was a key advisor to Secretary of State Colin Powell. After that position, General Taylor served as the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of diplomatic security where he was in charge of security for over 250 U.S. embassies and consulates worldwide.

General Taylor has spent the past 9 years in the private sector, most as the chief security officer for General Electric where he was responsible for GE's global security operations and crisis management. In that position, he has seen the government's homeland security functions from the outside, giving him an important perspective on the Department of Homeland Security's support to the private sector.

General Taylor will have to put his extensive experience and leadership skills to good use as Under Secretary of DHS for Intelligence and Analysis. The Office of Intelligence and Analysis has been without a leader confirmed by the Senate for over a year now, and it has a large number of missions, like DHS as a whole.

I hope and expect that General Taylor will provide strong leadership to the Office of Intelligence and Analysis at DHS and I look forward to working with him.

General Taylor was approved by the Intelligence Committee on March 4, 2014, and the committee received several letters supporting him, including from the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Major Cities Chiefs Association which represents the law enforcement agencies in large cities in the U.S.

I fully support General Taylor's confirmation.

CARLIN CONFIRMATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I supported the confirmation of Mr. John Carlin to be Assistant Attorney General for National Security in the Department of Justice, DOJ.

Mr. Carlin was serving as the Acting Assistant Attorney General for National Security, the top position in the National Security Division at the Department of Justice, which brings together the counterterrorism, intelligence, and counterintelligence efforts within DOJ.

The National Security Division is also important because it reviews and approves requests to the FISA Court for surveillance authorities.

Mr. Carlin has superb experience for the position to which he has been confirmed, having served as the Acting Assistant Attorney General since his

predecessor, Lisa Monaco, went to the White House last year to be President Obama's top advisor for counterterrorism and homeland security.

Before his position as Acting Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Carlin was the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General and chief of staff for the National Security Division. From 2007 to 2011, he served in leadership roles at the FBI, including as chief of staff to FBI Director Robert Mueller.

Mr. Carlin also served in a variety of positions in the Department between 1999 and 2007, including as a career Federal prosecutor, where Mr. Carlin served as National Coordinator of DOJ's Computer Hacking and Intellectual Property, CHIP, program. Before that, he was an assistant U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, where he prosecuted cases ranging from homicide and sex crimes to cyber, fraud, and public corruption matters.

In one noteworthy case, he obtained a guilty verdict against Modou Camara on charges of conspiracy, fraud, and money laundering, in connection with real estate transactions in which Camara persuaded unqualified buyers to submit fraudulent loan applications through a first-time homebuyer program run by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's, HUD, Federal Housing Administration, FHA. Through this scheme, Camara bought properties at low prices and sold them—usually on the same day that he purchased them—at an artificially inflated price for a large profit. When Camara's recruited purchasers failed to repay their loans, HUD was forced to reimburse the lender. HUD lost over \$1 million due to Camara's scheme.

As a prosecutor, he also obtained convictions in cases against a defendant who tortured and murdered a baby girl, a defendant who bribed former Congressman "Duke" Cunningham, and a defendant who was charged with first-degree murder.

Mr. Carlin was approved by the Intelligence Committee on March 4, 2014, and by the Judiciary Committee on February 6, 2014. Both committees received several letters in support of Mr. Carlin from senior officials and colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

I fully support Mr. Carlin's confirmation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, this is a special week. The Week of the Young Child, launched by the National Association for the Education of Young Children in 1971 and carried out in communities across the country, is a time to raise public awareness about the importance of high-quality early childhood education and to recognize the millions of people who care for and teach young children every day.

The theme of this year's Week of the Young Child is "early years are learn-

ing years." Research is compelling that children are ready to learn from birth—what they need are the positive conditions and opportunities to learn and thrive not only to be prepared for school but to prepare to be productive adults.

Early childhood education is about development and learning, but it is also an economic driver. Nobel laureate James Heckman and others note that when we invest in high-quality early childhood education, starting with infants, the taxpayer benefits from lower expenditures for special and remedial education, reduced juvenile crime rates, and higher graduation rates.

Even though we know about the importance of early childhood education, for many families the costs are too much for the family budget, especially high-quality programs. The child care and development block grant, helping families afford childcare and helping states raise the quality of care, serves only one in six eligible children. In fact, roughly 260,000 fewer children received assistance in 2012 than in 2006. I am glad we ended the cuts to Head Start in fiscal year 2014, but even so, we help less than half of the eligible preschoolers and only 4 percent of eligible Early Head Start infants and toddlers. State pre-K is growing, but it is uneven quality among our States and doesn't reach all the eligible children whose families would want to enroll them. Early intervention services—a significant intervention for children's early school readiness—is woefully underfunded as well.

The educators who work with these young children in childcare, Head Start and other program settings are very underpaid. A childcare provider makes about \$20,000 a year. The turnover rate is high. When teachers get a degree, they can move to better jobs to support their own families, but it means inconsistency of relationships for children and difficulty sustaining quality for providers. We must do more to ensure early childhood educators get the specialized degrees and credentials they need and then compensate them on par with their school-based colleagues.

In my State of Alaska, one snowy night over a year ago in Anchorage, I met with about 50 strongly committed Alaska educators to talk about how to improve our schools and prepare our students for the competitive 21st-century economy.

From that conversation, the idea for three bills evolved. I then introduced a package of legislation, the Keep Investing in Developmental Success, KIDS, Act. These three early childhood bills will address access, quality, and affordability in early education programs.

First, we will amend the Tax Code to provide a tax credit for early childhood educators. The Tax Relief for Early Educators Act will expand the deductions for certain expenses for early childhood education and increase the childcare tax credit so more parents

can afford to put their children in quality early child development programs.

Second, we will create a new student loan forgiveness program for graduates of associate's or bachelor's programs in early education. The Preparing and Reinvesting in Early Education Act—or PRE ED—will provide needed relief for early educators and encourage more to work with kids through age 5. Well-trained educators providing quality early education makes all the difference in a child's success.

Third, we need to reward companies offering onsite or near-site childcare with a company cost-share. We know it works for the company and for the employee—just look around our State. In Alaska BP, Credit Union One and Fairbanks Memorial Hospital are great examples. They all offer quality onsite centers. They know it makes more productive employees.

The Child Care Public-Private Partnership Act will establish a program to provide childcare through partnerships. Through new grant incentives for small and medium companies, we can help more Alaska companies do the same.

These bills recognize the importance of childcare in the lives of working families. They will make it easier for early childhood educators to provide stimulating and effective instruction in safe environments.

As we recognize and celebrate this week of the young child, we need to be perfectly clear in our commitment to continue to support and expand the education of children. I believe all of my colleagues in the Senate should join together to make this a priority because, as this year's theme says so well, the early years are indeed the learning years.●

REMEMBERING ALLEN MAXWELL

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, recently, we tragically lost Monticello, AR Mayor Allen Maxwell very suddenly and unexpectedly. He did a tremendous job as mayor. No one valued his family and community more than Mayor Maxwell.

After a successful career in the private sector, Allen embarked on a second career in public service that included a stint as U.S. Representative Jay Dickey's chief of staff in the 1990's. Six years later, he was motivated to run for an elected office of his own. It was an excellent decision that ended with a successful election to the Arkansas House of Representatives where he represented district 10 for 3 terms and focused on creating jobs in Arkansas's manufacturing sector before being term-limited out.

Committed to making Arkansas a better place to live and do business, Allen knew he could still contribute and decided to run for mayor of Monticello. He won with 70 percent of the vote, focused his energies on infrastructure and capital improvements, and left his mark on Monticello before his sudden and untimely passing.

Mayor Maxwell was a great example for us all. A humble public servant who entered this field for the right reasons—he truly wanted to help Arkansans and make the State that he loved better. My staff and I greatly missed his presence at the annual meeting with legislators in Washington. We continue to pray that his family and friends are comforted by the fact that major efforts for his community and region and concern for his fellow man will continue to live on.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES FRANKEL

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased and honored to salute James B. Frankel, a respected lawyer, environmental activist, and a pillar of the San Francisco community who recently celebrated his 90th birthday.

James Frankel was born on February 25, 1924, in Chicago to Louis and Thelma Frankel. After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1945, Jim went on to earn a law degree from Yale University, where he met his future wife Louise. Shortly thereafter the couple moved to San Francisco, where they raised their family.

In San Francisco, Jim maintained an active law practice until his retirement in 2000. He also contributed to the training and education of future lawyers, serving as an adjunct professor of law at Yale, UC Berkeley, Stanford, and UC Hastings.

Those of us who know Jim know that he is an inspiring and vibrant man who has always been generous with both his time and his energy on behalf of so many worthy causes. As an avid nature lover and outdoorsman passionate about backpacking, skiing, and the annual bicycle trips across Europe that he continued to take well into his eighties, Jim was an early supporter of the Natural Resources Defense Council, for which he served as a trustee for nearly 20 years.

My family is lucky to have known Jim for many years, and I have always admired his boundless passion and tireless zest for living life to its fullest. As Jim celebrates his 90th birthday, I am honored to join Louise, their children and five grandchildren, and Jim's many friends and admirers in offering my very best wishes on this wonderful milestone and many more years of continued happiness.●

TRIBUTE TO ANN YOUNG

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, public service is a noble calling. The work done by dedicated and hardworking government employees benefits countless Americans from coast to coast and many across my home State of Michigan. Indeed, there are many people who work tirelessly day after day to make sure the services we all rely on are there when we need them most. That is why it is no exaggeration to say that diligent and long-serving workers like Ann Young form the backbone of our great Nation. And, I am delighted to honor Ann, who recently retired after more than 40 years of Federal service.

Ann Young began her career in the Federal Government in 1973 with the

Animal and Plant Inspection Service within the Department of Agriculture and ended up staying in Federal health service for more than four decades. Thousands of hardworking Michigan farmers rely on the expertise and services provided by the Department of Agriculture, many of those families reside in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Throughout her career, Ann and her colleagues have been there for these families, always ready to lend a hand and do what is needed. Her work with the U.S. Forest Service and in the area of rural development has truly made a difference.

Ann has dedicated her professional life to helping others. She follows in a long and unbroken line of workers who have done the same. She will be missed by those in the Upper Peninsula who have relied on her work for so many years. And, she will be missed by her colleagues who have benefitted from her wisdom and insight. She can now take a well-deserved break, enjoy life and spend more time with the people she holds dear. She is certainly in the perfect place to do it—The Upper Peninsula of Michigan, home to extraordinary natural beauty.

I am delighted to recognize the work of Ann Young and wish her the best as she begins the next chapter of her life. She has certainly earned it.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 404. An act to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1872. An act to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3470. An act to affirm the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act, to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4323. An act to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration for the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 404. An act to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1872. An act to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

H.R. 3470. An act to affirm the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act, to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2575. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2223. 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.

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-5242. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Primary Peanut-Producing States and Adjustment of Membership" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0042) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5243. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Note" (RIN3052-AD00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5244. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Thiram; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9909-02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5245. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imazapic; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9400-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5246. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imazapyr; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9907-82) received in the Office of

the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5247. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interpretive Rule Regarding Applicability of the Exemption from Permitting under Section 404(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Water Act to Certain Agricultural Conservation Practices" (FRL No. 9908-97-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5248. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluoxastrobin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9907-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5249. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proquinazid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9903-11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5250. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Metaflumizone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9907-67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5251. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Report to Congress on Fiscal Year 2015 Staff Years of Technical Effort and Estimated Funding for Department of Defense Federally Funded Research and Development Centers"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5252. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5253. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stanley T. Kresge, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5254. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5255. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 2014-001: Interim Guidance for Dispositioning 10 CFR Part 37 Violations with Respect to Large Components or Robust Structures Containing Category 1 or Category 2 Quantities of Material at Power Reactor Facilities Licensed under 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52" (RIN3150-A112) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5256. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Ohio; Infrastructure SIP State Board Requirements for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9908-70-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5257. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Hawaii; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9908-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5258. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; 10-Year FESOP Amendments" (FRL No. 9907-50-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5259. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9909-09-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5260. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9909-10-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5261. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Enforceable Consent Agreement and Testing Consent Order for Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4); Export Notification" (FRL No. 9907-36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5262. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9909-11-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5263. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Test Methods and Testing Regulations; Technical Amendment" ((RIN2060-AQ01) (FRL No. 9908-99-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5264. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs); Manufacturing (Import) Exemption for the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)" (FRL No. 9908-98-OSWER) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5265. A joint communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Buy American Act Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5266. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2013 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5267. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Railroad Retirement Board's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5268. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5269. A communication from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission's Strategic Plan for 2014-2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5270. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5271. A communication from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2013 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5272. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5273. A communication from the Chair of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5274. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Submission of Forms, the Finished Products Records for Distilled Spirits Plants, and Closures on Certain Distilled Spirits and Products" (RIN1513-AB97) received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on April 7, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5275. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5276. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5277. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Revisions in the WIC Food Packages" (RIN0584-AD77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5278. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Child Care and Development Fund Report to Congress for Fiscal Years 2008 through 2011"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5279. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 67th World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5280. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0020—2014-0033); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5281. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled "Federal Aviation Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5282. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; South Bend, Indiana" (MB Docket No. 14-1, DA 14-363) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5283. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2014 Annual Catch Limits" (RIN0648-BD70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-210. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan

urging the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas, In response to the 2008 economic recession, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act was enacted in July 2010 to increase accountability and improve transparency in the nation's financial system. Among its provisions, section 1502 of the act creates new reporting requirements for publically traded companies that produce products containing gold, tin, tantalum, or tungsten, known as "conflict minerals." These reporting requirements and their public disclosure are meant to deter the purchase of conflict minerals from the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the surrounding nations of Central Africa Republic, South Sudan, Zambia, Angola, the Republic of the Congo, Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda; and

Whereas, The final rules on section 1502, issued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), taking effect May 31, 2014, is exceedingly complex and detrimental to American manufacturers, creating new, overly taxing compliance costs, especially for American small businesses, as well as unrealistic and burdensome reporting requirements. The new rules require publically traded manufacturers to trace conflict minerals through their entire supply chain, all the way back to the smelter. The SEC estimates the initial cost of compliance to be between \$3 billion and \$4 billion, with annual costs thereafter between \$207 million and \$609 million. However, the National Association of Manufacturers estimates total costs to be \$16 billion; and

Whereas, The SEC rule on conflict minerals jeopardizes Michigan's unparalleled efforts to restructure, create an improved business environment, and recover jobs lost during the recent recession. According to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics, as of October of this year, our unemployment rate of 9 percent ranked 48th among the states, 1.7 percent higher than the nation's average. Moreover, the stalwart of the Michigan economy—manufacturing—is still recovering. The state of Michigan condemns the human rights violations occurring in the DRC and surrounding nations. However, absorbing the exorbitant costs of complying with section 1502 will undermine our footing in the ongoing battle to grow manufacturing jobs; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate Concurring), That we urge the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairman of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-211. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington urging Congress to update and amend the Communications Decency Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8003

Whereas, The Communications Decency Act was enacted in 1996, nearly seventeen

years ago when the internet was still in a fledgling state and accessible only to about twenty million Americans; and

Whereas, The internet of 1996 would be largely unrecognizable in 2013, lacking nearly all of the popular sites of today, such as YouTube, Google, Twitter, Facebook, Wikipedia, Craig's List, and Backpage.com; and

Whereas, Today, the internet makes it possible for companies such as Backpage.com to earn millions of dollars annually from the sale of location-specific internet advertisements, some of which directly facilitate the sex trafficking of minors and other victims; and

Whereas, Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act assures internet service providers like Backpage.com nearly complete immunity from liability for the significant and known role they play in promoting today's sex trafficking industry through the sale and distribution of adult escort advertisements on the internet; and

Whereas, When the Communications Decency Act was written in 1996, section 230 was intended to encourage internet service providers to promote the growth of the internet without incurring liability for third-party communications during a time when the average American with internet access spent thirty minutes each month on the web, compared with today's average of twenty-seven hours per month; and

Whereas, The internet has evolved in ways few expected, making section 230 of the Communications Decency Act now outdated within the context, scope, and capability of today's internet to instantly disseminate information and facilitate rapid communication; and

Whereas, Without a change to section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, states remain powerless to enact meaningful reforms to hold accountable those internet service providers who profit from the sale of adult escort advertisements while turning a blind eye to their role in facilitating crimes against children and refusing to implement any bona fide measures to verify the age of persons featured in those advertisements;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that Congress update and amend the Communications Decency Act to reflect the current scope and power of the internet, to acknowledge the publisher-like role of companies like Backpage.com who profit from the sale and distribution of advertisements on the internet, and to authorize states to enact and enforce laws holding internet service providers responsible when they knowingly facilitate child sex trafficking through the sale of adult escort advertisements. Be it

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

POM-212. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming urging Congress to require the federal Environmental Protection Agency to respect the primacy of Wyoming in developing guidelines for regulating carbon dioxide emissions; to the Committee on Environment and

Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 0001

Whereas, a reliable and affordable energy supply is vital to Wyoming's economic growth, jobs, and the overall interests of its citizens; and

Whereas, Wyoming supports an all-the-above energy strategy because it is in the best interests of the state of Wyoming and the nation; and

Whereas, the United States has abundant supplies of coal and natural gas that provide economic and energy security benefits; and

Whereas, carbon regulations for existing power plants could threaten the affordability and reliability of Wyoming's electricity supplies and therefore threaten the wellbeing of its citizens; and

Whereas, the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that U.S. electric sector carbon dioxide emissions will be fourteen percent (14%) below 2005 levels in 2020; and

Whereas, on June 25, 2013, the President directed the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to issue standards, regulations or guidelines to address carbon dioxide emissions from new, existing, modified and reconstructed fossil-fueled power plants; and

Whereas, the President expressly recognized that states "will play a central role in establishing and implementing carbon standards for existing power plants;" and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act requires EPA to establish a "procedure" under which each state shall develop a plan for establishing and implementing standards of performance for existing sources within the state; and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act expressly allows states in developing and applying such standards of performance "to take into consideration, among other factors, the remaining useful life of the existing source to which such standard applies;" and

Whereas, EPA's existing regulations provide that states may adopt "less stringent emissions standards or longer compliance schedules" than EPA's guidelines based on factors such as "unreasonable cost of control," "physical impossibility of installing necessary control equipment," or other factors that make less stringent standards or longer compliance times "significantly more reasonable;" and

Whereas, it is in the best interest of electricity consumers in Wyoming to continue to benefit from reliable, affordable electricity provided by coal and natural gas-based electricity generating plants: Now, therefore be it:

Resolved by the members of the legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That Wyoming urges EPA, in developing, guidelines for regulating carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants, to respect the primacy of Wyoming and to take into account the unique policies, energy needs, resource mix and economic priorities of Wyoming and other states.

Section 2. That EPA should issue guidelines and approve state-established performance standards that are based on reductions of carbon dioxide emissions that are practical and achievable by measures undertaken at fossil-fueled power plants.

Section 3. That Wyoming and other states should be given maximum flexibility by EPA to implement carbon dioxide performance standards for fossil-fueled power plants within their jurisdiction.

Section 4. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM-213. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington urging the President of the United States and Congress to pass and sign into law legislation reforming the harbor maintenance tax; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBSTITUTE SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8007

Whereas, The federal harbor maintenance tax is not collected on trans-pacific cargo shipped to the United States via rail or roads; and

Whereas, This noncollection of the harbor maintenance tax is an incentive to divert cargo away from United States ports; and

Whereas, The federal maritime commission inquiry into the harbor maintenance tax found that up to half of United States bound containers coming into Canada's west coast ports could revert to using United States west coast ports if United States importers were relieved from paying the tax; and

Whereas, Current United States law does not require the revenues raised through the harbor maintenance tax to be fully spent on harbor maintenance related investments; and

Whereas, The geography of harbor maintenance tax expenditures does not correlate with the states where harbor maintenance revenues are generated; and

Whereas, The balance of the harbor maintenance trust fund has grown to over seven billion dollars;

Now, Therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that:

(1) Congress pass and the president sign legislation reforming the harbor maintenance tax; and

(2) Such legislation provide for full use of all harbor maintenance tax revenues, ensure United States tax policy does not disadvantage United States ports and maritime cargo, and provide greater equity for harbor maintenance tax donor ports through limited expanded use of the harbor maintenance revenues. Be it

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

POM-214. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming requesting Congress to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations and to resume free trade talks with Taiwan; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 0001

Whereas, Taiwan, the United States, and in particular the State of Wyoming share a historical and close relationship marked by strong bilateral trade educational and cultural exchange, and tourism; and

Whereas, Taiwan shares with the United States and the State of Wyoming the common values of freedom, democracy, human rights, and rule of law; and

Whereas, the United States ranks as Taiwan's third largest trading partner, Taiwan is the tenth largest trading partner of the United States and bilateral trade reached \$67.2 billion in 2011; and

Whereas, Taiwan and the State of Wyoming have enjoyed a long and mutually beneficial relationship with the prospect further growth; and

Whereas, the United States on November 1, 2012, officially included Taiwan in its Visa Waiver Program, allowing Taiwan's citizens to travel to the United States for tourism or business for stays of ninety (90) days or less without being required to obtain a visa, and the program will increase tourism and business between Taiwan and the United States, particularly Wyoming, with the prospect of thirty percent (30%) to forty percent (40%) growth of Taiwanese travelers to the United States in 2013, rising from four hundred thousand (400,000) Taiwanese travelers in 2011; and

Whereas, the issue of U.S. beef exports to Taiwan has been settled, and the resumption of trade talks on the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement and the signing of the Free Trade Agreement between Taiwan and the United States will not only help to forge a closer relationship but will also cre-

ate greater benefits and well-being for the State of Wyoming and boost Taiwan's chances to enter the Trans-Pacific Partnership; and

Whereas, President Ma Ying-jeou has worked tirelessly to uphold democratic principles in Taiwan, ensure the prosperity of Taiwan's twenty-three million citizens, promote Taiwan's international standing as a responsible member of the international community, increase participation in international organizations, dispatch humanitarian missions abroad and further improve relations between the United States and Taiwan; and

Whereas, Taiwan, as a willing and contributing member of the world community, has made countless contributions of technical and financial assistance in the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other natural disasters worldwide. Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That Wyoming reaffirms its commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and the State of Wyoming.

Section 2. That Wyoming supports Taiwan's appropriate participation in international organizations that impact the health, safety, and well-being of Taiwan.

Section 3. That Wyoming welcomes the resumption of trade talks on the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, welcomes the signing of the Free Trade Agreement between Taiwan and the United States in the process of closer economic integration, and supports Taiwan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Section 4. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM-215. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Guam requesting the President of the United States, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services further consider and amend the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to facilitate its equitable implementation in the territories; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION NO. 316-32 (COR)

Whereas, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) is intended to promote healthcare for millions of Americans in the fifty (50) states and the District of Columbia, by providing access to affordable healthcare, ensuring quality through market reforms, and advancing prevention and public health; and

Whereas, existing health insurance providers in the U.S. offshore territories shall have to meet higher standards of minimum coverage pursuant to the market reforms, which include: essential health benefits, guaranteed issue, guaranteed renewability, prohibitions on excluding preexisting conditions, adjusted community rating, and other consumer protections; and

Whereas, the PPACA also seeks to set up a healthcare exchange system nation-wide, through which Americans could buy or purchase not only affordable coverage, but coverage with better essential health benefits; and

Whereas, to help accomplish this in the fifty (50) states and Washington, D.C., the PPACA additionally provides the means to partially offset the states' costs of operating the exchanges, or the optional implementation of an equivalent qualifying program, through what are known as the individual and business mandates, as provided pursuant to specific applicable excise tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; and

Whereas, the Public Health Services Act (PHSA), that includes benefits for the territories, provides that, "The term "State"

means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands” (PHSA 2791(d)(14)); and

Whereas, in Title I of the PPACA, it amends the PHSA, and provides that, “In this Title, the term “State” means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia” (ACA 1304(d)); and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has determined that PPACA’s Public Health Service Act provisions, to include market reforms (e.g., guaranteed issue, guaranteed renewability, prohibitions on preexisting condition exclusions, essential health benefits, adjusted community rating, and other consumer protections), will apply to health insurance coverage sold in the territories; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has determined that PPACA’s individual and business mandates are not applicable to Guam; and

Whereas, the individual and business mandates are necessary to help offset the costs of anticipated increases in health insurance premiums, the implementation of which is directly impeded by the exclusion, and is further exacerbated; and

Whereas, the selective inclusion or denial of applicability to Guam places Guam in an untenable position, insofar that the market reforms are applicable, but the means to partially fund it through the individual and business mandates are specifically excluded; and

Whereas, the PPACA’s inequitable and unequal applicability to America’s off-shore territories will likely have the unintended opposite impact of driving up the cost of healthcare coverage if certain provisions are not amended so as to properly include or exempt the territories to the extent necessary and realistically practicable; and

Whereas, the Attorney General of Guam has raised in his response to a Legislative inquiry (LEG 12-0708), that the government could find itself liable, and stated, in part, “If we establish an Exchange, Guam will have to pay the Advance Premium Tax Credit under U.S.C.A. §36B. This is an unfunded mandate that Guam has to pay and it has been estimated that this will cost Guam 74 Million Dollars per year. If Guam does not establish an Exchange, there is the possibility that a class action lawsuit could be brought for payment of this credit much like the Earned Income Tax Credit lawsuit in the past”; and

Whereas, Guam’s Insurance Commissioner has estimated that it would cost the government of Guam a minimum of 74 Million Dollars annually to cover the eligible members in an exchange, yet Guam’s share of the startup appropriation under the PPACA is only 24 Million Dollars, which is a one-time subsidy and is not an annually recurring appropriation, a situation that, “if a territory elects to implement health insurance exchanges, they will receive a limited allotment of subsidy funding that only covers a fraction of needed funds” (see NAIC—October 16, 2013, letter to Secretary); and

Whereas, the individual and business mandates are tied into specific excise tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, which are not applicable to Guam, and it must be duly noted that Section 31 of the Organic Act (48 U.S.C.) was enacted by the Congress primarily to relieve the U.S. Treasury of making direct appropriations to the government of Guam. Although Congress delegated collection and enforcement function of the income tax to the government of Guam, the government of Guam is powerless to vary the terms of the Internal Revenue Code as applied to Guam, except as permitted by Con-

gress. [Bank of America v. Chaco, C.A. Guam 1976, 539 F 2d 1226]; and

Whereas, pursuant to the taxation limitations established in the Organic Act of Guam, as previously provided by the U.S. Congress in 1950, Guam is now prevented from unilaterally implementing under local law the individual and business mandates, by way of Guam’s implementation of the mirrored excise tax provisions taken from the Internal Revenue Code and established under local law; and

Whereas, Guam’s four domestic health insurance carriers have stated, in a January 23, 2014 briefing before the Guam Legislature, that the resulting impact of the PPACA market reforms will cause carriers to raise premium rates to offset the costs of implementing the applicable market reforms; and

Whereas, although the PPACA is intended to increase access to affordable healthcare for millions of Americans in the fifty (50) states and the District of Columbia, it will have the unintended opposite impact for Americans in the off-shore U.S. territory of Guam; and

Whereas, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has duly considered the impact to the U.S. territories, and has stated, in a letter to the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, dated October 16, 2013, “We urge you . . . to provide the Territories with the flexibility that they need to determine whether and how the market reforms should be applied”; and

Whereas, the NAIC paper further states, “Though the statute itself is unclear, (HHS) has determined that the ACA’s market reforms will apply to health insurance coverage sold in the territories, while the individual and employer mandates will not. If a territory elects to implement health insurance exchanges, they will receive a limited allotment of subsidy funding that only covers a fraction of needed funds. As a result, the threat of adverse selection driving up premiums is much higher than it is in the states”; and

Whereas, the Guam Legislature takes due note of the NAIC paper which highlights “the often-stated position taken by the ACA’s congressional sponsors and the administration that these reforms are not possible without the individual mandate and the subsidies”; and

Whereas, the Guam Legislature supports the veracity of the information provided, and endorses the statement, findings and arguments put forward by the NAIC to the Secretary; and

Whereas, Guam’s inability to participate is not from an unwillingness on our part, but, rather, from a failure to duly consider the situation of Guam, the size of our population and insurance risk pool, our economy, and the conflicting statutes and unfunded mandates the Congress has unilaterally established; and

Whereas, the American citizens of the off-shore U.S. territory of Guam must not be excluded from the opportunity to be legitimately included in the PPACA; and

Whereas, it would only prove just and proper for the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and the honorable Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, to duly consider the issues and matters raised in this Resolution; and

Whereas, at the urging and request of Americans in the respective fifty (50) states and District of Columbia, numerous extensions and accommodations have been granted by the administration and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, yet no extensions or accommodations have been provided to the Americans in the off-shore U.S. territories; now therefore, be it

Resolved, that I Mina Trentai Dos Na Liheslaturan Guåhan (the 32nd Guam Legislature) does hereby, on behalf of the people of Guam, request that the President of the United States, the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services further consider and amend, as necessary, the provisions of the PPACA so as to facilitate its equitable implementation in the territories, which must be inclusive of a determination to:

1. Include Guam in the mandates and provide for the phased-in applicability of the provisions of the PPACA, and fully provide the correlated premium subsidies and additional Medicaid subsidies; and

2. Finally address the October 16, 2013 letter the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) sent to Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, regarding the inequities and challenges that Guam and other U.S. territories are facing with the implementation of PPACA; and be it further

Resolved, that the Speaker certify, and the Legislative Secretary attest to, the adoption hereof, and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Barack Obama, President, United States of America; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior; to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Affairs; to the Honorable Jack Kingston, Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, 113th Congress, U.S. House of Representatives; to the Honorable Tom Harkin, Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, U.S. Senate; to the Honorable Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Guam’s Congressional Delegate, 113th Congress, U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Edward J.B. Calvo, I Maga’lahen Guåhan.

POM-216. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to support Michigan’s application for a state-sponsored EB-5 regional center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 315

Whereas, Attracting job-producing investments is critical to the continued economic recovery of the state of Michigan and the United States as a whole. Michigan—a long-standing leader of our nation’s industrial economy—sustained significant damage in the aftermath of the 2002 and 2008 economic downturns. In recent years, however, Michigan’s economic engine has begun turning again, marked by increasing property values and per capita incomes as well as an unemployment rate that continues to decline. With strides still to go, capital investments, including foreign direct investments, can infuse new growth in Michigan’s economy and is an important element for Michigan’s continued recovery; and

Whereas, The EB-5 investor-immigrant program is a constructive tool for attracting foreign investments to Michigan. In this program, immigrants willing to invest at least \$1,000,000 in capital to create a new business or take over an existing, troubled business can obtain an employment-based visa. For targeted unemployment areas—areas like Detroit that are experiencing an unemployment rate at least 150 times the national average—or rural areas, an employment-based visa can be issued with a minimum investment of \$500,000. This capital investment

goes toward creating American jobs, rebuilding and revitalizing our neighborhoods, and bringing new money to our local economies. EB-5 participants, as required by the federal statute, must directly create or retain at least ten domestic jobs within two years, jobs that otherwise may have never come to the United States; and

Whereas, EB-5 regional centers serve as a mechanism for coordinating and attracting potential investor-immigrants as well as offering investor-immigrants enhanced services. Public regional centers can serve as international marketers for the area in which they represent. Public regional centers also serve as concentrators of economic development, compounding investment after investment into their local economies. Investor-immigrants using regional centers also benefit from a broader interpretation of the EB-5 job creation requirement. While the minimum investment requirements remain the same, immigrant-investors going through an EB-5 regional center may count indirect job creation as well; and

Whereas, The establishment of a state of Michigan EB-5 regional center would be a crucial component in the ongoing effort to rebuild our economy. State-sponsored regional centers provide an unparalleled ability to attract and retain potential investors. States like Michigan can bring investor-immigrants to the table in ways private regional centers cannot and develop solid, lasting relationships. Statewide regional centers can also develop and deploy an estimable portfolio of statewide resources like industrial site searches, facilitate connections with local suppliers, laborers, and other businesses, and provide a general orientation of the government and economic environment to business owners; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to support Michigan's application for a state-sponsored EB-5 regional center; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Chairman and Ranking Member of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Chairman and Ranking Member of the United States House Committee on the Judiciary, Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-217. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to support Michigan's request for 50,000 EB-5 visas to assist in the economic recovery of the city of Detroit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 316

Whereas, Professionals with advanced skills in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) are crucial to the continued development of our economy. However, Michigan continues to suffer from a shortage of workers with advanced training in STEM-related skills, and this shortage is expected to worsen over the coming years with STEM-related occupations growing 1.7 times the rate of non-STEM-related occupations. By 2018, Michigan is estimated to have 274,000 more STEM-related positions available than professionals to fill them. While we are committed to increasing STEM proficiency in our own students, Michigan must also seek out and retain professionals with advanced degrees to help build our economy now; and

Whereas, The city of Detroit has a special need for skilled professionals to help rebuild,

revitalize, and reinvigorate the city. In recent years, Detroit, an iconic American city, has seen an unprecedented decline in population, and the loss of local revenue has made it difficult for the city to meet its financial obligations. Recruiting skilled professionals is one step toward achieving economic recovery and relieving the city's acute unemployment. In addition to adding a valuable new dynamic to the local economy, with their employment comes new consumers, increasing demand, and job growth in other sectors; and

Whereas, Allowing immigrants to fill vacant STEM positions would provide an economic boost to the state of Michigan and the city of Detroit. Through the recruitment and retention of foreign-born professionals, targeted immigration can help quench the unmet demands of Michigan's labor market—avoiding the suppression of economic production and growth that results—and help fortify the long-term health of its economy. Immigrants working in the United States also leverage their skills to contribute to the American economy rather than increasing the productivity and value of another nation's economy; and

Whereas, Federal employment-based visa programs, particularly the EB-2 program, grant foreign-born professionals legal working status in the United States. Designed for individuals with advanced degrees or its equivalent, the EB-2 program permits foreign-born professionals with STEM-related or business skills to be employed with domestic businesses, businesses otherwise unable to fill these jobs with the existing labor market. This program also encourages immigrants with exceptional abilities—abilities in science, art, or business that are significantly above those of ordinary workers in the field—to obtain an EB-2 visa; and

Whereas, The state of Michigan has requested a pilot program be instituted to reallocate 50,000 EB-2 visas over the next five years for use in the city of Detroit. As proposed, 5,000 visas would be made available to foreign-born professionals the first year, 10,000 visas for the next three years, and 15,000 visas would be available in the fifth year. Rather than taking from the national pool of annually-available EB-2 visas, the administration would reallocate any unused EB-1, EB-2, EB-3, and family-based preference visas into the EB-2 pilot program, making them available for employment opportunities in the city of Detroit; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to support Michigan's request for 50,000 EB-2 visas to assist in the economic recovery of the city of Detroit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Chairman and Ranking Member of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Chairman and Ranking Member of the United States House Committee on the Judiciary, Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-218. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia rescinding and withdrawing all past resolutions by the General Assembly applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 194

Whereas, there has been no convention convened to amend the Constitution of the

United States, and all amendments adopted to date have been initiated by two-thirds of the members of both houses of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the states; and

Whereas, the operations of a convention are unknown and the apportionment and selection of delegates, method of voting in convention, and other essential procedural details are not specified in Article V of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, the General Assembly of Virginia has not called for a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States in the recent past, but in the more distant past has called for a convention (i) by House Joint Resolution No. 168 in 1977 concerning a presidential item veto, (ii) by the second resolved clause of Senate joint Resolution No. 36 in 1976 concerning a balanced budget, and (iii) by other resolutions applying to the Congress to call a convention; and

Whereas, the status of these past resolutions is unclear and the prudent course requires the General Assembly to rescind and withdraw all past applications for a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States lest a convention be convened without current and careful consideration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly of Virginia rescinds and withdraws all past resolutions by the General Assembly applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States including HJR No. 168 (1977), SJR No. 36 (1976), and all other resolutions calling for a convention; and, be it

Resolved Further, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates transmit certified copies of this joint resolution to the Archivist of the United States at the National Archives and Records Administration of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Virginia delegation to the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

POM-219. A resolution adopted by the Delaware County Board of Supervisors of the State of New York entitled "In Support of Home Rule 1494 'Blue Water Navy Accountability Act'"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM-220. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Ulster County of the State of New York urging the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to postpone indefinitely its order issued August 13, 2013 and halt the creation of the New Capacity Zone; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-221. A petition from citizens of the State of New York relative to the repeal of the New York Secure Ammunition and Firearms Enforcement Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1237. A bill to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-146).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 697. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids

Mine Project Site, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-147).

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1294. A bill to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2017.

Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

*J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2014.

*Sharon Y. Bowen, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2018.

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Brian P. McKeon, of New York, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Air Force nominations beginning with Colonel David P. Baczewski and ending with Colonel Ricky G. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 26, 2014, (minus 4 nominees: Colonel Mark W. Anderson; Colonel Michael E. Guillory; Colonel Thomas J. Owens II; Colonel Frank H. Stokes)

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. John E. Hyten, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Wendy M. Masiello, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (Ih) Margaret G. Kibben, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Brent W. Scott, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Sean A. Pybus, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. John R. Ewers, Jr., to be Major General.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Bamidele J. Abogunrin and ending with Phillip M. Zeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 7, 2014.

*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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE—TREATIES

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

[Treaty Doc. 111-7 Tax Convention with Hungary (without printed report)]

The text of the committee-recommended resolutions of advice and consent to ratification are as follows:

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Hungary for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Budapest February 4, 2010, with a related agreement effected by exchange of notes February 4, 2010 (the "Convention") (Treaty Doc. 111-7), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 111-8 Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Luxembourg]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Luxembourg on May 20, 2009, with a related agreement effected by exchange of notes May 20, 2009 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 111-8), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Protocol is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 112-5 Protocol Amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters, done at Paris May 27, 2010 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 112-5), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 112-8 Tax Convention with Chile]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Luxembourg May 20, 2009, with a related agreement effected by exchange of notes May 20, 2009 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 111-8), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Convention is self-executing.

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 Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2218. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the eligibility of certain territories and regions for designation for participation in the visa waiver program and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2219. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to update a report on the role of telecommunications, including the Internet, in the commission of hate crimes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2220. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 2221. A bill to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2222. A bill to require a Comptroller General of the United States report on the sexual assault prevention activities of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. REID):

S. 2223. 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; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CORKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 417. A resolution designating October 30, 2014, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 418. A resolution to honor Gallaudet University, a premier institution of higher education for deaf and hard of hearing people in the United States, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary and to recognize the impact of the University on higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 419. A resolution recognizing the celebration of National Student Employment Week 2014 at the University of Minnesota Duluth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 715

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 715, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to establish a commission for the purpose of coordinating efforts to reduce prescription drug abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to require certain agencies to conduct assessments of data centers and develop data center consolidation and optimization plans.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 1862

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1873, a bill to provide for institutional risk-sharing in the Federal student loan programs.

S. 1925

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1925, a bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2023

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2023, a bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2091, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2106

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2106, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the individual health insurance mandate not apply until the employer health insurance mandate is enforced without exceptions.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2162

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a deduction for married couples who are both employed and have young children and to increase the earned income tax credit for childless workers, and to provide for budget offsets.

S. 2170

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2170, a bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2195

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2195, a bill to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

S. 2199

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2205

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2205, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain small businesses from the employer health insurance mandate and to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of such mandate.

S. RES. 364

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 364, a resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace.

S. RES. 410

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 410, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 2221. A bill to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan; to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the automobile is central to who we are as Michiganders. The automotive industry helped create the middle class, shape the labor movement, establish America's dominance in manufacturing, and spur new innovation across a range of other economic sectors.

For these reasons, Congressman DINGELL in the House of Representatives and I in the Senate introduced legislation in 1998 to establish the Motor Cities National Heritage Area. That legislation specified the heritage area would serve not only to preserve and interpret the history of our Nation's automotive heritage, but that it would also promote current and future economic opportunities.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area has provided over one million dollars to support tourism projects that have boosted economic activity and jobs. These grants attract additional investment because funding is typically matched by more than \$6 for each \$1 in grant funding. MotorCities also connects a broad range of auto-related organizations and attractions, and has connected more than 100 organizations, which has bolstered their visibility and impact.

Michigan is a magnet for car enthusiasts and history buffs around the globe and MotorCities helps them learn about our history and celebrate it with us. When visitors come to Detroit to see where Henry Ford built the Model T or to Lansing to learn about the rise of Oldsmobile, the existence of the Motor Cities National Heritage Area enhances their visit.

These activities will not be supported by the National Park Service after September 30, 2014 due to a sunset clause in the original enabling legislation. For this reason I am introducing today legislation to extend the date for which federal assistance may still be provided. Congressman DINGELL is introducing similar legislation in the House. We have extended the period during which the Park Service can support the Heritage Area to September 30, 2030.

Michigan's automotive heritage is worthy of celebration, remembrance and appreciation. I hope my colleagues will support the legislation I am introducing today.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 417—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 30, 2014, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CORKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution;

which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 417

Whereas, since World War II, hundreds of thousands of men and women, including uranium miners, millers, and haulers, have served the United States by building nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States;

Whereas those dedicated workers paid a high price for their service to develop a nuclear weapons program for the benefit of the United States, including by developing disabling or fatal illnesses;

Whereas the Senate recognized the contribution, service, and sacrifice those patriotic men and women made for the defense of the United States in Senate Resolution 151, 111th Congress, agreed to May 20, 2009, Senate Resolution 653, 111th Congress, agreed to September 28, 2010, Senate Resolution 275, 112th Congress, agreed to September 26, 2011, Senate Resolution 519, 112th Congress, agreed to August 1, 2012, and Senate Resolution 164, 113th Congress, agreed to September 18, 2013;

Whereas a national day of remembrance time capsule has been crossing the United States, collecting artifacts and the stories of nuclear weapons program workers relating to the nuclear defense era of the United States, and a remembrance quilt has been constructed to memorialize the contribution of those workers;

Whereas the stories and artifacts reflected in the time capsule and the remembrance quilt reinforce the importance of recognizing nuclear weapons program workers; and

Whereas those patriotic men and women deserve to be recognized for the contribution, service, and sacrifice they have made for the defense of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 30, 2014, as a national day of remembrance for the nuclear weapons program workers, including uranium miners, millers, and haulers, of the United States; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support and participate in appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities to commemorate October 30, 2014, as a national day of remembrance for past and present workers in the nuclear weapons program of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 418—TO HONOR GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY, A PREMIER INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES, ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY AND TO RECOGNIZE THE IMPACT OF THE UNIVERSITY ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 418

Whereas in 1856, philanthropist and former postmaster general Amos Kendall donated land on his estate in northeast Washington, D.C. for a place to educate the city's deaf youth, and, 8 years later, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill authorizing the institution to grant college degrees;

Whereas theology graduate Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet was inspired to dedicate his life to educating deaf people after tutoring Alice Cogswell, a 9-year-old deaf neighbor,

and traveled to France, where he learned a manual communication method of instruction developed by renowned French educators Abbe Sicard, Laurent Clerc, and Jean Massieu;

Whereas upon returning to the United States, Gallaudet established the American School for the Deaf, the first permanent school for deaf children in the United States, in Hartford, Connecticut;

Whereas in 1857, Thomas Gallaudet's youngest son, Edward Miner Gallaudet, took up his father's cause when he and his deaf mother, Sophia Fowler Gallaudet, were invited by Kendall to run the newly-established Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb and the Blind in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas with Kendall's resources and Edward Gallaudet's leadership and vision, the fledgling school grew and flourished, expanding to provide instruction for aspiring teachers of the deaf and becoming the world's first, and currently only, institution of higher education devoted to deaf and hard of hearing students and to hearing students who wish to pursue careers as professionals serving the deaf community;

Whereas following the 1969 signing of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act (MSSD) by President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur Cohen and Gallaudet President Leonard Elstad signed an agreement authorizing the establishment and operation of the MSSD on the Gallaudet campus;

Whereas in 1970, President Richard Nixon signed a bill to authorize the establishment of Kendall Demonstration Elementary School (along with MSSD, a component of Gallaudet's Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center), devoted to the creation and dissemination of educational opportunities for deaf students nationwide;

Whereas by an Act of Congress, Gallaudet was granted university status in October 1986, and in March 1988, the Deaf Present Now (DPN) movement led to the appointment of the University's first deaf president, Dr. I. King Jordan, and the first deaf chair of the Board of Trustees, Philip Bravin;

Whereas the DPN movement has become synonymous with self-determination and empowerment for deaf and hard of hearing people everywhere;

Whereas the new millennium at Gallaudet has brought events such as the Deaf Way II festival, the opening of the technology-rich I. King Jordan Student Academic Center, and the dedication of the James Lee Sorenson Language and Communication Center, a unique facility that provides an inclusive learning environment compatible with the visu-centric "deaf way of being";

Whereas Gallaudet's undergraduate students can choose from more than 40 majors leading to bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degrees, and students can enroll in graduate and certificate programs, leading to master of arts, master of science, doctoral, and specialist degrees in a variety of fields involving professional service to deaf and hard of hearing people;

Whereas through the Gallaudet University career center, students receive internships that provide a wealth of experiential learning opportunities, including placements in local and Federal government offices;

Whereas today Gallaudet is viewed by deaf and hearing people alike as a primary resource for all things related to deaf and hard of hearing people, including educational and career opportunities, open communication and visual learning, deaf history and culture, American Sign Language, and technology that impacts the deaf community;

Whereas Gallaudet student-athletes have consistently gained national and inter-

national recognition over the years for their accomplishments in a variety of sports, while also being recognized for their success in the classroom by being named All-Academic honorees within their collegiate conferences by posting cumulative grade point averages of 3.20 or higher during the year;

Whereas Gallaudet's anniversary goals are to—

(1) honor its years of academic excellence;

(2) use this milestone to launch new initiatives, discussions, and partnerships that will lead the University forward;

(3) emphasize that Gallaudet is first and foremost a university in which academic discourse plays a central role;

(4) recognize the University's unique place in deaf history;

(5) acknowledge and celebrate both the continuity and the change the campus has seen, including Gallaudet University's progression towards a greater diversity of people and ideas;

(6) demonstrate Gallaudet's impact on the world and underscore the University's leadership role on the local, national, and international level; and

(7) highlight the continuous support of Gallaudet's alumni and collaborations with the Gallaudet University Alumni Association; and

Whereas Gallaudet's 150th year theme is "Gallaudet University: Celebrating 150 Years of Visionary Leadership", and this theme will guide decisions on all activities planned in recognition of Gallaudet University's sesquicentennial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors Gallaudet University on the occasion of its 150th anniversary and recognizes its contributions to higher education in the United States and around the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—RECOGNIZING THE CELEBRATION OF NATIONAL STUDENT EMPLOYMENT WEEK 2014 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DULUTH

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 419

Whereas National Student Employment Week offers the University of Minnesota Duluth the opportunity to recognize students who work while attending college;

Whereas the University of Minnesota Duluth is committed to increasing awareness of student employment as an educational experience for students and as an alternative to financial aid;

Whereas there are nearly 1,500 student employees at the University of Minnesota Duluth;

Whereas the University of Minnesota Duluth recognizes the importance of student employees to their employers; and

Whereas National Student Employment Week is celebrated the week of April 14 through 18, 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the celebration of National Student Employment Week at the University of Minnesota Duluth.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2962. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in

the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2963. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2964. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2965. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2966. Mr. LEE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2967. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2968. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2969. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 361, recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People's Republic of China and urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to take meaningful steps to improve freedom of expression as fitting of a responsible international stakeholder.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2962. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 9, insert the following:

SEC. 9A. PRIVATE SECTOR WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY.

(a) COMPENSATORY TIME; FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOUR PROGRAM.—Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) COMPENSATORY TIME FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency; and

“(B) the terms ‘overtime compensation’, ‘compensatory time’, and ‘compensatory time off’ have the meanings given the terms in subsection (o)(7).

“(2) GENERAL RULE.—An employee may receive, in accordance with this subsection and in lieu of monetary overtime compensation, compensatory time off at a rate not less than one and one-half hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

“(3) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—An employer may provide compensatory time to an employee under paragraph (2) only in accordance with—

“(A) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees of the employer under applicable law; or

“(B) in the case of an employee who is not represented by a labor organization described in subparagraph (A), an agreement between the employer and employee arrived at before the performance of the work—

“(i) in which the employer has offered and the employee has chosen to receive compensatory time off under this subsection in lieu of monetary overtime compensation;

“(ii) that the employee enters into knowingly, voluntarily, and not as a condition of employment; and

“(iii) that is affirmed by a written or otherwise verifiable record maintained in accordance with section 11(c).

“(4) HOUR LIMIT.—An employee may accrue not more than 160 hours of compensatory time under this subsection and shall receive overtime compensation for any such compensatory time in excess of 160 hours.

“(5) UNUSED COMPENSATORY TIME.—

“(A) COMPENSATION PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employer of the employee shall provide monetary compensation for any unused compensatory time under this subsection accrued during the preceding calendar year that the employee did not use prior to December 31 of the preceding year at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A).

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION PERIOD.—An employer may designate and communicate to an employee a 12-month period other than the calendar year for determining unused compensatory time under this subsection, and the employer shall provide monetary compensation not later than 31 days after the end of such 12-month period at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A).

“(B) EXCESS OF 80 HOURS.—An employer may provide monetary compensation, at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A), for any unused compensatory time under this subsection of an employee in excess of 80 hours at any time after giving the employee not less than 30 days notice.

“(C) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—Upon the voluntary or involuntary termination of an employee, the employer of such employee shall provide monetary compensation at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A) for any unused compensatory time under this subsection.

“(6) WITHDRAWAL OF COMPENSATORY TIME AGREEMENT.—

“(A) EMPLOYER.—Except where a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, an employer that has adopted a policy of offering compensatory time to employees under this subsection may discontinue such policy after providing employees notice not less than 30 days prior to discontinuing the policy.

“(B) EMPLOYEE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (3)(B) after providing notice to the employer of the employee not less than 30 days prior to the withdrawal.

“(ii) REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION.—At any time, an employee may request in writing monetary compensation for any accrued and unused compensatory time under this subsection. The employer of such employee shall provide monetary compensation at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A) within 30 days of receiving the written request.

“(7) MONETARY COMPENSATION.—

“(A) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—An employer providing monetary compensation to an em-

ployee for accrued compensatory time under this subsection shall compensate the employee at a rate not less than the greater of—

“(i) the regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), of the employee on the date the employee earned such compensatory time; or

“(ii) the final regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), received by such employee.

“(B) TREATMENT AS UNPAID OVERTIME.—Any monetary payment owed to an employee for unused compensatory time under this subsection, as calculated in accordance with subparagraph (A), shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation for the purposes of this Act.

“(8) USING COMPENSATORY TIME.—An employer shall permit an employee to take time off work for compensatory time accrued under paragraph (2) within a reasonable time after the employee makes a request for using such compensatory time if the use does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(9) PROHIBITION OF COERCION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer that provides compensatory time under paragraph (2) shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of interfering with the rights of an employee under this subsection—

“(i) to use accrued compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (8) in lieu of receiving monetary compensation;

“(ii) to refrain from using accrued compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (8) and receive monetary compensation; or

“(iii) to refrain from entering into an agreement to accrue compensatory time under this subsection.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (A), the term ‘intimidate, threaten, or coerce’ includes—

“(i) promising to confer or conferring any benefit, such as appointment, promotion, or compensation; or

“(ii) effecting or threatening to effect any reprisal, such as deprivation of appointment, promotion, or compensation.

“(t) FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOUR PROGRAM FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘at the election of’, used with respect to an employee, means at the initiative of, and at the request of, the employee;

“(B) the term ‘basic work requirement’ means the number of hours, excluding overtime hours, that an employee is required to work or is required to account for by leave or otherwise within a specified period of time;

“(C) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency;

“(D) the term ‘flexible credit hour’ means any hour that an employee, who is participating in a flexible credit hour program, works in excess of the basic work requirement; and

“(E) the term ‘overtime compensation’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (o)(7).

“(2) PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT.—An employer may establish a flexible credit hour program for an employee to accrue flexible credit hours in accordance with this subsection and, in lieu of monetary compensation, reduce the number of hours the employee works in a subsequent day or week at a rate of one hour for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

“(3) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer may carry out a flexible credit hour program under paragraph (2) only in accordance with—

“(i) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees of the employer under applicable law; or

“(ii) in the case of an employee who is not represented by a labor organization described in clause (i), an agreement between the employer and the employee arrived at before the performance of the work that—

“(I) the employee enters into knowingly, voluntarily, and not as a condition of employment; and

“(II) is affirmed by a written statement maintained in accordance with section 11(c).

“(B) HOURS DESIGNATED.—An agreement that is entered into under subparagraph (A) shall provide that, at the election of the employee, the employer and the employee will jointly designate flexible credit hours for the employee to work within an applicable period of time.

“(4) HOUR LIMIT.—An employee participating in a flexible credit hour program may not accrue more than 50 flexible credit hours and shall receive overtime compensation for flexible credit hours in excess of 50 hours.

“(5) UNUSED FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employer of an employee who is participating in a flexible credit hour program shall provide monetary compensation for any flexible credit hour accrued during the preceding calendar year that the employee did not use prior to December 31 of the preceding calendar year at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i).

“(B) ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION PERIOD.—An employer may designate and communicate to the employees of the employer a 12-month period other than the calendar year for determining unused flexible credit hours, and the employer shall provide monetary compensation, at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i), not later than 31 days after the end of the 12-month period.

“(6) PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE AND WITHDRAWAL.—

“(A) EMPLOYER.—An employer that has established a flexible credit hour program under paragraph (2) may discontinue a flexible credit hour program for employees described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) after providing notice to such employees not less than 30 days before discontinuing such program.

“(B) EMPLOYEE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) at any time by submitting written notice of withdrawal to the employer of the employee not less than 30 days before the withdrawal.

“(ii) REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION.—An employee may request in writing, at any time, that the employer of such employee provide monetary compensation for all accrued and unused flexible credit hours. Within 30 days after receiving such written request, the employer shall provide the employee monetary compensation for such unused flexible credit hours at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i).

“(7) MONETARY COMPENSATION.—

“(A) FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—

“(i) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—An employer providing monetary compensation to an employee for accrued flexible credit hours shall compensate such employee at a rate not less than the regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), of the employee on the date the employee receives the monetary compensation.

“(ii) TREATMENT AS UNPAID OVERTIME.—Any monetary payment owed to an employee for unused flexible credit hours under this subsection, as calculated in accordance with

clause (i), shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation for the purposes of this Act.

“(B) OVERTIME HOURS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any hour that an employee works in excess of 40 hours in a workweek that is requested in advance by the employer, other than a flexible credit hour, shall be an ‘overtime hour’.

“(ii) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—The employee shall be compensated for each overtime hour at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which the employee is employed, in accordance with subsection (a)(1), or receive compensatory time off in accordance with subsection (s), for each such overtime hour.

“(8) USE OF FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—An employer shall permit an employee to use accrued flexible credit hours to take time off work, in accordance with the rate prescribed by paragraph (2), within a reasonable time after the employee makes a request for such use if the use does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(9) PROHIBITION OF COERCION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any employee for the purpose of interfering with the rights of the employee under this subsection—

“(i) to elect or not to elect to participate in a flexible credit hour program, or to elect or not to elect to work flexible credit hours; or

“(ii) to use or refrain from using accrued flexible credit hours in accordance with paragraph (8).

“(B) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (A), the term ‘intimidate, threaten, or coerce’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (s)(9).”

(b) REMEDIES.—Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), as amended by section 3(c), by striking “(b) Any employer” and inserting “(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), any employer”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) An employer that violates subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of section 7 shall be liable to the affected employee in the amount of—

“(1) the rate of compensation, determined in accordance with subsection (s)(7)(A) or (t)(7)(A)(i) of section 7, for each hour of unused compensatory time or for each unused flexible credit hour accrued by the employee; and

“(2) liquidated damages equal to the amount determined in paragraph (1).”

(c) NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall revise the materials the Secretary provides, under regulations contained in section 516.4 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, to employers for purposes of a notice explaining the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) to employees so that the notice reflects the amendments made to such Act by this section.

(d) PROTECTIONS FOR CLAIMS RELATING TO COMPENSATORY TIME OFF AND FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING.—Section 507(a)(4)(A) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and”; and

(2) by inserting “, the value of unused, accrued compensatory time off under section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(s)), all of which shall be deemed to have been earned within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first, at a rate of compensation not less than the final regular

rate received by such individual, and the value of unused, accrued flexible credit hours under section 7(t) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(t)), all of which shall be deemed to have been earned within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first, at a rate of compensation described in paragraph (7)(A)(i) of such section 7(t)” after “sick leave pay”.

(e) GAO REPORT.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and each of the 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress providing, with respect to the reporting period immediately prior to each such report—

(1) data concerning the extent to which employers provide compensatory time and flexible credit hours under subsections (s) and (t) of section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), as added by this section, and the extent to which employees opt to receive compensatory time under such subsection (s) and flexible credit hours under such subsection (t);

(2) the number of complaints alleging a violation of subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) filed by any employee with the Secretary of Labor, and the disposition or status of such complaints;

(3) the number of enforcement actions commenced by such Secretary, or commenced by such Secretary on behalf of any employee, for alleged violations of subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of such section, and the disposition or status of such actions; and

(4) an account of any unpaid wages, damages, penalties, injunctive relief, or other remedies obtained or sought by such Secretary in connection with such actions described in paragraph (3).

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 11(c) shall not be construed to prevent small businesses, as described in such section, from participating in compensatory time under section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) and the flexible credit hour program under section 7(t) of such Act, as amended by this section.

(g) SUNSET.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2963. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Workplace Advancement Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 1963, Congress passed on a bipartisan basis the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages for equal work performed by employees for employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

(2) Following the passage of such Act, in 1964, Congress passed on a bipartisan basis the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(3) Since the passage of both the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964,

women have made significant strides, both in the workforce and in their educational pursuits.

(4) Currently, according to a Prudential Research Study, 60 percent of women are the primary earners in their households and the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that 47 percent of women are members of the workforce.

(5) According to the Department of Education, women receive 57 percent of all college degrees, a 33 percent increase from 1970.

(6) Women hold the majority of positions in the 5 fastest growing fields, and women are more likely than men to work in professional and related occupations.

(7) Despite this significant progress, surveys suggest there is a concern among American women that gender-based pay discrimination still exists.

(8) Over the last 15 years, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has received on average 2,400 complaints annually alleging gender-based pay discrimination. This represents two to three percent of charges filed with the Commission during the same time period. Even though the Commission determines that no discrimination occurred in a majority of these complaints, the extent to which these allegations continue underscores there is still progress to be made.

(9) A number of factors contribute to differences in total compensation, including variations in occupation, education, hours worked, institutional knowledge, and other business reasons and personal choices that shape career paths and earning potential.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON WAGE DISCRIMINATION.

Pursuant to Federal law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—No employer shall discriminate, within any establishment in which employees are employed by the employer, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to employees in such establishment at a rate less than the rate at which the employer pays wages to employees of the opposite sex in such establishment for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions, except where such payment is made pursuant to—

(A) a seniority system;

(B) a merit system;

(C) a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or

(D) a differential based on any other factor other than sex.

(2) LIMITATION.—An employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this section shall not, in order to comply to comply with the provisions of this section, reduce the wage rate of any employee.

(3) NOTICE.—Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted, a notice to be prepared or approved by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that sets forth excerpts, from or, summaries of, the pertinent provisions of title Act and of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and information pertinent to the filing of a complaint.

SEC. 4. INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP GRANT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle D of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 171 the following:

“SEC. 171A. INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to promote industry or sector partnerships that lead collaborative planning, resource alignment, and training efforts across multiple firms for a range of workers employed or potentially employed by a targeted industry cluster, in order to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement in targeted industry clusters, including by developing—

“(1) immediate strategies for regions and communities to fulfill pressing skilled workforce needs;

“(2) long-term plans to grow targeted industry clusters with better training and a more productive workforce;

“(3) core competencies and competitive advantages for regions and communities undergoing structural economic redevelopment; and

“(4) skill standards, career ladders, job redefinitions, employer practices, and shared training and support capacities that facilitate the advancement of workers at all skill levels.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CAREER LADDER.—The term ‘career ladder’ means an identified series of positions, work experiences, and educational benchmarks or credentials that offer occupational and financial advancement within a specified career field or related fields over time.

“(2) ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY.—The term ‘economic self-sufficiency’ means, with respect to a worker, earning a wage sufficient to support a family adequately over time, based on factors such as—

“(A) family size;

“(B) the number and ages of children in the family;

“(C) the cost of living in the worker’s community; and

“(D) other factors that may vary by region.

“(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) an industry or sector partnership; or

“(B) an eligible State agency.

“(4) ELIGIBLE STATE AGENCY.—The term ‘eligible State agency’ means a State agency designated by the Governor of the State in which the State agency is located for the purposes of the grant program under this section.

“(5) HIGH-PRIORITY OCCUPATION.—The term ‘high-priority occupation’ means an occupation that—

“(A) has a significant presence in an industry cluster;

“(B) is in demand by employers;

“(C) pays family-sustaining wages that enable workers to achieve economic self-sufficiency, or can reasonably be expected to lead to such wages;

“(D) has or is in the process of developing a documented career ladder; and

“(E) has a significant impact on a region’s economic development strategy.

“(6) INDUSTRY CLUSTER.—The term ‘industry cluster’ means a concentration of interconnected businesses, suppliers, research and development entities, service providers, and associated institutions in a particular field that are linked by common workforce needs.

“(7) INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘industry or sector partnership’ means a workforce collaborative that is described as follows:

“(A) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An industry or sector partnership is a workforce collaborative that organizes key stakeholders in a targeted industry cluster into a working group that focuses on the workforce needs of the targeted

industry cluster and includes, at the appropriate stage of development of the partnership—

“(I) representatives of multiple firms or employers in the targeted industry cluster, including small- and medium-sized employers when practicable;

“(II) 1 or more representatives of local boards;

“(III) 1 or more representatives of postsecondary educational institutions or other training providers; and

“(IV) 1 or more representatives of State workforce agencies or other entities providing employment services.

“(i) DIVERSE AND DISTINCT REPRESENTATION.—No individual may serve as a member in an industry or sector partnership, as defined in this paragraph, for more than 1 of the required categories described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of clause (i).

“(B) AUTHORIZED MEMBERS.—An industry or sector partnership may include representatives of—

“(i) State or local government;

“(ii) State or local economic development agencies;

“(iii) other State or local agencies;

“(iv) chambers of commerce;

“(v) nonprofit organizations;

“(vi) philanthropic organizations;

“(vii) economic development organizations;

“(viii) industry associations; and

“(ix) other organizations, as determined necessary by the members comprising the industry or sector partnership.

“(8) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED.—The term ‘industry-recognized’, used with respect to a credential, means a credential that—

“(A) is sought or accepted by businesses within the industry or sector involved as a recognized, preferred, or required credential for recruitment, screening, or hiring purposes; and

“(B) is endorsed by a nationally recognized trade association or organization representing a significant part of the industry or sector, where appropriate.

“(9) NATIONALLY PORTABLE.—The term ‘nationally portable’, used with respect to a credential, means a credential that is sought or accepted by businesses within the industry sector involved, across multiple States, as a recognized, preferred, or required credential for recruitment, screening, or hiring purposes.

“(10) TARGETED INDUSTRY CLUSTER.—The term ‘targeted industry cluster’ means an industry cluster that has—

“(A) economic impact in a local or regional area, such as advanced manufacturing, clean energy technology, and health care;

“(B) immediate workforce development needs, such as advanced manufacturing, clean energy, technology, and health care;

“(C) documented career opportunities; and

“(D) a demonstrated workforce in which women and minorities have been underrepresented.

“(c) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, grants described in paragraph (3) to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to plan and implement, respectively, the eligible entities’ strategic objectives in accordance with subsection (d)(2)(D).

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—

“(A) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—An implementation grant awarded under paragraph (3)(A) may not exceed a total of \$2,500,000 for a 3-year period.

“(B) RENEWAL GRANTS.—A renewal grant awarded under paragraph (3)(C) may not exceed a total of \$1,500,000 for a 3-year period.

“(3) IMPLEMENTATION AND RENEWAL GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award an implementation grant under this section to an eligible entity that has established, or is in the process of establishing, an industry or sector partnership.

“(B) DURATION.—An implementation grant shall be for a duration of not more than 3 years, and may be renewed in accordance with subparagraph (C).

“(C) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew an implementation grant for not more than 3 years. A renewal of such grant shall be subject to the requirements of this section, except that the Secretary shall—

“(i) prioritize renewals to eligible entities that can demonstrate the long-term sustainability of an industry or sector partnership funded under this section; and

“(ii) require assurances that the eligible entity will leverage, in accordance with subparagraph (D)(ii), each year of the grant period, additional funding sources for the non-Federal share of the grant which shall—

“(I) be in an amount greater than—

“(aa) the non-Federal share requirement described in subparagraph (D)(i)(III); and

“(bb) for the second and third year of the grant period, the non-Federal share amount the eligible entity provided for the preceding year of the grant; and

“(II) include at least a 50 percent cash match from the State or the industry cluster, or some combination thereof, of the eligible entity.

“(D) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C)(ii) and clause (iii), the Federal share of a grant under this section shall be—

“(I) 90 percent of the costs of the activities described in subsection (f), in the first year of the grant;

“(II) 80 percent of such costs in the second year of the grant; and

“(III) 70 percent of such costs in the third year of the grant.

“(ii) NON-FEDERAL.—The non-Federal share of a grant under this section may be in cash or in-kind, and may come from State, local, philanthropic, private, or other sources.

“(iii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may require the Federal share of a grant under this section to be 100 percent if an eligible entity receiving such grant is located in a State or local area that is receiving a national emergency grant under section 173.

“(4) FISCAL AGENT.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section that is an industry or sector partnership shall designate an entity in the partnership as the fiscal agent for purposes of this grant.

“(5) USE OF GRANT FUNDS DURING GRANT PERIODS.—An eligible entity receiving grant funds under a grant under this section shall expend grant funds or obligate grant funds to be expended by the last day of the grant period.

“(d) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION OF A TARGETED INDUSTRY CLUSTER.—In order to qualify for a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall identify a targeted industry cluster that could benefit from such grant by—

“(A) working with businesses, industry associations and organizations, labor organizations, State boards, local boards, economic development agencies, and other organizations that the eligible entity determines necessary, to identify an appropriate targeted industry cluster based on criteria that include, at a minimum—

“(i) data showing the competitiveness of the industry cluster;

“(ii) the importance of the industry cluster to the economic development of the area

served by the eligible entity, including estimation of jobs created or preserved;

“(iii) the identification of supply and distribution chains within the industry cluster;

“(iv) research studies on industry clusters; and

“(v) data showing that the industry cluster has a workforce in which women and minorities have been underrepresented; and

“(B) working with appropriate employment agencies, workforce investment boards, economic development agencies, community organizations, and other organizations that the eligible entity determines necessary to ensure that the targeted industry cluster identified under subparagraph (A) should be targeted for investment, based primarily on the following criteria:

“(i) Demonstrated demand for job growth potential.

“(ii) Employment base.

“(iii) Wages and benefits.

“(iv) Demonstrated importance of the targeted industry cluster to the area’s economy.

“(v) Workforce development needs.

“(2) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. An application submitted under this paragraph shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) A description of the eligible entity, evidence of the eligible entity’s capacity to carry out activities in support of the strategic objectives identified in the application under subparagraph (D), and a description of the expected participation and responsibilities of each of the mandatory partners described in subsection (b)(8)(A).

“(B) A description of the targeted industry cluster for which the eligible entity intends to carry out activities through a grant under this section, and a description of how such targeted industry cluster was identified in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(C) A description of the workers that will be targeted or recruited by the partnership, including an analysis of the existing labor market, a description of potential barriers to employment for targeted workers, and a description of strategies that will be employed to help workers overcome such barriers.

“(D) A description of the strategic objectives that the eligible entity intends to carry out for the targeted industry cluster, which objectives shall include—

“(i) recruiting key stakeholders in the targeted industry cluster, such as multiple businesses and employers, labor organizations, local boards, and education and training providers, and regularly convening the stakeholders in a collaborative structure that supports the sharing of information, ideas, and challenges common to the targeted industry cluster;

“(ii) identifying the training needs of multiple businesses, especially skill gaps critical to competitiveness and innovation to the targeted industry cluster;

“(iii) facilitating economies of scale by aggregating training and education needs of multiple employers;

“(iv) helping postsecondary educational institutions, training institutions, apprenticeship programs, and all other training programs authorized under this Act, align curricula, entrance requirements, and programs to industry demand and nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials (or, if not available for the targeted industry, other credentials, as determined appropriate by the Secretary), particularly for higher skill, high-priority occupations validated by the industry;

“(v) ensuring that the State agency carrying out the State program under the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), including staff of the agency that provide services under such Act, shall inform recipients of unemployment insurance of the job and training opportunities that may result from the implementation of this grant;

“(vi) informing and collaborating with organizations such as youth councils, business-education partnerships, apprenticeship programs, secondary schools, and postsecondary educational institutions, and with parents and career counselors, for the purpose of addressing the challenges of connecting disadvantaged adults as defined in section 132(b)(1)(B)(v) and disadvantaged youth as defined in section 127(b) to careers;

“(vii) helping companies identify, and work together to address, common organizational and human resource challenges, such as—

“(I) recruiting new workers;

“(II) implementing effective workplace practices;

“(III) retraining dislocated and incumbent workers;

“(IV) implementing a high-performance work organization;

“(V) recruiting and retaining women in nontraditional occupations;

“(VI) adopting new technologies; and

“(VII) fostering experiential and contextualized on-the-job learning;

“(viii) developing and strengthening career ladders within and across companies, in order to enable dislocated, incumbent and entry-level workers to improve skills and advance to higher-wage jobs;

“(ix) improving job quality through improving wages, benefits, and working conditions;

“(x) helping partner companies in industry or sector partnerships to attract potential employees from a diverse job seeker base, including individuals with barriers to employment (such as job seekers who are low income, youth, older workers, and individuals who have completed a term of imprisonment), by identifying such barriers through analysis of the existing labor market and implementing strategies to help such workers overcome such barriers; and

“(xi) strengthening connections among businesses in the targeted industry cluster, leading to cooperation beyond workforce issues that will improve competitiveness and job quality, such as joint purchasing, market research, or centers for technology and innovation.

“(E) A description of the nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials or, if not available, other credentials, related to the targeted industry cluster that the eligible entity proposes to support, develop, or use as a performance measure, in order to carry out the strategic objectives described in subparagraph (D).

“(F) A description of the manner in which the eligible entity intends to make sustainable progress toward the strategic objectives.

“(G) Performance measures for measuring progress toward the strategic objectives. Such performance measures—

“(i) may consider the benefits provided by the grant activities funded under this section for workers employed in the targeted industry cluster, disaggregated by gender and race, such as—

“(I) the number of workers receiving nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials (or, if not available for the targeted industry, other credentials) described in the application under subparagraph (E);

“(II) the number of workers with increased wages, the percentage of workers with in-

creased wages, and the average wage increase; and

“(III) for dislocated or nonincumbent workers, the number of workers placed in sector-related jobs; and

“(ii) may consider the benefits provided by the grant activities funded under this section for firms and industries in the targeted industry cluster, such as—

“(I) the creation or updating of an industry plan to meet current and future workforce demand;

“(II) the creation or updating of published industry-wide skill standards or career pathways;

“(III) the creation or updating of nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials, or where there is not such a credential, the creation or updating of a training curriculum that can lead to the development of such a credential;

“(IV) the number of firms, and the percentage of the local industry, participating in the industry or sector partnership; and

“(V) the number of firms, and the percentage of the local industry, receiving workers or services through the grant funded under this section.

“(H) A timeline for achieving progress toward the strategic objectives.

“(I) In the case of an eligible entity desiring an implementation grant under this section, an assurance that the eligible entity will leverage other funding sources, in addition to the amount required for the non-Federal share under subsection (c)(3)(D), to provide training or supportive services to workers under the grant program. Such additional funding sources may include—

“(i) funding under this title used for such training and supportive services;

“(ii) funding under title II;

“(iii) economic development funding;

“(iv) employer contributions to training initiatives; or

“(v) providing employees with employee release time for such training or supportive services.

“(e) AWARD BASIS.—

“(1) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section in a manner to ensure geographic diversity.

“(2) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities that—

“(A) work with employers within a targeted industry cluster to retain and expand employment in high wage, high growth areas;

“(B) focus on helping workers move toward economic self-sufficiency and ensuring the workers have access to adequate supportive services;

“(C) address the needs of firms with limited human resources or in-house training capacity, including small- and medium-sized firms;

“(D) coordinate with entities carrying out State and local workforce investment, economic development, and education activities; and

“(E) work with employers within a targeted industry cluster that has a workforce in which women and minorities have been underrepresented.

“(f) ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall carry out the activities necessary to meet the strategic objectives, including planning activities if applicable, described in the entity’s application in a manner that—

“(A) integrates services and funding sources in a way that enhances the effectiveness of the activities; and

“(B) uses grant funds awarded under this section efficiently.

“(2) PLANNING ACTIVITIES.—Planning activities may only be carried out by an eligible entity receiving an implementation grant under this section during the first year of the grant period with not more than \$250,000 of the grant funds.

“(3) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—An eligible entity may retain a portion of a grant awarded under this section for a fiscal year to carry out the administration of this section in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the grant amount.

“(g) EVALUATION AND PROGRESS REPORTS.—

“(1) ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT AND EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under this section, and annually thereafter, an eligible entity shall—

“(A) report to the Secretary, and to the Governor of the State that the eligible entity serves, on the activities funded pursuant to a grant under this section; and

“(B) evaluate the progress the eligible entity has made toward the strategic objectives identified in the application under subsection (d)(2)(D), and measure the progress using the performance measures identified in the application under subsection (d)(2)(G).

“(2) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report containing the results of the evaluation described in subparagraph (B) at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

“(h) ADMINISTRATION BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary may retain not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for each fiscal year to administer this section.

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance and oversight to assist the eligible entities in applying for and administering grants awarded under this section. The Secretary shall also provide technical assistance to eligible entities in the form of conferences and through the collection and dissemination of information on best practices. The Secretary may award a grant or contract to 1 or more national or State organizations to provide technical assistance to foster the planning, formation, and implementation of industry cluster partnerships.

“(3) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Secretary shall issue a range of performance measures, with quantifiable benchmarks, and methodologies that eligible entities may use to evaluate the effectiveness of each type of activity in making progress toward the strategic objectives described in subsection (d)(2)(D). Such measures shall consider the benefits of the industry or sector partnership and its activities for workers, firms, industries, and communities.

“(4) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) coordinate the annual review of each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section and produce an overview report that, at a minimum, includes—

“(i) the critical learning of each industry or sector partnership, such as—

“(I) the training that was most effective; and

“(II) the human resource challenges that were most common;

“(III) how technology is changing the targeted industry cluster; and

“(IV) the changes that may impact the targeted industry cluster over the next 5 years; and

“(ii) a description of what eligible entities serving similar targeted industry clusters consider exemplary practices, such as—

“(I) how to work effectively with postsecondary educational institutions; and

“(II) the use of internships;

“(III) coordinating with apprenticeships and cooperative education programs;

“(IV) how to work effectively with schools providing vocational education;

“(V) how to work effectively with adult populations, including—

“(aa) dislocated workers;

“(bb) women in nontraditional occupations; and

“(cc) individuals with barriers to employment, such as job seekers who—

“(AA) are economically disadvantaged;

“(BB) have limited English proficiency;

“(CC) require remedial education;

“(DD) are older workers;

“(EE) are individuals who have completed a sentence for a criminal offense; and

“(FF) have other barriers to employment;

“(VI) employer practices that are most effective;

“(VII) the types of training that are most effective;

“(VIII) other areas where industry or sector partnerships can assist each other; and

“(IX) alignment of curricula to nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials in the sectors where they are available or, if not available for the sector, other credentials, as described in the application under subsection (d)(2)(E);

“(B) make resource materials, including all reports published and all data collected under this section, available on the Internet; and

“(C) conduct conferences and seminars to—

“(i) disseminate information on best practices developed by eligible entities receiving a grant under this section; and

“(ii) provide information to the communities of eligible entities.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Workplace Advancement Act, and on an annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit a report to Congress on the industry or sector partnership grant program established by this section. The report shall include a description of—

“(A) the eligible entities receiving funding;

“(B) the activities carried out by the eligible entities;

“(C) how the eligible entities were selected to receive funding under this section; and

“(D) an assessment of the results achieved by the grant program including findings from the annual reviews described in paragraph (4)(A).

“(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the reporting or sharing of personally identifiable information collected or made available under this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9201 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 171 the following:

“171A. Industry or sector partnership grant program.”.

SEC. 5. CONSOLIDATIONS OF RELEVANT JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of Labor, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall prepare a report on the consolidations of Federal job training programs and activities determined to be unnecessarily duplicative (referred to in this section as “relevant job training programs and activities”). Such report shall—

(1) describe all Federal job training programs and activities;

(2) propose consolidations of the relevant job training programs and activities;

(3) provide a justification for those Federal job training programs and activities not included in such consolidations;

(4) establish a plan to provide for such consolidations, including recommendations for necessary legislation; and

(5) contain legislative recommendations for consolidation.

(b) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall submit the report to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 6. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF EQUAL PAY ACT REQUIREMENTS.

Section 15(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) to discharge or in any other manner retaliate against any employee because such employee has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed comparative compensation information for the purpose of determining whether the employer is compensating an employee in a manner that provides equal pay for equal work, except that this paragraph shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee’s job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to an individual who does not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a charge or complaint or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employee.

Nothing in paragraph (6) shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.”.

SA 2964. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Good Jobs, Good Wages, and Good Hours Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—ENERGY

Subtitle A—Keystone XL and Natural Gas Exportation

Sec. 111. Keystone XL permit approval.

Sec. 112. Expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to Ukraine and North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries and Japan.

Subtitle B—Saving Coal Jobs

Sec. 120. Short title.

PART I—PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX

Sec. 121. Prohibition on energy tax.

PART II—PERMITS

Sec. 131. National pollutant discharge elimination system.

Sec. 132. Permits for dredged or fill material.

Sec. 133. Impacts of Environmental Protection Agency regulatory activity on employment and economic activity.

Sec. 134. Identification of waters protected by the Clean Water Act.

- Sec. 135. Limitations on authority to modify State water quality standards.
- Sec. 136. State authority to identify waters within boundaries of the State.
- Subtitle C—Point of Order Against Taxes on Carbon
- Sec. 141. Point of order against legislation that would create a tax or fee on carbon emissions.
- Subtitle D—Employment Analysis Requirements Under the Clean Air Act
- Sec. 151. Analysis of employment effects under the Clean Air Act.
- TITLE II—HEALTH**
- Sec. 201. Forty hours is full time.
- Sec. 202. Repeal of the individual mandate.
- Sec. 203. Repeal of medical device excise tax.
- Sec. 204. Long-term unemployed individuals not taken into account for employer health care coverage mandate.
- Sec. 205. Employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration may be exempted from employer mandate under Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.
- Sec. 206. Prohibition on certain taxes, fees, and penalties enacted under the Affordable Care Act.
- Sec. 207. Repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.
- TITLE III—INCREASING EMPLOYMENT AND DECREASING GOVERNMENT REGULATION**
- Subtitle A—Small Business Tax Provisions
- Sec. 301. Permanent extension of increased expensing limitations and treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.
- Sec. 302. Permanent full exclusion applicable to qualified small business stock.
- Sec. 303. Permanent increase in deduction for start-up expenditures.
- Sec. 304. Permanent extension of reduction in S-corporation recognition period for built-in gains tax.
- Sec. 305. Permanent allowance of deduction for health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes.
- Sec. 306. Clarification of inventory and accounting rules for small business.
- Subtitle B—Regulatory Accountability Act
- Sec. 311. Short title.
- Sec. 312. Definitions.
- Sec. 313. Rule making.
- Sec. 314. Agency guidance; procedures to issue major guidance; presidential authority to issue guidelines for issuance of guidance.
- Sec. 315. Hearings; presiding employees; powers and duties; burden of proof; evidence; record as basis of decision.
- Sec. 316. Actions reviewable.
- Sec. 317. Scope of review.
- Sec. 318. Added definition.
- Sec. 319. Effective date.
- TITLE IV—SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFELONG SKILLS**
- Sec. 401. Short title.
- Sec. 402. References.
- Sec. 403. Application to fiscal years.
- Subtitle A—Amendments to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998
- CHAPTER 1—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT DEFINITIONS**
- Sec. 406. Definitions.
- CHAPTER 2—STATEWIDE AND LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEMS**
- Sec. 411. Purpose.
- Sec. 412. State workforce investment boards.
- Sec. 413. State plan.
- Sec. 414. Local workforce investment areas.
- Sec. 415. Local workforce investment boards.
- Sec. 416. Local plan.
- Sec. 417. Establishment of one-stop delivery system.
- Sec. 418. Identification of eligible providers of training services.
- Sec. 419. General authorization.
- Sec. 420. State allotments.
- Sec. 421. Within State allocations.
- Sec. 422. Use of funds for employment and training activities.
- Sec. 423. Performance accountability system.
- Sec. 424. Authorization of appropriations.
- CHAPTER 3—JOB CORPS**
- Sec. 426. Job Corps purposes.
- Sec. 427. Job Corps definitions.
- Sec. 428. Individuals eligible for the Job Corps.
- Sec. 429. Recruitment, screening, selection, and assignment of enrollees.
- Sec. 430. Job Corps centers.
- Sec. 431. Program activities.
- Sec. 432. Counseling and job placement.
- Sec. 433. Support.
- Sec. 434. Operations.
- Sec. 435. Community participation.
- Sec. 436. Workforce councils.
- Sec. 437. Technical assistance.
- Sec. 438. Special provisions.
- Sec. 439. Performance accountability management.
- CHAPTER 4—NATIONAL PROGRAMS**
- Sec. 441. Technical assistance.
- Sec. 442. Evaluations.
- CHAPTER 5—ADMINISTRATION**
- Sec. 446. Requirements and restrictions.
- Sec. 447. Prompt allocation of funds.
- Sec. 448. Fiscal controls; sanctions.
- Sec. 449. Reports to Congress.
- Sec. 450. Administrative provisions.
- Sec. 451. State legislative authority.
- Sec. 452. General program requirements.
- Sec. 453. Federal agency staff and restrictions on political and lobbying activities.
- CHAPTER 6—STATE UNIFIED PLAN**
- Sec. 456. State unified plan.
- Subtitle B—Adult Education and Family Literacy Education
- Sec. 461. Amendment.
- Subtitle C—Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act
- Sec. 466. Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act.
- Subtitle D—Repeals and Conforming Amendments
- Sec. 471. Repeals.
- Sec. 472. Amendments to other laws.
- Sec. 473. Conforming amendment to table of contents.
- Subtitle E—Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Sec. 476. Findings.
- Sec. 477. Rehabilitation Services Administration.
- Sec. 478. Definitions.
- Sec. 479. Carryover.
- Sec. 480. Traditionally underserved populations.
- Sec. 481. State plan.
- Sec. 482. Scope of services.
- Sec. 483. Standards and indicators.
- Sec. 484. Expenditure of certain amounts.
- Sec. 485. Collaboration with industry.
- Sec. 486. Reservation for expanded transition services.
- Sec. 487. Client assistance program.
- Sec. 488. Research.
- Sec. 489. Title III amendments.
- Sec. 490. Repeal of title VI.
- Sec. 491. Title VII general provisions.
- Sec. 492. Authorizations of appropriations.
- Sec. 493. Conforming amendments.
- Subtitle F—Studies by the Comptroller General
- Sec. 496. Study by the Comptroller General on exhausting Federal Pell Grants before accessing WIA funds.
- Sec. 497. Study by the Comptroller General on administrative cost savings.
- Subtitle G—Entrepreneurial Training
- Sec. 499. Entrepreneurial training.
- TITLE I—ENERGY**
- Subtitle A—Keystone XL and Natural Gas Exportation**
- SEC. 111. KEYSTONE XL PERMIT APPROVAL.**
- (a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (delegating to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations), Trans-Canada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. is authorized to construct, connect, operate, and maintain pipeline facilities for the import of crude oil and other hydrocarbons at the United States-Canada Border at Phillips County, Montana, in accordance with the application filed with the Department of State on May 4, 2012.
- (b) **PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT NOT REQUIRED.**—Notwithstanding Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and any other Executive order or provision of law, no presidential permit shall be required for the facilities described in subsection (a).
- (c) **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The final environmental impact statement issued by the Secretary of State on August 26, 2011, the Final Evaluation Report issued by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality on January 3, 2013, and the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued on March 1, 2013, regarding the crude oil pipeline and appurtenant facilities associated with the facilities described in subsection (a), shall be considered to satisfy—
- (1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and
- (2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review with respect to the facilities described in subsection (a) and the related facilities in the United States.
- (d) **PERMITS.**—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States shall remain in effect.
- (e) **FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—The facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this section, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.
- SEC. 112. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO UKRAINE AND NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES AND JAPAN.**
- (a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (delegating to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations), Congress finds that exports of natural gas produced in the United States to Ukraine, member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and Japan is—

(1) necessary for the protection of the essential security interests of the United States; and

(2) in the public interest pursuant to section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

(b) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by inserting “, to Ukraine, to a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or to Japan” after “trade in natural gas”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Saving Coal Jobs

SEC. 120. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Saving Coal Jobs Act of 2014”.

PART I—PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX

SEC. 121. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, “The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in cardiovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.”;

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, “children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor”;

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and

children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

PART II—PERMITS

SEC. 131. NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) GUIDANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘guidance’ means draft, interim, or final guidance issued by the Administrator.

“(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘guidance’ includes—

“(I) the comprehensive guidance issued by the Administrator and dated April 1, 2010;

“(II) the proposed guidance entitled ‘Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act’ and dated April 28, 2011;

“(III) the final guidance proposed by the Administrator and dated July 21, 2011; and

“(IV) any other document or paper issued by the Administrator through any process other than the notice and comment rule-making process.

“(B) NEW PERMIT.—The term ‘new permit’ means a permit covering discharges from a structure—

“(i) that is issued under this section by a permitting authority; and

“(ii) for which an application is—

“(I) pending as of the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(II) filed on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(C) PERMITTING AUTHORITY.—The term ‘permitting authority’ means—

“(i) the Administrator; or

“(ii) a State, acting pursuant to a State program that is equivalent to the program under this section and approved by the Administrator.

“(2) PERMITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making a determination whether to approve a new permit or a renewed permit, the permitting authority—

(i) shall base the determination only on compliance with regulations issued by the Administrator or the permitting authority; and

(ii) shall not base the determination on the extent of adherence of the applicant for the new permit or renewed permit to guidance.

(B) NEW PERMITS.—If the permitting authority does not approve or deny an application for a new permit by the date that is 270 days after the date of receipt of the application for the new permit, the applicant may operate as if the application were approved in accordance with Federal law for the period of time for which a permit from the same industry would be approved.

(C) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETENESS.—In determining whether an application for a new permit or a renewed permit received under

this paragraph is substantially complete, the permitting authority shall use standards for determining substantial completeness of similar permits for similar facilities submitted in fiscal year 2007.”.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time after the promulgation of the guidelines required by section 304(a)(2), the Governor of each State desiring to administer a permit program for discharges into navigable waters within the jurisdiction of the State may submit to the Administrator—

(A) a full and complete description of the program the State proposes to establish and administer under State law or under an interstate compact; and

(B) a statement from the attorney general (or the attorney for those State water pollution control agencies that have independent legal counsel), or from the chief legal officer in the case of an interstate agency, that the laws of the State, or the interstate compact, as applicable, provide adequate authority to carry out the described program.

(2) APPROVAL.—The Administrator shall approve each program for which a description is submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator determines that adequate authority does not exist—

(A) to issue permits that—

(i) apply, and ensure compliance with, any applicable requirements of sections 301, 302, 306, 307, and 403;

(ii) are for fixed terms not exceeding 5 years;

(iii) can be terminated or modified for cause, including—

(I) a violation of any condition of the permit;

(II) obtaining a permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully all relevant facts; and

(III) a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the permitted discharge; and

(iv) control the disposal of pollutants into wells;

(B)(i) to issue permits that apply, and ensure compliance with, all applicable requirements of section 308; or

(ii) to inspect, monitor, enter, and require reports to at least the same extent as required in section 308;

(C) to ensure that the public, and any other State the waters of which may be affected, receives notice of each application for a permit and an opportunity for a public hearing before a ruling on each application;

(D) to ensure that the Administrator receives notice and a copy of each application for a permit;

(E) to ensure that any State (other than the permitting State), whose waters may be affected by the issuance of a permit may submit written recommendations to the permitting State and the Administrator with respect to any permit application and, if any part of the written recommendations are not accepted by the permitting State, that the permitting State will notify the affected State and the Administrator in writing of the failure of the State to accept the recommendations, including the reasons for not accepting the recommendations;

(F) to ensure that no permit will be issued if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, anchorage and navigation of

any of the navigable waters would be substantially impaired by the issuance of the permit;

“(G) to abate violations of the permit or the permit program, including civil and criminal penalties and other means of enforcement;

“(H) to ensure that any permit for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works includes conditions to require the identification in terms of character and volume of pollutants of any significant source introducing pollutants subject to pretreatment standards under section 307(b) into the treatment works and a program to ensure compliance with those pretreatment standards by each source, in addition to adequate notice, which shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent to be introduced into the treatment works and any anticipated impact of the change in the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the publicly owned treatment works, to the permitting agency of—

“(i) new introductions into the treatment works of pollutants from any source that would be a new source (as defined in section 306(a)) if the source were discharging pollutants;

“(ii) new introductions of pollutants into the treatment works from a source that would be subject to section 301 if the source were discharging those pollutants; or

“(iii) a substantial change in volume or character of pollutants being introduced into the treatment works by a source introducing pollutants into the treatment works at the time of issuance of the permit; and

“(I) to ensure that any industrial user of any publicly owned treatment works will comply with sections 204(b), 307, and 308.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a program under this subsection on the basis of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(II) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(ii) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”.

(B) Section 402(m) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(m)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “subsection (b)(8) of this section” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(H)”.

(c) SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM.—Section 402(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) LIMITATION ON DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (3), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a State program under subsection (b) on the basis of the failure of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the

State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”

(d) NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 402(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)” and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) OBJECTION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), no permit shall issue if—

“(i) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator receives notification under subsection (b)(2)(E), the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit; or

“(ii) not later than 90 days after the date on which the proposed permit of the State is transmitted to the Administrator, the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit as being outside the guidelines and requirements of this Act.”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Whenever the Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator shall not object to or deny the issuance of a permit by a State under subsection (b) or (s) based on the following:

“(i) Guidance, as that term is defined in subsection (s)(1).

“(ii) The interpretation of the Administrator of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”

SEC. 132. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through “SEC. 404. (a) The Secretary may issue” and inserting the following:

“**SEC. 404. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.**

“(a) PERMITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue”; and

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—

“(A) PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, as appropriate, is required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Secretary shall—

“(I) begin the process not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a permit application; and

“(II) approve or deny an application for a permit under this subsection not later than the latter of—

“(aa) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a finding of no significant impact, the date on which the finding of no significant impact is issued; or

“(bb) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a record of decision, 15 days after the date on which the record of decision on an environmental impact statement is issued.

“(ii) PROCESSES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), regardless of whether the Secretary has commenced an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement by the date described in clause (i)(I), the following deadlines shall apply:

“(I) An environmental assessment carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be

completed not later than 1 year after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(II) An environmental impact statement carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to act by the deadline specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the application, and the permit requested in the application, shall be considered to be approved;

“(ii) the Secretary shall issue a permit to the applicant; and

“(iii) the permit shall not be subject to judicial review.”

(b) STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4), until the Secretary has issued a permit under this section, the Administrator is authorized to prohibit the specification (including the withdrawal of specification) of any defined area as a disposal site, and deny or restrict the use of any defined area for specification (including the withdrawal of specification) as a disposal site, if the Administrator determines, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, that the discharge of the materials into the area will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds or fishery areas (including spawning and breeding areas), wildlife, or recreational areas.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—Before making a determination under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary.

“(3) FINDINGS.—The Administrator shall set forth in writing and make public the findings of the Administrator and the reasons of the Administrator for making any determination under this subsection.

“(4) AUTHORITY OF STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—This subsection shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the determination of the Administrator that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).”

(c) STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 404(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “for the discharge” and inserting “for all or part of the discharges”.

SEC. 133. IMPACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term “covered action” means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term “more than a de minimis negative impact” means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs, except that any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than \$1,000,000 over any calendar year, except that any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

(b) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) **ANALYSIS.**—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall use the best available economic models.

(B) **ANNUAL GAO REPORT.**—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post the analysis in the Capitol of the State.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents.

(B) **PRIORITY.**—In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(d) **NOTIFICATION.**—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the congressional delegation, Governor, and legislature of the State at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

SEC. 134. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not—

(1) finalize, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled “EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act” (EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); and

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), any successor document, or any substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) **RULES.**—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any successor

document or substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacating the rule.

SEC. 135. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO MODIFY STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) **STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.**—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking “(4) The” and inserting the following:

“(4) **PROMULGATION OF REVISED OR NEW STANDARDS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The”;

(3) by striking “The Administrator shall promulgate” and inserting the following:

“(B) **DEADLINE.**—The Administrator shall promulgate;” and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Administrator may not promulgate a revised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the determination of the Administrator that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.”.

(b) **FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.**—Section 401(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) **STATE OR INTERSTATE AGENCY DETERMINATION.**—With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point at which the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.”.

SEC. 136. STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State shall submit to the Administrator from time to time, with the first such submission not later than 180 days after the date of publication of the first identification of pollutants under section 304(a)(2)(D), the waters identified and the loads established under subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1).

“(B) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission, the Administrator shall approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load.

“(ii) **APPROVAL.**—If the Administrator approves the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the State shall incorporate the identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(iii) **DISAPPROVAL.**—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the Administrator shall submit, not later than 30 days after the date that the Administrator announces the disagreement of the

Administrator with the submission of the State, to the State the written recommendation of the Administrator of those additional waters that the Administrator identifies and such loads for such waters as the Administrator believes are necessary to implement the water quality standards applicable to the waters.

“(C) **ACTION BY STATE.**—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the recommendation of the Administrator, the State shall—

“(i) disregard the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its own identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e);

“(ii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its identification and load as amended by the recommendation of the Administrator into the current plan of the State under subsection (e); or

“(iii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in part, identifying certain additional waters and certain additional loads proposed by the Administrator to be added to the State’s identification and load and incorporate the State’s identification and load as amended into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(D) NONCOMPLIANCE BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Administrator fails to approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load within the time specified in this subsection—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(ii) **RECOMMENDATIONS NOT SUBMITTED.**—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load of the State but fails to submit the written recommendation of the Administrator to the State within 30 days as required by subparagraph (B)(iii)—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(E) **APPLICATION.**—This section shall apply to any decision made by the Administrator under this subsection issued on or after March 1, 2013.”.

Subtitle C—Point of Order Against Taxes on Carbon

SEC. 141. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) **WAIVER.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths 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 subsection (a).

Subtitle D—Employment Analysis Requirements Under the Clean Air Act

SEC. 151. ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not propose or finalize any major rule (as defined in section 804

of title 5, United States Code) under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) until after the date on which the Administrator—

(1) completes an economy-wide analysis capturing the costs and cascading effects across industry sectors and markets in the United States of the implementation of major rules promulgated under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); and

(2) establishes a process to update that analysis not less frequently than semiannually, so as to provide for the continuing evaluation of potential loss or shifts in employment, pursuant to section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)), that may result from the implementation of major rules under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

TITLE II—HEALTH

SEC. 201. FORTY HOURS IS FULL TIME.

(a) DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(E), by striking “by 120” and inserting “by 174”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “30 hours” and inserting “40 hours”.

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

SEC. 202. REPEAL OF THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

Section 1501 and subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 10106 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (and the amendments made by such sections and subsections) are repealed and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if such provisions and amendments had never been enacted.

SEC. 203. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapter for chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item related to subchapter E.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR EMPLOYER HEALTH CARE COVERAGE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘full-time employee’ shall not include any individual who is a long-term unemployed individual with respect to such employer.

“(ii) LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘long-term unemployed individual’ means, with respect to any employer, an individual who—

“(I) begins employment with such employer after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, and

“(II) has been unemployed for 27 weeks or longer, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, immediately before the date such employment begins.”

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

SEC. 205. EMPLOYEES WITH HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 206. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TAXES, FEES, AND PENALTIES ENACTED UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

No tax, fee, or penalty imposed or enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall be implemented, administered, or enforced unless there has been a certification by the Joint Committee on Taxation that such provision would not have a direct or indirect economic impact on individuals with an annual income of less than \$200,000 or families with an annual income of less than \$250,000.

SEC. 207. REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective as of the enactment of Public Law 111-148, such Act (including any provision amended under sections 201 through 205 of this Act) is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such Act (including any provision amended under such sections) are restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted.

(b) HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.—Effective as of the enactment of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), title I and subtitle B of title II of such Act (including any provision amended under sections 201 through 205 of this Act) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such title or subtitle, respectively (including any provision amended under such sections), are restored or revived as if such title and subtitle had not been enacted.

TITLE III—INCREASING EMPLOYMENT AND DECREASING GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Subtitle A—Small Business Tax Provisions

SEC. 301. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF INCREASED EXPENSING LIMITATIONS AND TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SECTION 179 PROPERTY.

(a) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$500,000.”

(b) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (C),

(2) by striking “, and” at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a period,

(3) by striking the comma at the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting “, and”, and

(4) by inserting “beginning before 2014” after “The limitation under paragraph (1) for any taxable year”.

(c) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Section 179(d)(1)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and before 2014”.

(d) ELECTION.—Section 179(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and before 2014”.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 179(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013” and inserting “beginning after 2009”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4).

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

SEC. 302. PERMANENT FULL EXCLUSION APPLICABLE TO QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 1202(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and before January 1, 2014”, and

(2) by striking “CERTAIN PERIODS IN 2010, 2011, 2012, AND 2013” in the heading and inserting “CERTAIN PERIODS AFTER 2009”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for section 1202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “PARTIAL”.

(2) The item relating to section 1202 in the table of sections for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking “Partial exclusion” and inserting “Exclusion”.

(3) Section 1223(13) of such Code is amended by striking “1202(a)(2).”

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF GROSS ASSET THRESHOLD FOR INFLATION.—Subsection (d) of section 1202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2014, the \$50,000,000 amount in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof. If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to stock acquired after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 303. PERMANENT INCREASE IN DEDUCTION FOR START-UP EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (ii) of section 195(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”, and

(2) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$60,000”.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—Paragraph (3) of section 195(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(3) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2014, the \$10,000 and \$60,000 amounts in paragraph (1)(A)(i) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof. If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000.”

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

SEC. 304. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF REDUCTION IN S-CORPORATION RECOGNITION PERIOD FOR BUILT-IN GAINS TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (7) of section 1374(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “10-year” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “5-year”,

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively, and

(3) by striking “593(e)—” and all that follows in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, and inserting “593(e), subparagraph (A) shall be applied without regard to the phrase ‘5-year’.”

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

SEC. 305. PERMANENT ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS IN COMPUTING SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “beginning before January 1, 2010” and all that follows and inserting “beginning—

“(A) before January 1, 2010, or

“(B) after December 31, 2010, and before January 1, 2013.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF INVENTORY AND ACCOUNTING RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) CASH ACCOUNTING PERMITTED.—Section 446 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYERS PERMITTED TO USE CASH ACCOUNTING METHOD WITHOUT LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an eligible taxpayer who uses the cash receipts and disbursements method for any taxable year, such method shall be deemed to clearly reflect income and the taxpayer shall not be required to use an accrual method.

“(2) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, a taxpayer is an eligible taxpayer with respect to any taxable year if—

“(A) for all prior taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013, the taxpayer (or any predecessor) met the gross receipts test of section 448(c) (determined by substituting ‘\$10,000,000’ for ‘\$5,000,000’ each place it appears), and

“(B) the taxpayer is not subject to section 447 or 448.”

(b) INVENTORY RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 471 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYERS NOT REQUIRED TO USE INVENTORIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A qualified taxpayer shall not be required to use inventories under this section for a taxable year.

“(2) TREATMENT OF TAXPAYERS NOT USING INVENTORIES.—If a qualified taxpayer does

not use inventories with respect to any property for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, such property shall be treated as a material or supply which is not incidental.

“(3) QUALIFIED TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified taxpayer’ means—

“(A) any eligible taxpayer (as defined in section 446(g)(2)), and

“(B) any taxpayer described in section 448(b)(3) (determined by substituting ‘\$10,000,000’ for ‘\$5,000,000’ each place it appears in subsections (b) and (c) of section 448).”

(2) INCREASED ELIGIBILITY FOR SIMPLIFIED DOLLAR-VALUE LIFO METHOD.—Section 474(c) of such Code is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 263A of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) EXCLUSION FROM INVENTORY RULES.—Nothing in this section shall require the use of inventories for any taxable year by a qualified taxpayer (within the meaning of section 471(c)) who is not required to use inventories under section 471 for such taxable year.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer changing the taxpayer’s method of accounting for any taxable year under the amendments made by this section—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer; and

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Subtitle B—Regulatory Accountability Act

SEC. 311. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Regulatory Accountability Act of 2014”.

SEC. 312. DEFINITIONS.

Section 551 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) ‘guidance’ means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect, other than a regulatory action, that sets forth a policy on a statutory, regulatory or technical issue or an interpretation of a statutory or regulatory issue;

“(16) ‘high-impact rule’ means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose an annual cost on the economy of \$1,000,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

“(17) ‘Information Quality Act’ means section 515 of Public Law 106-554, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001, and guidelines issued by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs or other agencies under that Act;

“(18) ‘major guidance’ means guidance that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs finds is likely to lead to—

“(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity,

innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

“(19) ‘major rule’ means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose—

“(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local, or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; and

“(20) ‘Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs’ means the office established under section 3503 of chapter 35 of title 44 and any successor to that office.”

SEC. 313. RULE MAKING.

Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) This section applies” and inserting “(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies”; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(b) RULE MAKING CONSIDERATIONS.—In a rule making, an agency shall make all preliminary and final determinations based on evidence and consider, in addition to other applicable considerations, the following:

“(1) The legal authority under which a rule may be proposed, including whether a rule making is required by statute, and if so, whether by a specific date, or whether the agency has discretion to commence a rule making.

“(2) Other statutory considerations applicable to whether the agency can or should propose a rule or undertake other agency action.

“(3) The specific nature and significance of the problem the agency may address with a rule (including the degree and nature of risks the problem poses and the priority of addressing those risks compared to other matters or activities within the jurisdiction of the agency), whether the problem warrants new agency action, and the countervailing risks that may be posed by alternatives for new agency action.

“(4) Whether existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency may address with a rule and whether those rules could be amended or rescinded to address the problem in whole or part.

“(5) Any reasonable alternatives for a new rule or other response identified by the agency or interested persons, including not only responses that mandate particular conduct or manners of compliance, but also—

“(A) the alternative of no Federal response;

“(B) amending or rescinding existing rules;

“(C) potential regional, State, local, or tribal regulatory action or other responses that could be taken instead of agency action; and

“(D) potential responses that—

“(i) specify performance objectives rather than conduct or manners of compliance;

“(ii) establish economic incentives to encourage desired behavior;

“(iii) provide information upon which choices can be made by the public; or

“(iv) incorporate other innovative alternatives rather than agency actions that specify conduct or manners of compliance.

“(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(A) the potential costs and benefits associated with potential alternative rules and other responses considered under paragraph (5), including direct, indirect, and cumulative costs and benefits and estimated impacts on jobs, economic growth, innovation, and economic competitiveness;

“(B) the means to increase the cost-effectiveness of any Federal response; and

“(C) incentives for innovation, consistency, predictability, lower costs of enforcement and compliance (to government entities, regulated entities, and the public), and flexibility.

“(C) ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING FOR MAJOR RULES AND HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—

“(1) In the case of a rule making for a major rule or high-impact rule, not later than 90 days before a notice of proposed rule making is published in the Federal Register, an agency shall publish advance notice of proposed rule making in the Federal Register.

“(2) In publishing advance notice under paragraph (1), the agency shall—

“(A) include a written statement identifying, at a minimum—

“(i) the nature and significance of the problem the agency may address with a rule, including data and other evidence and information on which the agency expects to rely for the proposed rule;

“(ii) the legal authority under which a rule may be proposed, including whether a rule making is required by statute, and if so, whether by a specific date, or whether the agency has discretion to commence a rule making; and

“(iii) preliminary information available to the agency concerning the other considerations specified in subsection (b);

“(B) solicit written data, views or arguments from interested persons concerning the information and issues addressed in the advance notice; and

“(C) provide for a period of not fewer than 60 days for interested persons to submit such written data, views, or arguments to the agency.

“(d) NOTICES OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING; DETERMINATIONS OF OTHER AGENCY COURSE.— Following completion of procedures under subsection (c), if applicable, and consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the agency shall publish either a notice of proposed rule making or a determination of other agency course, in accordance with the following:

“(1) A notice of proposed rule making shall include—

“(A) a statement of the time, place, and nature of public rule making proceedings;

“(B) reference to the legal authority under which the rule is proposed;

“(C) the terms of the proposed rule;

“(D) a description of information known to the agency on the subject and issues of the proposed rule, including—

“(i) a summary of information known to the agency concerning the considerations specified in subsection (b);

“(ii) a summary of additional information the agency provided to and obtained from interested persons under subsection (c); and

“(iii) information specifically identifying all data, studies, models, and other evidence or information considered or used by the agency in connection with the determination by the agency to propose the rule;

“(E)(i) a reasoned preliminary determination of need for the rule based on the information described under subparagraph (D); and

“(ii) an additional statement of whether a rule is required by statute;

“(F) a reasoned preliminary determination that the benefits of the proposed rule meet the relevant statutory objectives and justify the costs of the proposed rule, including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6), based on the information described under subparagraph (D);

“(G) a discussion of—

“(i) the alternatives to the proposed rule, and other alternative responses, considered by the agency under subsection (b);

“(ii) the costs and benefits of those alternatives, including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6);

“(iii) whether those alternatives meet relevant statutory objectives; and

“(iv) why the agency did not propose any of those alternatives; and

“(H)(i) a statement of whether existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the proposed rule; and

“(ii) if so, whether or not the agency proposes to amend or rescind any such rules, and why.

All information considered by the agency, and actions to obtain information by the agency, in connection with its determination to propose the rule, including all information described by the agency under subparagraph (D) and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the proposed rule and made accessible to the public for the public's use when the notice of proposed rule making is published.

“(2)(A) A notice of determination of other agency course shall include a description of the alternative response the agency determined to adopt.

“(B) If in its determination of other agency course the agency makes a determination to amend or rescind an existing rule, the agency need not undertake additional proceedings under subsection (c) before the agency publishes a notice of proposed rule making to amend or rescind the existing rule.

All information considered by the agency, and actions to obtain information by the agency, in connection with its determination of other agency course, including the information specified under paragraph (1)(D) and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the determination and made accessible to the public for the public's use when the notice of determination is published.

“(3) After notice of proposed rule making required by this section, the agency shall provide interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making through submission of written data, views, or arguments with or without opportunity for oral presentation, except that—

“(A) if a hearing is required under paragraph (4)(B) or subsection (e), reasonable opportunity for oral presentation shall be provided under that requirement; or

“(B) when other than under subsection (e) rules are required by statute or at the discretion of the agency to be made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, sections 556 and 557 shall apply, and paragraph (4), requirements of subsection (e) to receive comment outside of the procedures of sections 556 and 557, and the petition procedures of subsection (e)(6) shall not apply.

The agency shall provide not fewer than 90 days for interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments (or 120 days in the case of a proposed major rule or high-impact rule).

“(4)(A) Within 30 days after publication of notice of proposed rule making, a member of the public may petition for a hearing in accordance with section 556 to determine whether any evidence or other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule fails to comply with of the Information Quality Act.

“(B)(i) The agency may, upon review of the petition, determine without further process to exclude from the rule making the evidence or other information that is the subject of the petition and, if appropriate, withdraw the proposed rule. The agency shall promptly publish any such determination.

“(ii) If the agency does not resolve the petition under the procedures of clause (i), it shall grant any such petition that presents a prima facie case that evidence or other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule fails to comply with the Information Quality Act, hold the requested hearing not later than 30 days after receipt of the petition, provide for a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination at the hearing, and decide the issues presented by the petition not later than 60 days after receipt of the petition. The agency may deny any petition that it determines does not present such a prima facie case.

“(C) There shall be no judicial review of the agency's disposition of issues considered and decided or determined under subparagraph (B)(i) until judicial review of the agency's final action. There shall be no judicial review of an agency's determination to withdraw a proposed rule under subparagraph (B)(i).

“(D) Failure to petition for a hearing under this paragraph shall not preclude judicial review of any claim based on the Information Quality Act under chapter 7 of this title.

“(e) HEARINGS FOR HIGH-IMPACT RULES.— Following notice of a proposed rule making, receipt of comments on the proposed rule, and any hearing held under subsection (d)(4), and before adoption of any high-impact rule, the agency shall hold a hearing in accordance with sections 556 and 557, unless such hearing is waived by all participants in the rule making other than the agency. The agency shall provide a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination at such hearing. The hearing shall be limited to the following issues of fact, except that participants at the hearing other than the agency may waive determination of any such issue:

“(1) Whether the agency's asserted factual predicate for the rule is supported by the evidence.

“(2) Whether there is an alternative to the proposed rule that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at a lower cost (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) than the proposed rule.

“(3) If there is more than one alternative to the proposed rule that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at a lower cost than the proposed rule, which alternative would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at the lowest cost.

“(4) If the agency proposes to adopt a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)), whether the additional benefits of the more costly rule exceed the additional costs of the more costly rule.

“(5) Whether the evidence and other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule meets the requirements of the Information Quality Act.

“(6) Upon petition by an interested person who has participated in the rule making,

other issues relevant to the rule making, unless the agency determines that consideration of the issues at the hearing would not advance consideration of the rule or would, in light of the nature of the need for agency action, unreasonably delay completion of the rule making. An agency shall grant or deny a petition under this paragraph within 30 days after the receipt of the petition.

No later than 45 days before any hearing held under this subsection or sections 556 and 557, the agency shall publish in the Federal Register a notice specifying the proposed rule to be considered at such hearing, the issues to be considered at the hearing, and the time and place for such hearing, except that such notice may be issued not later than 15 days before a hearing held under subsection (d)(4)(B).

“(f) FINAL RULES.—(1) The agency shall adopt a rule only following consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to facilitate compliance with applicable rule making requirements.

“(2) The agency shall adopt a rule only on the basis of the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other evidence and information concerning the need for and consequences of the rule.

“(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the agency shall adopt the least costly rule considered during the rule making (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) that meets relevant statutory objectives.

“(B) The agency may adopt a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives only if—

“(i) the additional benefits of the more costly rule justify its additional costs; and

“(ii) the agency explains its reason for doing so based on interests of public health, safety or welfare (including protection of the environment) that are clearly within the scope of the statutory provision authorizing the rule.

“(4)(A) When the agency adopts a final rule, the agency shall publish a notice of final rule making. The notice shall include—

“(i) a concise, general statement of the rule’s basis and purpose;

“(ii) the agency’s reasoned final determination of need for a rule to address the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule, including a statement of whether a rule is required by statute;

“(iii) the agency’s reasoned final determination that the benefits of the rule meet the relevant statutory objectives and justify the rule’s costs (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6));

“(iv) the agency’s reasoned final determination not to adopt any of the alternatives to the proposed rule considered by the agency during the rule making, including—

“(I) the agency’s reasoned final determination that no alternative considered achieved the relevant statutory objectives with lower costs (including costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) than the rule; or

“(II) the agency’s reasoned final determination that its adoption of a more costly rule complies with paragraph (3)(B);

“(v) the agency’s reasoned final determination—

“(I) that existing rules have not created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule; or

“(II) that existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule, and, if so—

“(aa) why amendment or rescission of such existing rules is not alone sufficient to respond to the problem; and

“(bb) whether and how the agency intends to amend or rescind the existing rule separate from adoption of the rule;

“(vi) the agency’s reasoned final determination that the evidence and other information upon which the agency bases the rule complies with of the Information Quality Act; and

“(vii) for any major rule or high-impact rule, the agency’s plan for review of the rule no less frequently than every 10 years to determine whether, based upon evidence, there remains a need for the rule, whether the rule is in fact achieving statutory objectives, whether the rule’s benefits continue to justify its costs, and whether the rule can be modified or rescinded to reduce costs while continuing to achieve statutory objectives.

“(B) Review of a rule under a plan required by paragraph (4)(G) shall take into account the factors and criteria set forth in subsections (b) through (e) and this subsection.

“(C) All information considered by the agency in connection with its adoption of the rule, and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the rule and made accessible to the public for the public’s use not later than the date on which the rule is adopted.

“(g) EXCEPTIONS FROM NOTICE AND HEARING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Except when notice or hearing is required by statute, subsections (c) through (e) of this section do not apply to interpretive rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice.

“(2)(A) When the agency for good cause, based upon evidence, finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of this section before the issuance of an interim rule is impracticable or contrary to the public interest, including interests of national security, such subsections or requirements to render final determinations shall not apply to the agency’s adoption of an interim rule.

“(B) If, following compliance with subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the agency adopts an interim rule, it shall commence proceedings that comply fully with subsections (c) through (f) of this section immediately upon publication of the interim rule. No less than 270 days from publication of the interim rule (or 18 months in the case of a major rule or high-impact rule), the agency shall complete rule making under subsections (c) through (f) of this subsection and take final action to adopt a final rule or rescind the interim rule. If the agency fails to take timely final action, the interim rule shall cease to have the effect of law.

“(C) Other than in cases involving interests of national security, upon the agency’s publication of an interim rule without compliance with subsections (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of this section, an interested party may seek immediate judicial review under chapter 7 of this title of the agency’s determination to adopt such interim rule. The record on such review shall include all documents and information considered by the agency and any additional information presented by a party that the court determines necessary to consider to assure justice.

“(h) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR HEARINGS.—When a hearing is required under subsection (e) or is otherwise required by statute or at the agency’s discretion before adoption of a rule, the agency shall comply with the requirements of sections 556 and 557 in

addition to the requirements of subsection (f) in adopting the rule and in providing notice of the rule’s adoption.

“(i) DATE OF PUBLICATION OF RULE.—The required publication or service of a substantive final or interim rule shall be made not less than 30 days before the effective date of the rule, except—

“(1) a substantive rule which grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction;

“(2) interpretive rules and statements of policy; or

“(3) as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule.

“(j) RIGHT TO PETITION.—Each agency shall give an interested person the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.

“(k) RULE MAKING GUIDELINES.—(1)(A) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall have authority to establish guidelines for the assessment, including quantitative and qualitative assessment, of the costs and benefits of potential, proposed, and final rules and other economic issues or issues related to risk that are relevant to rule making under this section and other sections of this title. The rigor of cost-benefit analysis required by such guidelines shall be commensurate, in the Administrator’s determination, with the economic impact of the rule.

“(B) To ensure that agencies use the best available techniques to quantify and evaluate anticipated present and future benefits, costs, other economic issues, and risks as accurately as possible, the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall regularly update guidelines established under subparagraph (A).

“(2) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall also have authority to issue guidelines to promote coordination, simplification and harmonization of agency rules during the rule making process and otherwise. Such guidelines shall assure that each agency avoids regulations that are inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, its other regulations and those of other Federal agencies and drafts its regulations to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.

“(3)(A) To ensure consistency in Federal rule making, the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall—

“(i) issue guidelines and otherwise take action to ensure that rule makings conducted in whole or in part under procedures specified in provisions of law other than those under this subchapter conform to the fullest extent allowed by law with the procedures set forth in this section; and

“(ii) issue guidelines for the conduct of hearings under subsections (d)(4) and (e), including to assure a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination.

“(B) Each agency shall adopt regulations for the conduct of hearings consistent with the guidelines issued under this subparagraph.

“(4) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall issue guidelines under the Information Quality Act to apply in rule making proceedings under this section and sections 556 and 557. In all cases, the guidelines, and the Administrator’s specific determinations regarding agency compliance with the guidelines, shall be entitled to judicial deference.

“(l) RECORD.—The agency shall include in the record for a rule making all documents and information considered by the agency

during the proceeding, including, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, documents and information communicated by that Office during consultation with the agency.

“(m) EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY.—Nothing in subsection (b)(6), subparagraph (F) through (G) of subsection (d)(1), subsection (e), subsection (f)(3), or clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (f)(4)(A) shall apply to rule makings that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.”.

SEC. 314. AGENCY GUIDANCE; PROCEDURES TO ISSUE MAJOR GUIDANCE; PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO ISSUE GUIDELINES FOR ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 553 the following:

“§ 553a. Agency guidance; procedures to issue major guidance; authority to issue guidelines for issuance of guidance

“(a) Before issuing any major guidance, an agency shall—

“(1) make and document a reasoned determination that—

“(A) assures that such guidance is understandable and complies with relevant statutory objectives and regulatory provisions;

“(B) identifies the costs and benefits (including all costs to be considered during the rule making under section 553(b) of this title) of conduct conforming to such guidance and assures that such benefits justify such costs; and

“(C) describes alternatives to such guidance and their costs and benefits (including all costs to be considered during rule making under section 553(b) of this title) and explains why the agency rejected those alternatives; and

“(2) confer with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs on the issuance of such guidance to assure that the guidance is reasonable, understandable, consistent with relevant statutory and regulatory provisions and requirements or practices of other agencies, does not produce costs that are unjustified by the guidance's benefits, and is otherwise appropriate.

“(b) AGENCY GUIDANCE.—

“(1) is not legally binding and may not be relied upon by an agency as legal grounds for agency action;

“(2) shall state in a plain, prominent and permanent manner that it is not legally binding; and

“(3) shall, at the time it is issued or upon request, be made available by the issuing agency to interested persons and the public.

“(c) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall have authority to issue guidelines for use by the agencies in the issuance of major guidance and other guidance. Such guidelines shall assure that each agency avoids issuing guidance documents that are inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, its other regulations and those of other Federal agencies and drafts its guidance documents to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 553 the following:

“553a. Agency guidance; procedures to issue major guidance; presidential authority to issue guidelines for issuance of guidance.”.

SEC. 315. HEARINGS; PRESIDING EMPLOYEES; POWERS AND DUTIES; BURDEN OF PROOF; EVIDENCE; RECORD AS BASIS OF DECISION.

Section 556 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e)(1) The transcript of testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, constitutes the exclusive record for decision in accordance with section 557 and, on payment of lawfully prescribed costs, shall be made available to the parties. When an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, in a proceeding held under this section under section 553(d)(4) or 553(e), the record for decision shall include any information that is part of the record of proceedings under section 553.

“(f) When an agency conducts rule making under this section and section 557 directly after concluding proceedings upon an advance notice of proposed rule making under section 553(c), the matters to be considered and determinations to be made shall include, among other relevant matters and determinations, the matters and determinations described in subsections (b) and (f) of section 553.

“(g)(1) Upon receipt of a petition for a hearing under this section, the agency shall grant the petition in the case of any major rule, unless the agency reasonably determines that a hearing would not advance consideration of the rule or would, in light of the need for agency action, unreasonably delay completion of the rule making. The agency shall publish its decision to grant or deny the petition when it renders the decision, including an explanation of the grounds for decision. The information contained in the petition shall in all cases be included in the administrative record.

“(2) This subsection shall not apply to rule makings that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.”.

SEC. 316. ACTIONS REVIEWABLE.

Section 704 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Agency action made” and inserting “(a) Agency action made”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b)(1) Except as provided under paragraph (2) and notwithstanding subsection (a), upon the agency's publication of an interim rule without compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 553 or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of section 553, an interested party may seek immediate judicial review under this chapter of the agency's determination to adopt such rule on an interim basis. Review shall be limited to whether the agency abused its discretion to adopt the interim rule without compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 553 or without rendering final determinations under subsection (f) of section 553.

“(2) This subsection shall not apply in cases involving interests of national security.

“(c) For rules other than major rules and high-impact rules, compliance with subsection (b)(6), subparagraphs (F) through (G) of subsection (d)(1), subsection (f)(3), and clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (f)(4)(A) of section 553 shall not be subject to judicial review. In all cases, the determination that a rule is not a major rule within the meaning of section 551(19)(A) or a high-impact rule shall be subject to judicial review under section 706(a)(2)(A).

“(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit judicial review of an agency's consideration of costs or benefits as a mandatory or discretionary factor under the statute authorizing the rule or any other applicable statute.”.

SEC. 317. SCOPE OF REVIEW.

Section 706 of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking “To the extent necessary” and inserting “(a) To the extent necessary”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A) of subsection (a) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section), by inserting after “in accordance with law” the following: “(including the Information Quality Act as defined under section 551(17))”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) The court shall not defer to the agency's—

“(1) interpretation of an agency rule if the agency did not comply with the procedures of section 553 or sections 556 and 557 to issue the interpretation;

“(2) determination of the costs and benefits or other economic or risk assessment of the regulatory action, if the agency failed to conform to guidelines on such determinations and assessments established by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs under section 553(k); or

“(3) determinations under interlocutory review under sections 553(g)(2)(C) and 704(2).

“(c) The court shall review agency denials of petitions under section 553(e)(6) or any other petition for a hearing under sections 556 and 557 for abuse of agency discretion.”.

SEC. 318. ADDED DEFINITION.

Section 701(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end, and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ‘substantial evidence’ means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion in light of the record considered as a whole, taking into account whatever in the record fairly detracts from the weight of the evidence relied upon by the agency to support its decision.”.

SEC. 319. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title to—

(1) sections 553, 556, and 704 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) section 701(b) of title 5, United States Code;

(3) paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 706(b) of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) section 706(c) of title 5, United States Code,

shall not apply to any rule makings pending or completed on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFELONG SKILLS

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act” or the “SKILLS Act”.

SEC. 402. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

SEC. 403. APPLICATION TO FISCAL YEARS.

Except as otherwise provided, this title and the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2015 and succeeding fiscal years.

Subtitle A—Amendments to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998

CHAPTER 1—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT DEFINITIONS

SEC. 406. DEFINITIONS.

Section 101 (29 U.S.C. 2801) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.**—The term ‘adult education and family literacy education activities’ has the meaning given the term in section 203.”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (13) and (24);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (12) as paragraphs (3) through (14), and paragraphs (14) through (23) as paragraphs (15) through (24), respectively;

(4) by striking paragraphs (52) and (53);

(5) by inserting after “In this title:” the following new paragraphs:

“(1) **ACCRUED EXPENDITURES.**—The term ‘accrued expenditures’ means—

“(A) charges incurred by recipients of funds under this title for a given period requiring the provision of funds for goods or other tangible property received;

“(B) charges incurred for services performed by employees, contractors, subgrantees, subcontractors, and other payees; and

“(C) other amounts becoming owed, under programs assisted under this title, for which no current services or performance is required, such as amounts for annuities, insurance claims, and other benefit payments.

“(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The term ‘administrative costs’ means expenditures incurred by State boards and local boards, direct recipients (including State grant recipients under subtitle B and recipients of awards under subtitles C and D), local grant recipients, local fiscal agents or local grant subrecipients, and one-stop operators in the performance of administrative functions and in carrying out activities under this title that are not related to the direct provision of workforce investment activities (including services to participants and employers). Such costs include both personnel and non-personnel expenditures and both direct and indirect expenditures.”;

(6) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “Except in sections 127 and 132, the” and inserting “The”;

(7) by amending paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

“(5) **AREA CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.**—The term ‘area career and technical education school’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3)).”;

(8) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by inserting “(or such other level as the Governor may establish)” after “8th grade level”;

(9) in paragraph (10)(C) (as so redesignated), by striking “not less than 50 percent of the cost of the training” and inserting “a significant portion of the cost of training, as determined by the local board involved (or, in the case of an employer in multiple local areas in the State, as determined by the Governor), taking into account the size of the employer and such other factors as the local board or Governor, respectively, determines to be appropriate”;

(10) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), by striking “section 134(c)” and inserting “section 121(e)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(i) by striking “134(d)(4)” and inserting “134(c)(4)”; and

(ii) by striking “intensive services described in section 134(d)(3)” and inserting

“work ready services described in section 134(c)(2)”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(E)(i) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (as defined in section 101(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code) who has experienced a loss of employment as a direct result of relocation to accommodate a permanent change in duty station of such member; or

“(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) who meets the criteria described in paragraph (12)(B).”;

(11) in paragraph (12)(A) (as redesignated)—

(A) by striking “and” after the semicolon and inserting “or”;

(B) by striking “(A)” and inserting “(A)(i)”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (as defined in section 101(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code) whose family income is significantly reduced because of a deployment (as defined in section 991(b) of title 10, United States Code, or pursuant to paragraph (4) of such section), a call or order to active duty pursuant to a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, a permanent change of station, or the service-connected (as defined in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code) death or disability of the member; and”;

(12) in paragraph (13) (as so redesignated), by inserting “or regional” after “local” each place it appears;

(13) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 122(e)(3)” and inserting “section 122”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B), and inserting the following:

“(B) work ready services, means a provider who is identified or awarded a contract as described in section 117(d)(5)(C); or”;

(C) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(14) in paragraph (15) (as so redesignated), by striking “adult or dislocated worker” and inserting “individual”;

(15) in paragraph (20), by striking “The” and inserting “Subject to section 116(a)(1)(E), the”;

(16) in paragraph (25)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “higher of—” and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting “poverty line for an equivalent period”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) receives or is eligible to receive a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.);”;

(17) in paragraph (32), by striking “the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia,”;

(18) by amending paragraph (33) to read as follows:

“(33) **OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.**—The term ‘out-of-school youth’ means—

“(A) an at-risk youth who is a school dropout; or

“(B) an at-risk youth who has received a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent but is basic skills deficient, unemployed, or underemployed.”;

(19) in paragraph (38), by striking “134(a)(1)(A)” and inserting “134(a)(1)(B)”;

(20) in paragraph (41), by striking “, and the term means such Secretary for purposes of section 503”;

(21) in paragraph (43), by striking “clause (iii) or (v) of section 136(b)(3)(A)” and inserting “section 136(b)(3)(A)(iii)”;

(22) by amending paragraph (49) to read as follows:

“(49) **VETERAN.**—The term ‘veteran’ has the same meaning given the term in section 2108(1) of title 5, United States Code.”;

(23) by amending paragraph (50) to read as follows:

“(50) **CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.**—The term ‘career and technical education’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).”;

(24) in paragraph (51), by striking “, and a youth activity”; and

(25) by adding at the end the following:

“(52) **AT-RISK YOUTH.**—Except as provided in subtitle C, the term ‘at-risk youth’ means an individual who—

“(A) is not less than age 16 and not more than age 24;

“(B) is a low-income individual; and

“(C) is an individual who is one or more of the following:

“(i) A secondary school dropout.

“(ii) A youth in foster care (including youth aging out of foster care).

“(iii) A youth offender.

“(iv) A youth who is an individual with a disability.

“(v) A migrant youth.

“(53) **INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP.**—The term ‘industry or sector partnership’ means a partnership of—

“(A) a State board or local board; and

“(B) one or more industry or sector organizations, and other entities, that have the capability to help the State board or local board determine the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries or sectors and other occupations important to the State or local economy, respectively.

“(54) **INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIAL.**—The term ‘industry-recognized credential’ means a credential that is sought or accepted by companies within the industry sector involved, across multiple States, as recognized, preferred, or required for recruitment, screening, or hiring and is awarded for completion of a program listed or identified under subsection (d) or (i) of section 122, for the local area involved.

“(55) **PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE CONTRACT STRATEGY.**—The term ‘pay-for-performance contract strategy’ means a strategy in which a pay-for-performance contract to provide a program of employment and training activities incorporates provisions regarding—

“(A) the core indicators of performance described in subclauses (I) through (IV) and (VI) of section 136(b)(2)(A)(i);

“(B) a fixed amount that will be paid to an eligible provider of such employment and training activities for each program participant who, within a defined timetable, achieves the agreed-to levels of performance based upon the core indicators of performance described in subparagraph (A), and may include a bonus payment to such provider, which may be used to expand the capacity of such provider;

“(C) the ability for an eligible provider to recoup the costs of providing the activities for a program participant who has not achieved those levels, but for whom the provider is able to demonstrate that such participant gained specific competencies required for education and career advancement

that are, where feasible, tied to industry-recognized credentials and related standards, or State licensing requirements; and

“(D) the ability for an eligible provider that does not meet the requirements under section 122(a)(2) to participate in such pay-for-performance contract and to not be required to report on the performance and cost information required under section 122(d).

“(56) **RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.**—The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ means a credential awarded by a provider of training services or postsecondary educational institution based on completion of all requirements for a program of study, including coursework or tests or other performance evaluations. The term means an industry-recognized credential, a certificate of completion of a registered apprenticeship program, or an associate or baccalaureate degree from an institution described in section 122(a)(2)(A)(i).

“(57) **REGISTERED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.**—The term ‘registered apprenticeship program’ means a program described in section 122(a)(2)(B).”.

CHAPTER 2—STATEWIDE AND LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEMS

SEC. 411. PURPOSE.

Section 106 (29 U.S.C. 2811) is amended by adding at the end the following: “It is also the purpose of this subtitle to provide workforce investment activities in a manner that enhances employer engagement, promotes customer choices in the selection of training services, and ensures accountability in the use of taxpayer funds.”.

SEC. 412. STATE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS.

Section 111 (29 U.S.C. 2821) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by amending clause (i)(I), by striking “section 117(b)(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “section 117(b)(2)(A)”;

(II) by amending clause (i)(II) to read as follows:

“(II) represent businesses, including large and small businesses, each of which has immediate and long-term employment opportunities in an in-demand industry or other occupation important to the State economy; and”;

(III) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) a State agency official responsible for economic development; and”;

(IV) by striking clauses (iv) through (vi);

(V) by amending clause (vii) to read as follows:

“(vii) such other representatives and State agency officials as the Governor may designate, including—

“(I) members of the State legislature;

“(II) representatives of individuals and organizations that have experience with respect to youth activities;

“(III) representatives of individuals and organizations that have experience and expertise in the delivery of workforce investment activities, including chief executive officers of community colleges and community-based organizations within the State;

“(IV) representatives of the lead State agency officials with responsibility for the programs and activities that are described in section 121(b) and carried out by one-stop partners; or

“(V) representatives of veterans service organizations.”; and

(VI) by redesignating clause (vii) (as so amended) as clause (iv); and

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) **MAJORITY.**—A $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of the members of the board shall be representatives described in paragraph (1)(B)(i).”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “(b)(1)(C)(i)” and inserting “(b)(1)(B)(i)”;

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) **FUNCTIONS.**—The State board shall assist the Governor of the State as follows:

“(1) **STATE PLAN.**—Consistent with section 112, the State board shall develop a State plan.

“(2) **STATEWIDE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM.**—The State board shall review and develop statewide policies and programs in the State in a manner that supports a comprehensive statewide workforce development system that will result in meeting the workforce needs of the State and its local areas. Such review shall include determining whether the State should consolidate additional amounts for additional activities or programs into the Workforce Investment Fund in accordance with section 501(e).

“(3) **WORKFORCE AND LABOR MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEM.**—The State board shall develop a statewide workforce and labor market information system described in section 15(e) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491-2(e)), which may include using information collected under Federal law other than this Act by the State economic development entity or a related entity in developing such system.

“(4) **EMPLOYER ENGAGEMENT.**—The State board shall develop strategies, across local areas, that meet the needs of employers and support economic growth in the State by enhancing communication, coordination, and collaboration among employers, economic development entities, and service providers.

“(5) **DESIGNATION OF LOCAL AREAS.**—The State board shall designate local areas as required under section 116.

“(6) **ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.**—The State board shall identify and disseminate information on best practices for effective operation of one-stop centers, including use of innovative business outreach, partnerships, and service delivery strategies.

“(7) **PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.**—The State board shall conduct the following program oversight:

“(A) Reviewing and approving local plans under section 118.

“(B) Ensuring the appropriate use and management of the funds provided for State employment and training activities authorized under section 134.

“(C) Preparing an annual report to the Secretary described in section 136(d).

“(8) **DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES.**—The State board shall develop and ensure continuous improvement of comprehensive State performance measures, including State adjusted levels of performance, as described under section 136(b).”;

(4) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e);

(5) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), by inserting “or participate in any action taken” after “vote”;

(6) by inserting after subsection (e) (as so redesignated), the following:

“(f) **STAFF.**—The State board may employ staff to assist in carrying out the functions described in subsection (d).”;

(7) in subsection (g), by inserting “electronic means and” after “on a regular basis through”.

SEC. 413. STATE PLAN.

Section 112 (29 U.S.C. 2822)—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “127 or”;

(B) by striking “5-year strategy” and inserting “3-year strategy”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) information describing—

“(A) the economic conditions in the State;

“(B) the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the State economy;

“(C) the knowledge and skills of the workforce in the State; and

“(D) workforce development activities (including education and training) in the State.”;

(B) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

“(7) a description of the State criteria for determining the eligibility of training services providers in accordance with section 122, including how the State will take into account the performance of providers and whether the training services relate to in-demand industries and other occupations important to the State economy.”;

(C) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8)(A) a description of the procedures that will be taken by the State to assure coordination of, and avoid duplication among, the programs and activities identified under section 501(b)(2); and

“(B) a description of and an assurance regarding common data collection and reporting processes used for the programs and activities described in subparagraph (A), which are carried out by one-stop partners, including—

“(i) an assurance that such processes use quarterly wage records for performance measures described in section 136(b)(2)(A) that are applicable to such programs or activities; or

“(ii) if such wage records are not being used for the performance measures, an identification of the barriers to using such wage records and a description of how the State will address such barriers within 1 year of the approval of the plan.”;

(D) in paragraph (9), by striking “, including comment by representatives of businesses and representatives of labor organizations.”;

(E) in paragraph (11), by striking “under sections 127 and 132” and inserting “under section 132”;

(F) by striking paragraph (12);

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (18) as paragraphs (12) through (17), respectively;

(H) in paragraph (12) (as so redesignated), by striking “111(f)” and inserting “111(e)”;

(I) in paragraph (13) (as so redesignated), by striking “134(c)” and inserting “121(e)”;

(J) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated), by striking “116(a)(5)” and inserting “116(a)(3)”;

(K) in paragraph (16) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking “to dislocated workers”;

and

(bb) by inserting “and additional assistance” after “rapid response activities”;

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “134(d)(4)” and inserting “134(c)(4)”;

(III) by striking “and” at the end of clause (iii);

(IV) by amending clause (iv) to read as follows:

“(iv) how the State will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers (including displaced homemakers), low-income individuals (including recipients of public assistance such as supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits pursuant to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)), long-term unemployed individuals (including individuals who have

exhausted entitlement to Federal and State unemployment compensation), English learners, homeless individuals, individuals training for nontraditional employment, youth (including out-of-school youth and at-risk youth), older workers, ex-offenders, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, refugees and entrants, veterans (including disabled and homeless veterans), and Native Americans; and”;

(V) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) how the State will—

“(I) consistent with section 188 and Executive Order No. 13217 (42 U.S.C. 12131 note), serve the employment and training needs of individuals with disabilities; and

“(II) consistent with sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794, 794d), include the provision of outreach, intake, assessments, and service delivery, the development of performance measures, the training of staff, and other aspects of accessibility for individuals with disabilities to programs and services under this subtitle;”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “to the extent practicable” and inserting “in accordance with the requirements of the Jobs for Veterans Act (Public Law 107-288) and the amendments made by such Act”; and

(L) by striking paragraph (17) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(17) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the State—

“(A) to more fully engage employers, including small businesses and employers in in-demand industries and occupations important to the State economy;

“(B) to meet the needs of employers in the State; and

“(C) to better coordinate workforce development programs with economic development activities;

“(18) a description of how the State board will convene (or help to convene) industry or sector partnerships that lead to collaborative planning, resource alignment, and training efforts across a targeted cluster of multiple firms for a range of workers employed or potentially employed by the industry or sector—

“(A) to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement in the industry or sector;

“(B) to address the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the State economy; and

“(C) to address critical skill gaps within and across industries and sectors;

“(19) a description of how the State will utilize technology, to facilitate access to services in remote areas, which may be used throughout the State;

“(20) a description of the State strategy and assistance to be provided by the State for encouraging regional cooperation within the State and across State borders, as appropriate;

“(21) a description of the actions that will be taken by the State to foster communication, coordination, and partnerships with nonprofit organizations (including public libraries, community, faith-based, and philanthropic organizations) that provide employment-related, training, and complementary services, to enhance the quality and comprehensiveness of services available to participants under this title;

“(22) a description of the process and methodology for determining—

“(A) one-stop partner program contributions for the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers under section 121(h)(1); and

“(B) the formula for allocating such infrastructure funds to local areas under section 121(h)(3);

“(23) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, credentials (including recognized postsecondary credentials, such as industry-recognized credentials), and employment experience to succeed in the labor market, including—

“(A) training and internships in in-demand industries or occupations important to the State and local economy;

“(B) dropout recovery activities that are designed to lead to the attainment of a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or other State-recognized equivalent (including recognized alternative standards for individuals with disabilities); and

“(C) activities combining remediation of academic skills, work readiness training, and work experience, and including linkages to postsecondary education and training and career-ladder employment; and

“(24) a description of—

“(A) how the State will furnish employment, training, including training in advanced manufacturing, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans;

“(B) the strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist in and expedite reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force; and

“(C) the veterans population to be served in the State.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “period, that—” and all that follows through paragraph (2) and inserting “period, that the plan is inconsistent with the provisions of this title.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “5-year” and inserting “3-year”.

SEC. 414. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREAS.

Section 116 (29 U.S.C. 2831) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) PROCESS.—In order to receive an allotment under section 132, a State, through the State board, shall establish a process to designate local workforce investment areas within the State. Such process shall—

“(i) support the statewide workforce development system developed under section 111(d)(2), enabling the system to meet the workforce needs of the State and its local areas;

“(ii) include consultation, prior to the designation, with chief elected officials;

“(iii) include consideration of comments received on the designation through the public comment process as described in section 112(b)(9); and

“(iv) require the submission of an application for approval under subparagraph (B).

“(B) APPLICATION.—To obtain designation of a local area under this paragraph, a local or regional board (or consortia of local or regional boards) seeking to take responsibility for the area under this Act shall submit an application to a State board at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State board may require, including—

“(i) a description of the local area, including the population that will be served by the local area, and the education and training needs of its employers and workers;

“(ii) a description of how the local area is consistent or aligned with—

“(I) service delivery areas (as determined by the State);

“(II) labor market areas; and

“(III) economic development regions;

“(iii) a description of the eligible providers of education and training, including postsecondary educational institutions such as community colleges, located in the local area and available to meet the needs of the local workforce;

“(iv) a description of the distance that individuals will need to travel to receive services provided in such local area; and

“(v) any other criteria that the State board may require.

“(C) PRIORITY.—In designating local areas under this paragraph, a State board shall give priority consideration to an area proposed by an applicant demonstrating that a designation as a local area under this paragraph will result in the reduction of overlapping service delivery areas, local market areas, or economic development regions.

“(D) ALIGNMENT WITH LOCAL PLAN.—A State may designate an area proposed by an applicant as a local area under this paragraph for a period not to exceed 3 years.

“(E) REFERENCES.—For purposes of this Act, a reference to a local area—

“(i) used with respect to a geographic area, refers to an area designated under this paragraph; and

“(ii) used with respect to an entity, refers to the applicant.”;

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall, if requested by the Governor of a State, provide the State with technical assistance in making the determinations required under paragraph (1). The Secretary shall not issue regulations governing determinations to be made under paragraph (1).”;

(C) by striking paragraph (3);

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(E) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and

(F) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “(2) or (3)” both places it appears and inserting “(1)”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) SINGLE STATES.—Consistent with subsection (a), the State board of a State may designate the State as a single State local area for the purposes of this title.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “The State may require the local boards for the designated region to prepare a single regional plan that incorporates the elements of the local plan under section 118 and that is submitted and approved in lieu of separate local plans under such section.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “employment statistics” and inserting “workforce and labor market information”.

SEC. 415. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS.

Section 117 (29 U.S.C. 2832) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “include—” and all that follows through “representatives” and inserting “include representatives”;

(II) by striking clauses (ii) through (vi);

(III) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (III) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively (and by moving the margins of such clauses 2 ems to the left);

(IV) by striking clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(ii) represent businesses, including large and small businesses, each of which has immediate and long-term employment opportunities in an in-demand industry or other occupation important to the local economy; and”;

and”;

(V) by striking the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting “; and”; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) may include such other individuals or representatives of entities as the chief elected official in the local area may determine to be appropriate, including—

“(i) the superintendent or other employee of the local educational agency who has primary responsibility for secondary education, the presidents or chief executive officers of postsecondary educational institutions (including a community college, where such an entity exists), or administrators of local entities providing adult education and family literacy education activities;

“(ii) representatives of community-based organizations (including organizations representing individuals with disabilities and veterans, for a local area in which such organizations are present); or

“(iii) representatives of veterans service organizations.”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “A majority” and inserting “A ¾ majority”; and

(ii) by striking “(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “(2)(A)”; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “(2)(A)”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking “paragraphs (1) through (7)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) through (8)”; and

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL BOARD.—The functions of the local board shall include the following:

“(1) LOCAL PLAN.—Consistent with section 118, each local board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local area involved, shall develop and submit a local plan to the Governor.

“(2) WORKFORCE RESEARCH AND REGIONAL LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The local board shall—

(i) conduct, and regularly update, an analysis of—

“(I) the economic conditions in the local area;

“(II) the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries and other occupations important to the local economy;

“(III) the knowledge and skills of the workforce in the local area; and

“(IV) workforce development activities (including education and training) in the local area; and

(ii) assist the Governor in developing the statewide workforce and labor market information system described in section 15(e) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491-2(e)).

“(B) EXISTING ANALYSIS.—In carrying out requirements of subparagraph (A)(i), a local board shall use an existing analysis, if any, by the local economic development entity or related entity.

“(3) EMPLOYER ENGAGEMENT.—The local board shall meet the needs of employers and support economic growth in the local area by enhancing communication, coordination, and collaboration among employers, economic development entities, and service providers.

“(4) BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION.—

“(A) BUDGET.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The local board shall develop a budget for the activities of the local board in the local area, consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

“(ii) TRAINING RESERVATION.—In developing a budget under clause (i), the local board

shall reserve a percentage of funds to carry out the activities specified in section 134(c)(4). The local board shall use the analysis conducted under paragraph (2)(A)(i) to determine the appropriate percentage of funds to reserve under this clause.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(i) GRANT RECIPIENT.—The chief elected official in a local area shall serve as the local grant recipient for, and shall be liable for any misuse of, the grant funds allocated to the local area under section 133, unless the chief elected official reaches an agreement with the Governor for the Governor to act as the local grant recipient and bear such liability.

“(ii) DESIGNATION.—In order to assist in administration of the grant funds, the chief elected official or the Governor, where the Governor serves as the local grant recipient for a local area, may designate an entity to serve as a local grant subrecipient for such funds or as a local fiscal agent. Such designation shall not relieve the chief elected official or the Governor of the liability for any misuse of grant funds as described in clause (i).

“(iii) DISBURSAL.—The local grant recipient or an entity designated under clause (ii) shall disburse the grant funds for workforce investment activities at the direction of the local board, pursuant to the requirements of this title. The local grant recipient or entity designated under clause (ii) shall disburse the funds immediately on receiving such direction from the local board.

“(C) STAFF.—The local board may employ staff to assist in carrying out the functions described in this subsection.

“(D) GRANTS AND DONATIONS.—The local board may solicit and accept grants and donations from sources other than Federal funds made available under this Act.

“(5) SELECTION OF OPERATORS AND PROVIDERS.—

“(A) SELECTION OF ONE-STOP OPERATORS.—Consistent with section 121(d), the local board, with the agreement of the chief elected official—

(i) shall designate or certify one-stop operators as described in section 121(d)(2)(A); and

(ii) may terminate for cause the eligibility of such operators.

“(B) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE TRAINING SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Consistent with this subtitle, the local board shall identify eligible providers of training services described in section 134(c)(4) in the local area, annually review the outcomes of such eligible providers using the criteria under section 122(b)(2), and designate such eligible providers in the local area who have demonstrated the highest level of success with respect to such criteria as priority eligible providers for the program year following the review.

“(C) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF WORK READY SERVICES.—If the one-stop operator does not provide the services described in section 134(c)(2) in the local area, the local board shall identify eligible providers of such services in the local area by awarding contracts.

“(6) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.—The local board, in partnership with the chief elected official, shall be responsible for—

(A) ensuring the appropriate use and management of the funds provided for local employment and training activities authorized under section 134(b); and

(B) conducting oversight of the one-stop delivery system, in the local area, authorized under section 121.

“(7) NEGOTIATION OF LOCAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The local board, the chief elected official, and the Governor shall negotiate

and reach agreement on local performance measures as described in section 136(c).

“(8) TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS.—The local board shall develop strategies for technology improvements to facilitate access to services authorized under this subtitle and carried out in the local area, including access in remote areas.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting “electronic means and” after “regular basis through”; and

(B) by striking “and the award of grants or contracts to eligible providers of youth activities.”;

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “section 134(d)(4)” and inserting “section 134(c)(4)”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) WORK READY SERVICES; DESIGNATION OR CERTIFICATION AS ONE-STOP OPERATORS.—A local board may provide work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) through a one-stop delivery system described in section 121 or be designated or certified as a one-stop operator only with the agreement of the chief elected official and the Governor.”;

(6) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting “or participate in any action taken” after “vote”; and

(7) by striking subsections (h) and (i).

SEC. 416. LOCAL PLAN.

Section 118 (29 U.S.C. 2833) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “5-year” and inserting “3-year”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CONTENTS.—The local plan shall include—

“(1) a description of the analysis of the local area’s economic and workforce conditions conducted under subclauses (I) through (IV) of section 117(d)(2)(A)(i), and an assurance that the local board will use such analysis to carry out the activities under this subtitle;

“(2) a description of the one-stop delivery system in the local area, including—

“(A) a description of how the local board will ensure—

“(i) the continuous improvement of eligible providers of services through the system; and

“(ii) that such providers meet the employment needs of local businesses and participants; and

“(B) a description of how the local board will facilitate access to services described in section 117(d)(8) and provided through the one-stop delivery system consistent with section 117(d)(8);

“(3) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the local area—

“(A) to more fully engage employers, including small businesses and employers in in-demand industries and occupations important to the local economy;

“(B) to meet the needs of employers in the local area;

“(C) to better coordinate workforce development programs with economic development activities; and

“(D) to better coordinate workforce development programs with employment, training, and literacy services carried out by nonprofit organizations, including public libraries, as appropriate;

“(4) a description of how the local board will convene (or help to convene) industry or sector partnerships that lead to collaborative planning, resource alignment, and training efforts across multiple firms for a range of workers employed or potentially employed by a targeted industry or sector—

“(A) to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker

training, retention, and advancement in the targeted industry or sector;

“(B) to address the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the local economy; and

“(C) to address critical skill gaps within and across industries and sectors;

“(5) a description of how the funds reserved under section 117(d)(4)(A)(ii) will be used to carry out activities described in section 134(c)(4);

“(6) a description of how the local board will coordinate workforce investment activities carried out in the local area with statewide workforce investment activities, as appropriate;

“(7) a description of how the local area will—

“(A) coordinate activities with the local area’s disability community, and with transition services (as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401)) provided under that Act by local educational agencies serving such local area, to make available comprehensive, high-quality services to individuals with disabilities;

“(B) consistent with section 188 and Executive Order No. 13217 (42 U.S.C. 12131 note), serve the employment and training needs of individuals with disabilities, with a focus on employment that fosters independence and integration into the workplace; and

“(C) consistent with sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794, 794d), include the provision of outreach, intake, assessments, and service delivery, the development of performance measures, the training of staff, and other aspects of accessibility for individuals with disabilities to programs and services under this subtitle;

“(8) a description of the local levels of performance negotiated with the Governor and chief elected official pursuant to section 136(c), to be—

“(A) used to measure the performance of the local area; and

“(B) used by the local board for measuring performance of the local fiscal agent (where appropriate), eligible providers, and the one-stop delivery system, in the local area;

“(9) a description of the process used by the local board, consistent with subsection (c), to provide an opportunity for public comment prior to submission of the plan;

“(10) a description of how the local area will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers (including displaced homemakers), low-income individuals (including recipients of public assistance such as supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits pursuant to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)), long-term unemployed individuals (including individuals who have exhausted entitlement to Federal and State unemployment compensation), English learners, homeless individuals, individuals training for nontraditional employment, youth (including out-of-school youth and at-risk youth), older workers, ex-offenders, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, refugees and entrants, veterans (including disabled veterans and homeless veterans), and Native Americans;

“(11) an identification of the entity responsible for the disbursement of grant funds described in section 117(d)(4)(B)(iii), as determined by the chief elected official or the Governor under such section;

“(12) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the local area to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, credentials (including recognized postsecondary credentials), and employment experience to succeed in the labor market, including—

“(A) training and internships in in-demand industries or occupations important to the local economy;

“(B) dropout recovery activities that are designed to lead to the attainment of a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or other State-recognized equivalent (including recognized alternative standards for individuals with disabilities); and

“(C) activities combining remediation of academic skills, work readiness training, and work experience, and including linkages to postsecondary education and training and career-ladder employment;

“(13) a description of—

“(A) how the local area will furnish employment, training, including training in advanced manufacturing, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans;

“(B) the strategies and services that will be used in the local area to assist in and expedite reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force; and

“(C) the veteran population to be served in the local area;

“(14) a description of—

“(A) the duties assigned to the veteran employment specialist consistent with the requirements of section 134(f);

“(B) the manner in which the veteran employment specialist is integrated into the one-stop career system described in section 121;

“(C) the date on which the veteran employment specialist was assigned; and

“(D) whether the veteran employment specialist has satisfactorily completed related training by the National Veterans’ Employment and Training Services Institute; and

“(15) such other information as the Governor may require.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “such means” and inserting “electronic means and such means”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “, including representatives of business and representatives of labor organizations.”.

SEC. 417. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.

Section 121 (29 U.S.C. 2841) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(A) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ONE-STOP PARTNERS.—Each entity that carries out a program or activities described in subparagraph (B) shall—

“(i) provide access through a one-stop delivery system to the program or activities carried out by the entity, including making the work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) that are applicable to the program or activities of the entity available at one-stop centers (in addition to any other appropriate locations);

“(ii) use a portion of the funds available to the program or activities of the entity to maintain the one-stop delivery system, including payment of the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers in accordance with subsection (h);

“(iii) enter into a local memorandum of understanding with the local board, relating to the operation of the one-stop delivery system, that meets the requirements of subsection (c); and

“(iv) participate in the operation of the one-stop delivery system consistent with the terms of the memorandum of understanding, the requirements of this title, and the requirements of the Federal laws authorizing the program or activities carried out by the entity.”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking clauses (ii), (v), and (vi);

(ii) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively;

(iii) by redesignating clauses (vii) through (xii) as clauses (iv) through (ix), respectively;

(iv) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking “adult education and literacy activities” and inserting “adult education and family literacy education activities”

(v) in clause (viii), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(vi) in clause (ix), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

“(x) subject to subparagraph (C), programs authorized under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);”;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1)(B) the following:

“(C) DETERMINATION BY THE GOVERNOR.—Each entity carrying out a program described in subparagraph (B)(x) shall be considered to be a one-stop partner under this title and carry out the required partner activities described in subparagraph (A) unless the Governor of the State in which the local area is located provides the Secretary and Secretary of Health and Human Services written notice of a determination by the Governor that such an entity shall not be considered to be such a partner and shall not carry out such required partner activities.”;

(D) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “section 134(d)(2)” and inserting “section 134(c)(2)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clauses (i), (ii), and (v);

(II) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(III) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) employment and training programs administered by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration;

“(iv) employment and training programs carried out by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

“(v) employment, training, and literacy services carried out by public libraries; and

“(vi) other appropriate Federal, State, or local programs, including programs in the private sector.”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) provisions describing—

“(i) the services to be provided through the one-stop delivery system consistent with the requirements of this section, including the manner in which the services will be coordinated through such system;

“(ii) how the costs of such services and the operating costs of such system will be funded, through cash and in-kind contributions, to provide a stable and equitable funding stream for ongoing one-stop system operations, including the funding of the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers in accordance with subsection (h);

“(iii) methods of referral of individuals between the one-stop operator and the one-stop partners for appropriate services and activities, including referrals for training for non-traditional employment; and

“(iv) the duration of the memorandum of understanding and the procedures for amending the memorandum during the term of the memorandum, and assurances that such memorandum shall be reviewed not less than once every 3-year period to ensure appropriate funding and delivery of services under the memorandum; and”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the heading for paragraph (1), by striking “DESIGNATION AND CERTIFICATION”

and inserting “LOCAL DESIGNATION AND CERTIFICATION”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “section 134(c)” and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) shall be designated or certified as a one-stop operator through a competitive process; and”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking clause (ii) and redesignating clauses (iii) through (vi) as clauses (ii) through (v), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “vocational” and inserting “career and technical”;

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established in a State that receives an allotment under section 132(b) a one-stop delivery system, which shall—

“(A) provide the work ready services described in section 134(c)(2);

“(B) provide access to training services as described in paragraph (4) of section 134(c), including serving as the point of access to career enhancement accounts for training services to participants in accordance with paragraph (4)(F) of such section;

“(C) provide access to the activities carried out under section 134(d), if any;

“(D) provide access to programs and activities carried out by one-stop partners that are described in subsection (b); and

“(E) provide access to the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 15(a)(1) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491-2(a)(1)).

“(2) ONE-STOP DELIVERY.—At a minimum, the one-stop delivery system—

“(A) shall make each of the programs, services, and activities described in paragraph (1) accessible at not less than one physical center in each local area of the State; and

“(B) may also make programs, services, and activities described in paragraph (1) available—

“(i) through a network of affiliated sites that can provide one or more of the programs, services, and activities to individuals; and

“(ii) through a network of eligible one-stop partners—

“(I) in which each partner provides one or more of the programs, services, and activities to such individuals and is accessible at an affiliated site that consists of a physical location or an electronically- or technologically-linked access point; and

“(II) that assures individuals that information on the availability of the work ready services will be available regardless of where the individuals initially enter the statewide workforce investment system, including information made available through an access point described in subclause (I).

“(3) SPECIALIZED CENTERS.—The centers and sites described in paragraph (2) may have a specialization in addressing special needs.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) CERTIFICATION OF ONE-STOP CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State board shall establish objective procedures and criteria for certifying, at least once every 3 years, one-stop centers for the purpose of awarding the one-stop infrastructure funding described in subsection (h).

“(B) CRITERIA.—The criteria for certification of a one-stop center under this subsection shall include—

“(i) meeting the expected levels of performance for each of the corresponding core indicators of performance as outlined in the State plan under section 112;

“(ii) meeting minimum standards relating to the scope and degree of service integration achieved by the center, involving the programs provided by the one-stop partners; and

“(iii) meeting minimum standards relating to how the center ensures that eligible providers meet the employment needs of local employers and participants.

“(C) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION.—One-stop centers certified under this subsection shall be eligible to receive the infrastructure funding authorized under subsection (h).

“(2) LOCAL BOARDS.—Consistent with the criteria developed by the State, the local board may develop, for certification referred to in paragraph (1)(A), additional criteria or higher standards on the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(B) to respond to local labor market and demographic conditions and trends.

“(h) ONE-STOP INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.—

“(1) PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) PROVISION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, as determined under subparagraph (B), a portion of the Federal funds provided to the State and areas within the State under the Federal laws authorizing the one-stop partner programs described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and participating additional partner programs described in subsection (b)(2)(B), for a fiscal year shall be provided to the Governor by such partners to carry out this subsection.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF GOVERNOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Governor, in consultation with the State board, shall determine the portion of funds to be provided under subparagraph (A) by each one-stop partner and in making such determination shall consider the proportionate use of the one-stop centers in the State by each such partner, the costs of administration for purposes not related to one-stop centers for each such partner, and other relevant factors described in paragraph (3).

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—In those States where the State constitution places policy-making authority that is independent of the authority of the Governor in an entity or official with respect to the funds provided for adult education and family literacy education activities authorized under title II and for postsecondary career and technical education activities authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the determination described in clause (i) with respect to the corresponding 2 programs shall be made by the Governor with the appropriate entity or official with such independent policy-making authority.

“(iii) APPEAL BY ONE-STOP PARTNERS.—The Governor shall establish a procedure for the one-stop partner administering a program described in subsection (b) and subparagraph (A) to appeal a determination regarding the portion of funds to be provided under this paragraph on the basis that such determination is inconsistent with the requirements described in the State plan for the program or with the requirements of this paragraph. Such procedure shall ensure prompt resolution of the appeal.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) PROVISION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—The funds provided under this paragraph by a one-stop partner shall be provided only from funds available for the costs of administration under the program administered by such partner, and shall be subject to the limitations with respect to the portion of funds under such program that may be used for administration.

“(ii) FEDERAL DIRECT SPENDING PROGRAMS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A program that provides Federal direct spending under section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(8)) shall not, for purposes of this paragraph, be required to provide more than the maximum amount determined under subclause (II).

“(II) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The maximum amount for the program is the amount that bears the same relationship to the costs referred to in paragraph (2) for the State as the use of the one-stop centers by such program bears to the use of such centers by all one-stop partner programs in the State.

“(2) ALLOCATION BY GOVERNOR.—From the funds provided under paragraph (1), the Governor shall allocate funds to local areas in accordance with the formula established under paragraph (3) for the purposes of assisting in paying the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers certified under subsection (g).

“(3) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—The State board shall develop a formula to be used by the Governor to allocate the funds provided under paragraph (1) to local areas. The formula shall include such factors as the State board determines are appropriate, which may include factors such as the number of centers in a local area that have been certified, the population served by such centers, and the performance of such centers.

“(4) COSTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘costs of infrastructure’ means the nonpersonnel costs that are necessary for the general operation of a one-stop center, including the rental costs of the facilities involved, and the costs of utilities and maintenance, and equipment (including assistive technology for individuals with disabilities).

“(i) OTHER FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds provided under subsection (h), a portion of funds made available under Federal law authorizing the one-stop partner programs described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and participating additional partner programs described in subsection (b)(2)(B), or the noncash resources available under such 2 types of programs, shall be used to pay the costs relating to the operation of the one-stop delivery system that are not paid for from the funds provided under subsection (h), to the extent not inconsistent with the Federal law involved. Such portion shall be used to pay for costs including—

“(A) costs of infrastructure (as defined in subsection (h)) that are in excess of the funds provided under subsection (h);

“(B) common costs that are in addition to the costs of infrastructure (as so defined); and

“(C) the costs of the provision of work ready services applicable to each program.

“(2) DETERMINATION AND STANDARDS.—The method for determining the appropriate portion of funds and noncash resources to be provided by each program under paragraph (1) shall be determined as part of the memorandum of understanding under subsection (c). The State board shall provide standards to facilitate the determination of appropriate allocation of the funds and noncash resources to local areas.”.

SEC. 418. IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF TRAINING SERVICES.

Section 122 (29 U.S.C. 2842) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 122. IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF TRAINING SERVICES.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Governor, after consultation with the State board, shall establish criteria and procedures regarding the

eligibility of providers of training services described in section 134(c)(4) to receive funds provided under section 133(b) for the provision of such training services and be included on the list of eligible providers of training services described in subsection (d).

“(2) PROVIDERS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, to be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list, the provider shall be—

“(A) a postsecondary educational institution that—

“(i) is eligible to receive Federal funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) provides a program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential;

“(B) an entity that carries out programs under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the ‘National Apprenticeship Act’; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.); or

“(C) another public or private provider of a program of training services.

“(3) INCLUSION IN LIST OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.—A provider described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (2) shall comply with the criteria and procedures established under this subsection to be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list. A provider described in paragraph (2)(B) shall be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list with respect to programs described in paragraph (2)(B) for so long as the provider remains certified by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the programs.

“(b) CRITERIA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The criteria established by the Governor pursuant to subsection (a) shall take into account—

“(A) the performance of providers of training services with respect to the performance measures described in section 136, measures for other matters for which information is required under paragraph (2), and other appropriate measures of performance outcomes for those participants receiving training services under this subtitle;

“(B) whether the training programs of such providers relate to in-demand industries or occupations important to the local economy;

“(C) the need to ensure access to training services throughout the State, including in rural areas;

“(D) the ability of the providers to offer programs that lead to a recognized postsecondary credential, and the quality of such programs;

“(E) the performance of the providers as reflected in the information such providers are required to report to State agencies with respect to other Federal and State programs (other than the program carried out under this subtitle), including one-stop partner programs; and

“(F) such other factors as the Governor determines are appropriate.

“(2) INFORMATION.—The criteria established by the Governor shall require that a provider of training services submit appropriate, accurate, and timely information to the State for purposes of carrying out subsection (d), with respect to participants receiving training services under this subtitle in the applicable program, including—

“(A) information on recognized postsecondary credentials received by such participants;

“(B) information on costs of attendance for such participants;

“(C) information on the program completion rate for such participants; and

“(D) information on the performance of the provider with respect to the performance measures described in section 136 for such participants.

“(3) RENEWAL.—The criteria established by the Governor shall also provide for a review

on the criteria every 3 years and renewal of eligibility under this section for providers of training services.

“(4) LOCAL CRITERIA.—A local board in the State may establish criteria in addition to the criteria established by the Governor, or may require higher levels of performance than required on the criteria established by the Governor, for purposes of determining the eligibility of providers of training services under this section in the local area involved.

“(5) LIMITATION.—In carrying out the requirements of this subsection, no entity may disclose personally identifiable information regarding a student, including a Social Security number, student identification number, or other identifier, without the prior written consent of the parent or student in compliance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

“(c) PROCEDURES.—The procedures established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) identify—

“(A) the application process for a provider of training services to become eligible under this section; and

“(B) the respective roles of the State and local areas in receiving and reviewing applications and in making determinations of eligibility based on the criteria established under this section; and

“(2) establish a process, for a provider of training services to appeal a denial or termination of eligibility under this section, that includes an opportunity for a hearing and prescribes appropriate time limits to ensure prompt resolution of the appeal.

“(d) INFORMATION TO ASSIST PARTICIPANTS IN CHOOSING PROVIDERS.—In order to facilitate and assist participants under chapter 5 in choosing providers of training services, the Governor shall ensure that an appropriate list of providers determined eligible under this section in the State, including information provided under subsection (b)(2) with respect to such providers, is provided to the local boards in the State and is made available to such participants and to members of the public through the one-stop delivery system in the State.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures established under this section shall provide the following:

“(A) INTENTIONALLY SUPPLYING INACCURATE INFORMATION.—Upon a determination, by an individual or entity specified in the procedures, that a provider of training services, or individual providing information on behalf of the provider, intentionally supplied inaccurate information under this section, the eligibility of such provider under this section shall be terminated for a period of time that is not less than 2 years.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL VIOLATIONS.—Upon a determination, by an individual or entity specified in the procedures, that a provider of training services substantially violated any requirement under this title, the eligibility of such provider under this section shall be terminated for a period of time that is not less than 10 years.

“(C) REPAYMENT.—A provider of training services whose eligibility is terminated under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be liable for the repayment of funds received under chapter 5 during a period of noncompliance described in such subparagraph. For purposes of subparagraph (A), that period shall be considered to be the period beginning on the date on which the inaccurate information described in subparagraph (A) was supplied, and ending on the date of the termination described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) shall be construed to provide remedies and penalties

that supplement, but do not supplant, other civil and criminal remedies and penalties.

“(f) AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER STATES.—A State may enter into an agreement with another State, on a reciprocal basis, to permit eligible providers of training services to accept career enhancement accounts provided in the other State.

“(g) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing the criteria (including requirements for related information) and procedures required under this section, the Governor shall solicit and take into consideration the recommendations of local boards and providers of training services within the State.

“(h) OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT COMMENTS.—During the development of the criteria and procedures, and the list of eligible providers required under this section, the Governor shall provide an opportunity for interested members of the public to submit comments regarding such criteria, procedures, and list.

“(i) ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OR CUSTOMIZED TRAINING EXCEPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Providers of on-the-job training or customized training shall not be subject to the requirements of subsections (a) through (d).

“(2) COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—A one-stop operator in a local area shall collect such performance information from on-the-job training and customized training providers as the Governor may require, determine whether the providers meet such performance criteria as the Governor may require, and disseminate information identifying providers that meet the criteria as eligible providers, and the performance information, through the one-stop delivery system. Providers determined to meet the criteria shall be considered to be identified as eligible under this section, to be providers of the training services involved.”.

SEC. 419. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.

Chapter 5 of subtitle B of title I is amended—

(1) by striking the heading for chapter 5 and inserting the following: “**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES**”; and

(2) in section 131 (29 U.S.C. 2861)—

(A) by striking “paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of”; and

(B) by striking “adults, and dislocated workers,” and inserting “individuals”.

SEC. 420. STATE ALLOTMENTS.

Section 132 (29 U.S.C. 2862) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) reserve ½ of 1 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year, of which—

“(A) 50 percent shall be used to provide technical assistance under section 170; and

“(B) 50 percent shall be used for evaluations under section 172;

“(2) reserve 1 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to make grants to, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with Indian tribes, tribal organizations, Alaska Native entities, Indian-controlled organizations serving Indians, or Native Hawaiian organizations to carry out employment and training activities;

“(3) reserve not more than 25 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to carry out the Jobs Corps program under subtitle C;

“(4) reserve not more than 3.5 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to—

“(A) make grants to State boards or local boards to provide employment and training assistance to workers affected by major economic dislocations, such as plant closures, mass layoffs, or closures and realignments of military installations; and

“(B) provide assistance to Governors of States with an area that has suffered an emergency or a major disaster (as such terms are defined in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)) to provide disaster relief employment in the area; and

“(5) from the remaining amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year (after reserving funds under paragraphs (1) through (4)), make allotments in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT FUND.—

“(1) RESERVATION FOR OUTLYING AREAS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amount made available under subsection (a)(5) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent to provide assistance to the outlying areas.

“(B) RESTRICTION.—The Republic of Palau shall cease to be eligible to receive funding under this paragraph upon entering into an agreement for extension of United States educational assistance under the Compact of Free Association (approved by the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-188) after the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act.

“(2) STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After determining the amount to be reserved under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall allot the remainder of the amount referred to in subsection (a)(5) for a fiscal year to the States pursuant to subparagraph (B) for employment and training activities and statewide workforce investment activities.

“(B) FORMULA.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), of the remainder—

“(i) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in each State, compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in all States;

“(ii) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of individuals in the civilian labor force in each State, compared to the total number of such individuals in all States;

“(iii) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more, compared to the total number of individuals in all States who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more; and

“(iv) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of disadvantaged youth in each State, compared to the total number of disadvantaged youth in all States.

“(C) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PERCENTAGES.—

“(i) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—The Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for—

“(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is less than 100 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for fiscal year 2013; and

“(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is less than 90 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

“(ii) MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.—Subject to clause (i), the Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for—

“(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is more than 130 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for fiscal year 2013; and

“(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is more than 130 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for the

fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

“(D) SMALL STATE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for a fiscal year that is less than $\frac{1}{5}$ of 1 percent of the remainder described in subparagraph (A) for the fiscal year.

“(E) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of the formula specified in this paragraph:

“(i) ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE.—The term ‘allotment percentage’—

“(I) used with respect to fiscal year 2013, means the percentage of the amounts allotted to States under title I of this Act, title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.), the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code, and sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), as such provisions were in effect for fiscal year 2013, that is received under such provisions by the State involved for fiscal year 2013; and

“(II) used with respect to fiscal year 2017 or a succeeding fiscal year, means the percentage of the amounts allotted to States under this paragraph for the fiscal year, that is received under this paragraph by the State involved for the fiscal year.

“(ii) AREA OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘area of substantial unemployment’ means any area that is of sufficient size and scope to sustain a program of workforce investment activities carried out under this subtitle and that has an average rate of unemployment of at least 7 percent for the most recent 12 months, as determined by the Secretary. For purposes of this clause, determinations of areas of substantial unemployment shall be made once each fiscal year.

“(iii) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.—The term ‘disadvantaged youth’ means an individual who is not less than age 16 and not more than age 24 who receives an income, or is a member of a family that receives a total family income, that in relation to family size, does not exceed the higher of—

“(I) the poverty line; or

“(II) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

“(iv) INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘individual’ means an individual who is age 16 or older.”.

SEC. 421. WITHIN STATE ALLOCATIONS.

Section 133 (29 U.S.C. 2863) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) RESERVATIONS FOR STATEWIDE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—The Governor of a State shall reserve not more than 15 percent of the total amount allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) for a fiscal year to carry out the statewide activities described in section 134(a).

“(2) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Of the amount reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Governor of the State shall reserve not more than 25 percent for statewide rapid response activities and additional assistance described in section 134(a)(4).

“(3) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—Of the amount reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Governor of the State shall reserve 15 percent to carry out statewide activities described in section 134(a)(5).

“(4) STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMIT.—Not more than 5 percent of the funds reserved under paragraph (1) may be used by the Governor of the State for administrative costs of carrying out the statewide activities described in section 134(a).”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) METHODS.—The Governor, acting in accordance with the State plan, and after consulting with chief elected officials in the local areas in the State, shall—

“(A) allocate the funds that are allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) and not reserved under subsection (a), in accordance with paragraph (2)(A); and

“(B) award the funds that are reserved by the State under subsection (a)(3) through competitive grants to eligible entities, in accordance with section 134(a)(1)(C).

“(2) FORMULA ALLOCATIONS FOR THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT FUND.—

“(A) ALLOCATION.—In allocating the funds described in paragraph (1)(A) to local areas, a State shall allocate—

“(i) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(i);

“(ii) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(ii);

“(iii) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(iii); and

“(iv) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(iv),

except that a reference in a section specified in any of clauses (i) through (iv) to ‘each State’ shall be considered to refer to each local area, and to ‘all States’ shall be considered to refer to all local areas.

“(B) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PERCENTAGES.—

“(i) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—The State shall ensure that no local area shall receive an allocation under this paragraph for—

“(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is less than 100 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for fiscal year 2013; and

“(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is less than 90 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

“(ii) MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.—Subject to clause (i), the State shall ensure that no local area shall receive an allocation for a fiscal year under this paragraph for—

“(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is more than 130 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for fiscal year 2013; and

“(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is more than 130 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of the formula specified in this paragraph, the term ‘allocation percentage’—

“(i) used with respect to fiscal year 2013, means the percentage of the amounts allocated to local areas under title I of this Act, title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.), the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code, and sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), as such provisions were in effect for fiscal year 2013, that is received under such provisions by the local area involved for fiscal year 2013; and

“(ii) used with respect to fiscal year 2017 or a succeeding fiscal year, means the percentage of the amounts allocated to local areas under this paragraph for the fiscal year, that is received under this paragraph by the local area involved for the fiscal year.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Governor may, in accordance with this subsection, reallocate to eligible local areas within the State

amounts that are allocated under subsection (b) for employment and training activities and that are available for reallocation.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “paragraph (2)(A) or (3) of subsection (b) for such activities” and inserting “subsection (b) for such activities”;

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) REALLOCATIONS.—In making reallocations to eligible local areas of amounts available pursuant to paragraph (2) for a program year, the Governor shall allocate to each eligible local area within the State an amount based on the relative amount allocated to such local area under subsection (b)(2) for such activities for such prior program year, as compared to the total amount allocated to all eligible local areas in the State under subsection (b)(2) for such activities for such prior program year.”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “paragraph (2)(A) or (3) of”;

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

“(d) LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMIT.—Of the amount allocated to a local area under this section for a fiscal year, not more than 10 percent of the amount may be used by the local board involved for the administrative costs of carrying out local workforce investment activities in the local area under this chapter.”.

SEC. 422. USE OF FUNDS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.

Section 134 (29 U.S.C. 2864) is amended—
(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DISTRIBUTION OF STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(1) and not reserved under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 133(a)—

“(i) shall be used to carry out the statewide employment and training activities described in paragraph (2); and

“(ii) may be used to carry out any of the statewide employment and training activities described in paragraph (3).

“(B) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(2) shall be used to provide the statewide rapid response activities and additional assistance described in paragraph (4).

“(C) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(3) shall be used to award statewide grants for individuals with barriers to employment on a competitive basis, and carry out other activities, as described in paragraph (5).

“(2) REQUIRED STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—A State shall use funds referred to in paragraph (1)(A) to carry out statewide employment and training activities, which shall include—

“(A) disseminating the State list of eligible providers of training services described in section 122(d), information identifying eligible providers of on-the-job training and customized training described in section 122(i), and performance information and program cost information described in section 122(b)(2);

“(B) supporting the provision of work ready services described in subsection (c)(2) in the one-stop delivery system;

“(C) implementing strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, recognized post-secondary credentials, and employment experience to succeed in the labor market;

“(D) conducting evaluations under section 136(e) of activities authorized under this chapter in coordination with evaluations carried out by the Secretary under section 172;

“(E) providing technical assistance to local areas that fail to meet local performance measures;

“(F) operating a fiscal and management accountability system under section 136(f); and

“(G) carrying out monitoring and oversight of activities carried out under this chapter.

“(3) ALLOWABLE STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—A State may use funds referred to in paragraph (1)(A) to carry out statewide employment and training activities which may include—

“(A) implementing innovative programs and strategies designed to meet the needs of all employers in the State, including small employers, which may include incumbent worker training programs, sectoral and industry cluster strategies and partnership initiatives, career ladder programs, micro-enterprise and entrepreneurial training and support programs, utilization of effective business intermediaries, activities to improve linkages between the one-stop delivery system in the State and all employers (including small employers) in the State, and other business services and strategies that better engage employers in workforce investment activities and make the workforce investment system more relevant to the needs of State and local businesses, consistent with the objectives of this title;

“(B) providing incentive grants to local areas—

“(i) for regional cooperation among local boards (including local boards in a designated region as described in section 116(c));

“(ii) for local coordination of activities carried out under this Act; and

“(iii) for exemplary performance by local areas on the local performance measures;

“(C) developing strategies for effectively integrating programs and services among one-stop partners;

“(D) carrying out activities to facilitate remote access to services provided through a one-stop delivery system, including facilitating access through the use of technology;

“(E) incorporating pay-for-performance contract strategies as an element in funding activities under this section and providing technical support to local areas and eligible providers in order to carry out such a strategy, which may involve providing assistance with data collection and data entry requirements;

“(F) carrying out the State option under subsection (f)(8); and

“(G) carrying out other activities authorized under this section that the State determines to be necessary to assist local areas in carrying out activities described in subsection (c) or (d) through the statewide workforce investment system.

“(4) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—A State shall use funds reserved as described in section 133(a)(2)—

“(A) to carry out statewide rapid response activities, which shall include provision of rapid response activities, carried out in local areas by the State or by an entity designated by the State, working in conjunction with the local boards and the chief elected officials in the local areas; and

“(B) to provide additional assistance to local areas that experience disasters, mass layoffs, or plant closings, or other events that precipitate substantial increases in the number of unemployed individuals, carried out in local areas by the State or by an entity designated by the State, working in con-

junction with the local boards and the chief elected officials in the local areas.

“(5) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds reserved as described in section 133(a)(3), the Governor of a State—

“(i) may reserve up to 5 percent to provide technical assistance for, and conduct evaluations as described in section 136(e) of, the programs carried out under this paragraph; and

“(ii) using the remainder, shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities (that meet specific performance outcomes and criteria established by the Governor) described in subparagraph (B) to carry out employment and training programs authorized under this paragraph for individuals with barriers to employment.

“(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that—

“(i) is a—

“(I) local board or a consortium of local boards;

“(II) nonprofit entity, for-profit entity, or a consortium of nonprofit or for-profit entities; or

“(III) consortium of the entities described in subclasses (I) and (II);

“(ii) has a demonstrated record of placing individuals into unsubsidized employment and serving hard-to-serve individuals; and

“(iii) agrees to be reimbursed primarily on the basis of meeting specified performance outcomes and criteria established by the Governor.

“(C) GRANT PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this paragraph shall be awarded for a period of 1 year.

“(ii) GRANT RENEWAL.—A Governor of a State may renew, for up to 4 additional 1-year periods, a grant awarded under this paragraph.

“(D) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—To be eligible to participate in activities under this paragraph, an individual shall be a low-income individual age 16 or older.

“(E) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds for programs of activities that are designed to assist eligible participants in obtaining employment and acquiring the education and skills necessary to succeed in the labor market. To be eligible to receive a grant under this paragraph for an employment and training program, an eligible entity shall submit an application to a State at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State may require, including—

“(i) a description of how the strategies and activities of the program will be aligned with the State plan submitted under section 112 and the local plan submitted under section 118, with respect to the area of the State that will be the focus of the program under this paragraph;

“(ii) a description of the educational and skills training programs and activities the eligible entity will provide to eligible participants under this paragraph;

“(iii) how the eligible entity will collaborate with State and local workforce investment systems established under this title in the provision of such programs and activities;

“(iv) a description of the programs of demonstrated effectiveness on which the provision of such educational and skills training programs and activities are based, and a description of how such programs and activities will improve education and skills training for eligible participants;

“(v) a description of the populations to be served and the skill needs of those populations, and the manner in which eligible

participants will be recruited and selected as participants;

“(vi) a description of the private, public, local, and State resources that will be leveraged, with the grant funds provided, for the program under this paragraph, and how the entity will ensure the sustainability of such program after grant funds are no longer available;

“(vii) a description of the extent of the involvement of employers in such program;

“(viii) a description of the levels of performance the eligible entity expects to achieve with respect to the indicators of performance for all individuals specified in section 136(b)(2);

“(ix) a detailed budget and a description of the system of fiscal controls, and auditing and accountability procedures, that will be used to ensure fiscal soundness for the program provided under this paragraph; and

“(x) any other criteria the Governor may require.”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)—

“(1) shall be used to carry out employment and training activities described in subsection (c); and

“(2) may be used to carry out employment and training activities described in subsection (d).”;

(3) by striking subsection (c);

(4) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e), as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(5) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b) shall be used—

“(A) to establish a one-stop delivery system as described in section 121(e);

“(B) to provide the work ready services described in paragraph (2) through the one-stop delivery system in accordance with such paragraph; and

“(C) to provide training services described in paragraph (4) in accordance with such paragraph.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “CORE SERVICES” and inserting “WORK READY SERVICES”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “(1)(A)” and inserting “(1)”;

(II) by striking “core services” and inserting “work ready services”; and

(III) by striking “who are adults or displaced workers”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (V);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (J) as subparagraphs (C) through (K), respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) assistance in obtaining eligibility determinations under the other one-stop partner programs through activities, where appropriate and consistent with the authorizing statute of the one-stop partner program involved, such as assisting in—

“(i) the submission of applications;

“(ii) the provision of information on the results of such applications; and

“(iii) the provision of intake services and information.”;

(vi) by amending subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(E) labor exchange services, including—

“(i) job search and placement assistance, and where appropriate, career counseling;

“(ii) appropriate recruitment services for employers, including small employers, in the local area, which may include services described in this subsection, including provi-

sion of information and referral to specialized business services not traditionally offered through the one-stop delivery system; and

“(iii) reemployment services provided to unemployment claimants, including claimants identified as in need of such services under the worker profiling system established under section 303(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(j));”;

(vii) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking “employment statistics” and inserting “workforce and labor market”;

(viii) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking “and eligible providers of youth activities described in section 123.”;

(ix) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by inserting “under section 136” after “local performance measures”;

(x) in subparagraph (J), as so redesignated, by inserting “and information regarding the administration of the work test for the unemployment compensation system” after “compensation”;

(xi) by amending subparagraph (K), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(K) assistance in establishing eligibility for programs of financial aid assistance for education and training programs that are not funded under this Act and are available in the local area.”; and

(xii) by inserting the following new subparagraphs after subparagraph (K), as so redesignated:

“(L) the provision of information from official publications of the Internal Revenue Service regarding Federal tax credits, available to participants in employment and training activities, and relating to education, job training, and employment;

“(M) comprehensive and specialized assessments of the skill levels and service needs of workers, which may include—

“(i) diagnostic testing and use of other assessment tools; and

“(ii) in-depth interviewing and evaluation to identify employment barriers and appropriate employment goals;

“(N) development of an individual employment plan, to identify the employment goals, appropriate achievement objectives, and appropriate combination of services for the participant;

“(O) group counseling;

“(P) individual counseling and career planning;

“(Q) case management;

“(R) short-term pre-career services, including development of learning skills, communications skills, interviewing skills, punctuality, personal maintenance skills, and professional conduct, to prepare individuals for unsubsidized employment or training;

“(S) internships and work experience;

“(T) literacy activities relating to basic work readiness, information and communication technology literacy activities, and financial literacy activities, if the activities involved are not available to participants in the local area under programs administered under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.);

“(U) out-of-area job search assistance and relocation assistance; and”;

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) DELIVERY OF SERVICES.—The work ready services described in paragraph (2) shall be provided through the one-stop delivery system and may be provided through contracts with public, private for-profit, and private nonprofit service providers, approved by the local board.”; and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds described in paragraph (1)(C) shall be used to provide training services to individuals who—

“(i) after an interview, evaluation, or assessment, and case management, have been determined by a one-stop operator or one-stop partner, as appropriate, to—

“(I) be in need of training services to obtain or retain employment; and

“(II) have the skills and qualifications to successfully participate in the selected program of training services;

“(ii) select programs of training services that are directly linked to the employment opportunities in the local area involved or in another area in which the individual receiving such services are willing to commute or relocate; and

“(iii) who meet the requirements of subparagraph (B).”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “Except” and inserting “Notwithstanding section 479B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087tu) and except”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) TRAINING SERVICES.—Training services authorized under this paragraph may include—

“(i) occupational skills training;

“(ii) on-the-job training;

“(iii) skill upgrading and retraining;

“(iv) entrepreneurial training;

“(v) education activities leading to a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent in combination with, concurrently or subsequently, occupational skills training;

“(vi) adult education and family literacy education activities provided in conjunction with other training services authorized under this subparagraph;

“(vii) workplace training combined with related instruction;

“(viii) occupational skills training that incorporates English language acquisition;

“(ix) customized training conducted with a commitment by an employer or group of employers to employ an individual upon successful completion of the training; and

“(x) training programs operated by the private sector.”;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E) and redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively;

(v) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “section 121”;

(bb) in subclause (I), by striking “section 122(e)” and inserting “section 122(d)” and by striking “section 122(h)” and inserting “section 122(i)”;

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking “subsections (e) and (h)” and inserting “subsections (d) and (i)”;

(II) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) CAREER ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNTS.—An individual who seeks training services and who is eligible pursuant to subparagraph (A), may, in consultation with a case manager, select an eligible provider of training services from the list or identifying information for providers described in clause (ii)(I). Upon such selection, the one-stop operator involved shall, to the extent practicable, refer such individual to the eligible provider of training services, and arrange for payment for such services through a career enhancement account.

“(iv) COORDINATION.—Each local board may, through one-stop centers, coordinate career enhancement accounts with other Federal, State, local, or private job training programs or sources to assist the individual

in obtaining training services from (notwithstanding any provision of this title) eligible providers for those programs and sources.

“(v) ASSISTANCE.—Each local board may, through one-stop centers, assist individuals receiving career enhancement accounts in obtaining funds (in addition to the funds provided under this section) from other programs and sources that will assist the individual in obtaining training services.”; and
 (vi) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “INDIVIDUAL TRAINING ACCOUNTS” and inserting “CAREER ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNTS”;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “individual training accounts” and inserting “career enhancement accounts”;

(III) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking “an individual training account” and inserting “a career enhancement account”;

(bb) by striking “subparagraph (F)” and inserting “subparagraph (E)”;

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking “individual training accounts” and inserting “career enhancement accounts”;

(dd) in subclause (II), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(ee) in subclause (III), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(ff) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) the local board determines that it would be most appropriate to award a contract to a postsecondary educational institution that has been identified as a priority eligible provider under section 117(d)(5)(B) in order to facilitate the training of multiple individuals in in-demand industries or occupations important to the State or local economy, that such contract may be used to enable the expansion of programs provided by a priority eligible provider, and that such contract does not limit customer choice.”;

(IV) in clause (iii), by striking “adult or dislocated worker” and inserting “individual”;

(V) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (V); and

(bb) by inserting after subclause (III) the following:

“(IV) Individuals with disabilities.”;

(6) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) DISCRETIONARY ONE-STOP DELIVERY ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)(2) may be used to provide, through the one-stop delivery system—

“(i) customized screening and referral of qualified participants in training services to employers;

“(ii) customized employment-related services to employers on a fee-for-service basis;

“(iii) customer supports, including transportation and child care, to navigate among multiple services and activities for special participant populations that face multiple barriers to employment, including individuals with disabilities;

“(iv) employment and training assistance provided in coordination with child support enforcement activities of the State agency carrying out subtitle D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651 et seq.);

“(v) incorporation of pay-for-performance contract strategies as an element in funding activities under this section;

“(vi) activities to facilitate remote access to services provided through a one-stop delivery system, including facilitating access through the use of technology; and

“(vii) activities to carry out business services and strategies that meet the workforce investment needs of local area employers, as

determined by the local board, consistent with the local plan under section 118.”;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) INCUMBENT WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The local board may use funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)(2) to carry out incumbent worker training programs in accordance with this paragraph.

“(B) TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—The training programs for incumbent workers under this paragraph shall be carried out by the local area in conjunction with the employers of such workers for the purpose of assisting such workers in obtaining the skills necessary to retain employment and avert layoffs.

“(C) EMPLOYER MATCH REQUIRED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Employers participating in programs under this paragraph shall be required to pay a proportion of the costs of providing the training to the incumbent workers of the employers. The local board shall establish the required payment toward such costs, which may include in-kind contributions.

“(ii) CALCULATION OF MATCH.—The wages paid by an employer to a worker while they are attending training may be included as part of the required payment of the employer.”;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PRIORITY FOR PLACEMENT IN PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS.—In providing employment and training activities authorized under this section, the State board and local board shall give priority to placing participants in jobs in the private sector.

“(f) VETERAN EMPLOYMENT SPECIALIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (8), a local board shall hire and employ one or more veteran employment specialists to carry out employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection in the local area served by the local board.

“(2) PRINCIPAL DUTIES.—A veteran employment specialist in a local area shall—

“(A) conduct outreach to employers in the local area to assist veterans, including disabled veterans, in gaining employment, including—

“(i) conducting seminars for employers; and

“(ii) in conjunction with employers, conducting job search workshops, and establishing job search groups; and

“(B) facilitate the furnishing of employment, training, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans, in the local area.

“(3) HIRING PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH EXPERTISE IN SERVING VETERANS.—Subject to paragraph (8), a local board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, employ veterans or individuals with expertise in serving veterans to carry out the services described in paragraph (2) in the local area served by the local board. In hiring an individual to serve as a veteran employment specialist, a local board shall give preference to veterans and other individuals in the following order:

“(A) To service-connected disabled veterans.

“(B) If no veteran described in subparagraph (A) is available, to veterans.

“(C) If no veteran described in subparagraph (A) or (B) is available, to any member of the Armed Forces transitioning out of military service.

“(D) If no veteran or member described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) is available, to any spouse of a veteran or a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces transitioning out of military service.

“(E) If no veteran or member described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) is available and no spouse described in paragraph (D) is available, to any other individuals with expertise in serving veterans.

“(4) ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each veteran employment specialist shall be administratively responsible to the one-stop operator of the one-stop center in the local area and shall provide, at a minimum, quarterly reports to the one-stop operator of such center and to the Assistant Secretary for Veterans’ Employment and Training for the State on the specialist’s performance, and compliance by the specialist with Federal law (including regulations), with respect to the—

“(i) principal duties (including facilitating the furnishing of services) for veterans described in paragraph (2); and

“(ii) hiring preferences described in paragraph (3) for veterans and other individuals.

“(B) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—Each State shall submit to the Secretary an annual report on the qualifications used by each local board in the State in making hiring determinations for a veteran employment specialist and the salary structure under which such specialist is compensated.

“(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate an annual report summarizing the reports submitted under subparagraph (B), and including summaries of outcomes achieved by participating veterans, disaggregated by local areas.

“(5) PART-TIME EMPLOYEES.—A part-time veteran employment specialist shall perform the functions of a veteran employment specialist under this subsection on a halftime basis.

“(6) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—Each veteran employment specialist described in paragraph (2) shall satisfactorily complete training provided by the National Veterans’ Employment and Training Institute during the 3-year period that begins on the date on which the employee is so assigned.

“(7) SPECIALIST’S DUTIES.—A full-time veteran employment specialist shall perform only duties related to employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection, and shall not perform other non-veteran-related duties if such duties detract from the specialist’s ability to perform the specialist’s duties related to employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection.

“(8) STATE OPTION.—At the request of a local board, a State may opt to assume the duties assigned to the local board under paragraphs (1) and (3), including the hiring and employment of one or more veteran employment specialists for placement in the local area served by the local board.”.

SEC. 423. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.

Section 136 (29 U.S.C. 2871) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each State, the State performance measures shall consist of—

“(A)(i) the core indicators of performance described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(ii) additional indicators of performance (if any) identified by the State under paragraph (2)(B); and

“(B) a State adjusted level of performance for each indicator described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(A) CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The core indicators of performance for the program of employment and training activities authorized under sections 132(a)(2) and 134, the program of adult education and family literacy education activities authorized under title II, and the program authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 720 et seq.), other than section 112 or part C of that title (29 U.S.C. 732, 741), shall consist of the following indicators of performance (with performance determined in the aggregate and as disaggregated by the populations identified in the State and local plan in each case):

“(I) The percentage and number of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second full calendar quarter after exit from the program.

“(II) The percentage and number of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth full calendar quarter after exit from the program.

“(III) The difference in the median earnings of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second full calendar quarter after exit from the program, compared to the median earnings of such participants prior to participation in such program.

“(IV) The percentage and number of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential (such as an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program), or a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent (subject to clause (ii)), during participation in or within 1 year after exit from the program.

“(V) The percentage and number of program participants who, during a program year—

“(aa) are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential (such as an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program), a certificate from an on-the-job training program, a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or unsubsidized employment; and

“(bb) are achieving measurable basic skill gains toward such a credential, certificate, diploma, or employment.

“(VI) The percentage and number of program participants who obtain unsubsidized employment in the field relating to the training services described in section 134(c)(4) that such participants received.

“(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), program participants who obtain a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted as meeting the criterion under such clause only if such participants (in addition to obtaining such diploma or its recognized equivalent), within 1 year after exit from the program, have obtained or retained employment, have been removed from public assistance, or have begun an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential.

“(B) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS.—A State may identify in the State plan additional indicators for workforce investment activities authorized under this subtitle.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the heading, by striking “AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDICATOR”;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “and the customer satisfaction indicator described in paragraph (2)(B)”;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking “and the customer satisfaction indicator of performance, for the first 3” and inserting “, for all 3”;

(IV) in clause (iii)—

(aa) in the heading, by striking “FOR FIRST 3 YEARS”; and

(bb) by striking “and the customer satisfaction indicator of performance, for the first 3 program years” and inserting “for all 3 program years”;

(V) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by striking “or (v)”;

(bb) by striking subclause (I) and redesignating subclauses (II) and (III) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively; and

(cc) in subclause (I) (as so redesignated)—

(AA) by inserting “, such as unemployment rates and job losses or gains in particular industries” after “economic conditions”; and

(BB) by inserting “, such as indicators of poor work experience, dislocation from high-wage employment, low levels of literacy or English proficiency, disability status (including disability status among veterans), and welfare dependency,” after “program”;

(VI) by striking clause (v) and redesignating clause (vi) as clause (v); and

(VII) in clause (v) (as so redesignated)—

(aa) by striking “described in clause (iv)(I)” and inserting “described in clause (iv)(I)”;

(bb) by striking “or (v)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “paragraph (2)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(B)”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending clause (i) of paragraph (1)(A) to read as follows:

“(i) the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(2)(A) for activities described in such subsection, other than statewide workforce investment activities; and”;

(B) in clause (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), by striking “(b)(2)(C)” and inserting “(b)(2)(B)”;

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) DETERMINATIONS.—In determining such local levels of performance, the local board, the chief elected official, and the Governor shall ensure such levels are adjusted based on the specific economic conditions (such as unemployment rates and job losses or gains in particular industries), or demographic characteristics or other characteristics of the population to be served, in the local area.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “127 or”;

(ii) by striking “and the customer satisfaction indicator” each place it appears; and

(iii) in the last sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and on the amount and percentage of the State’s annual allotment under section 132 the State spends on administrative costs and on the amount and percentage of its annual allocation under section 133 each local area in the State spends on administrative costs”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (A);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (B);

(iv) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “(excluding participants who received only self-service and informational activities)”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(v) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) with respect to each local area in the State—

“(i) the number of individuals who received work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the number of individuals who

received training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services, and the amount of funds spent on each of the 2 types of services during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 fiscal years;

“(ii) the number of individuals who successfully exited out of work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the number of individuals who exited out of training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services; and

“(iii) the average cost per participant of those individuals who received work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the average cost per participant of those individuals who received training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services; and

(D) the amount of funds spent on training services and discretionary activities described in section 134(d), disaggregated by the populations identified under section 112(b)(16)(A)(iv) and section 118(b)(10).”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “through publication” and inserting “through electronic means”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) DATA VALIDATION.—In preparing the reports described in this subsection, each State shall establish procedures, consistent with guidelines issued by the Secretary, to ensure the information contained in the reports is valid and reliable.

“(5) STATE AND LOCAL POLICIES.—

“(A) STATE POLICIES.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 132 shall maintain a central repository of policies related to access, eligibility, availability of services, and other matters, and plans approved by the State board and make such repository available to the public, including by electronic means.

“(B) LOCAL POLICIES.—Each local area that receives an allotment under section 133 shall maintain a central repository of policies related to access, eligibility, availability of services, and other matters, and plans approved by the local board and make such repository available to the public, including by electronic means.”;

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or (B)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “may reduce by not more than 5 percent,” and inserting “shall reduce”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) FUNDS RESULTING FROM REDUCED ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall return to the Treasury the amount retained, as a result of a reduction in an allotment to a State made under paragraph (1)(B).”;

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or (B)”;
and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by amending the matter preceding clause (i) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If such failure continues for a second consecutive year, the Governor shall take corrective actions, including the development of a reorganization plan. Such plan shall—”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

“(B) REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF GRANT.—If such failure continues for a third consecutive year, the Governor shall reduce the amount of the grant that would (in the absence of this subparagraph) be payable to the local area under such program for the program year after such third consecutive year. Such penalty shall be based on the degree of failure to meet local levels of performance.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C)(i) (as so redesignated), by striking “a reorganization plan under subparagraph (A) may, not later than 30 days after receiving notice of the reorganization plan, appeal to the Governor to rescind or revise such plan” and inserting “corrective action under subparagraph (A) or (B) may, not later than 30 days after receiving notice of the action, appeal to the Governor to rescind or revise such action”;

(v) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking “subparagraph (B)” each place it appears and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(C)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(B)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(b)(3)(A)(vi)” and inserting “(b)(3)(A)(v)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the activities described in section 502 concerning”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “described in paragraph (1) and in the activities described in section 502” and inserting “and activities described in this subsection”;

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

“(j) USE OF CORE INDICATORS FOR OTHER PROGRAMS.—Consistent with the requirements of the applicable authorizing laws, the Secretary shall use the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(2)(A) to assess the effectiveness of the programs described in section 121(b)(1)(B) (in addition to the programs carried out under chapter 5) that are carried out by the Secretary.

“(k) ESTABLISHING PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the discretion of the Governor of a State, a State may establish an incentive system for local boards to implement pay-for-performance contract strategies for the delivery of employment and training activities in the local areas served by the local boards.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—A State that establishes a pay-for-performance incentive system shall reserve not more than 10 percent of the total amount allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) for a fiscal year to provide funds to local areas in the State whose local boards have implemented a pay-for-performance contract strategy.

“(3) EVALUATIONS.—A State described in paragraph (2) shall use funds reserved by the State under section 133(a)(1) to evaluate the return on investment of pay-for-performance contract strategies implemented by local boards in the State.”.

SEC. 424. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 137 (29 U.S.C. 2872) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 137. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities described in section 132, \$5,945,639,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.”.

CHAPTER 3—JOB CORPS

SEC. 426. JOB CORPS PURPOSES.

Paragraph (1) of section 141 (29 U.S.C. 2881(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) to maintain a national Job Corps program for at-risk youth, carried out in partnership with States and communities, to assist eligible youth to connect to the workforce by providing them with intensive academic, career and technical education, and service-learning opportunities, in residential and nonresidential centers, in order for such youth to obtain regular secondary school diplomas and recognized postsecondary credentials leading to successful careers in in-demand industries that will result in opportunities for advancement.”.

SEC. 427. JOB CORPS DEFINITIONS.

Section 142 (29 U.S.C. 2882) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “APPLICABLE ONE-STOP” and inserting “ONE-STOP”;

(B) by striking “applicable”;

(C) by striking “customer service”;

(D) by striking “intake” and inserting “assessment”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “before completing the requirements” and all that follows and inserting “prior to becoming a graduate.”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “has completed the requirements” and all that follows and inserting the following: “who, as a result of participation in the Job Corps program, has received a regular secondary school diploma, completed the requirements of a career and technical education and training program, or received, or is making satisfactory progress (as defined under section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c))) toward receiving, a recognized postsecondary credential (including an industry-recognized credential) that prepares individuals for employment leading to economic self-sufficiency.”.

SEC. 428. INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS.

Section 144 (29 U.S.C. 2884) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) not less than age 16 and not more than age 24 on the date of enrollment”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting “secondary” before “school”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(E), by striking “vocational” and inserting “career and technical education and”.

SEC. 429. RECRUITMENT, SCREENING, SELECTION, AND ASSIGNMENT OF ENROLLEES.

Section 145 (29 U.S.C. 2885) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C)(i) by striking “vocational” and inserting “career and technical education and training”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “To the extent practicable, the” and inserting “The”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “applicable”;

(II) by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C);

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) organizations that have a demonstrated record of effectiveness in placing at-risk youth into employment.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and agrees to such rules” after “failure to observe the rules”;

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) the individual has passed a background check conducted in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, which shall include—

“(i) a search of the State criminal registry or repository in the State where the individual resides and each State where the individual previously resided;

“(ii) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in the State where the individual resides and each State where the individual previously resided;

“(iii) a search of the National Crime Information Center;

“(iv) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

“(v) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.)”;

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

“(3) INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF A CRIME.—An individual shall be ineligible for enrollment if the individual—

“(A) makes a false statement in connection with the criminal background check described in paragraph (1)(C);

“(B) is registered or is required to be registered on a State sex offender registry or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); or

“(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

“(i) homicide;

“(ii) child abuse or neglect;

“(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

“(iv) a crime involving rape or sexual assault; or

“(v) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed within the past 5 years.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “2 years” and inserting “year”;

(ii) by striking “an assignment” and inserting “a”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, every 2 years,”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by inserting “the education and training” after “including”;

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) the performance of the Job Corps center relating to the indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in section 159(c), and whether any actions have been taken with respect to such center pursuant to section 159(f).”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “is closest to the home of the enrollee, except that the” and inserting “offers the type of career and technical education and training selected by the individual and, among the centers that offer such education and training, is closest to the home of the individual. The”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A); and
 (iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “that offers the career and technical education and training desired by” after “home of the enrollee”.

SEC. 430. JOB CORPS CENTERS.

Section 147 (29 U.S.C. 2887) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “vocational” both places it appears and inserting “career and technical”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “subsections (c) and (d) of section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253)” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b) of section 3304 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(II) by striking “industry council” and inserting “workforce council”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(I) by amending subclause (II) to read as follows:

“(II) the ability of the entity to offer career and technical education and training that the workforce council proposes under section 154(c);”;

(II) in subclause (III), by striking “is familiar with the surrounding communities, applicable” and inserting “demonstrates relationships with the surrounding communities, employers, workforce boards,” and by striking “and” at the end;

(III) by amending subclause (IV) to read as follows:

“(IV) the performance of the entity, if any, relating to operating or providing activities described in this subtitle to a Job Corps center, including the entity’s demonstrated effectiveness in assisting individuals in achieving the primary and secondary indicators of performance described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 159(c); and”;

(IV) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(V) the ability of the entity to demonstrate a record of successfully assisting at-risk youth to connect to the workforce, including by providing them with intensive academic, and career and technical education and training.”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(I) by striking “, as appropriate”; and

(II) by striking “through (IV)” and inserting “through (V)”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “In any year, no more than 20 percent of the individuals enrolled in the Job Corps may be non-residential participants in the Job Corps.”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Job Corps centers may include Civilian Conservation Centers, operated under an agreement between the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture, that are located primarily in rural areas. Such centers shall adhere to all the provisions of this subtitle, and shall provide, in addition to education, career and technical education and training, and workforce preparation skills training described in section 148, programs of work experience to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to develop community projects in the public interest.

“(2) SELECTION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall select an entity that submits an application under subsection (d) to operate a Civilian Conservation Center on a competitive basis, as provided in subsection (a).”;

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to operate a Job Corps center under this subtitle, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(1) a description of the program activities that will be offered at the center, including how the career and technical education and training reflect State and local employment opportunities, including in in-demand industries;

“(2) a description of the counseling, placement, and support activities that will be offered at the center, including a description of the strategies and procedures the entity will use to place graduates into unsubsidized employment upon completion of the program;

“(3) a description of the demonstrated record of effectiveness that the entity has in placing at-risk youth into employment, including past performance of operating a Job Corps center under this subtitle;

“(4) a description of the relationships that the entity has developed with State and local workforce boards, employers, State and local educational agencies, and the surrounding communities in an effort to promote a comprehensive statewide workforce investment system;

“(5) a description of the strong fiscal controls the entity has in place to ensure proper accounting of Federal funds, and a description of how the entity will meet the requirements of section 159(a);

“(6) a description of the strategies and policies the entity will utilize to reduce participant costs;

“(7) a description of the steps taken to control costs in accordance with section 159(a)(3);

“(8) a detailed budget of the activities that will be supported using funds under this subtitle;

“(9) a detailed budget of the activities that will be supported using funds from non-Federal resources;

“(10) an assurance the entity will comply with the administrative cost limitation included in section 151(c);

“(11) an assurance the entity is licensed to operate in the State in which the center is located; and

“(12) an assurance the entity will comply with and meet basic health and safety codes, including those measures described in section 152(b).

“(e) LENGTH OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement described in subsection (a)(1)(A) shall be for not longer than a 2-year period. The Secretary may renew the agreement for 3 1-year periods if the entity meets the requirements of subsection (f).

“(f) RENEWAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may renew the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a)(1)(A) for an entity to operate a Job Corps center if the center meets or exceeds each of the indicators of performance described in section 159(c)(1).

“(2) RECOMPETITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not renew the terms of the agreement for an entity to operate a Job Corps center if such center is ranked in the bottom quintile of centers described in section 159(f)(2) for any program year. Such entity may submit a new application under subsection (d) only if such center has shown significant improvement on the indicators of performance described in section 159(c)(1) over the last program year.

“(B) VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall not select an entity to operate a Job Corps center if such entity or such center has been found to have a systemic or substantial material failure that involves—

“(i) a threat to the health, safety, or civil rights of program participants or staff;

“(ii) the misuse of funds received under this subtitle;

“(iii) loss of legal status or financial viability, loss of permits, debarment from receiving Federal grants or contracts, or the improper use of Federal funds;

“(iv) failure to meet any other Federal or State requirement that the entity has shown an unwillingness or inability to correct, after notice from the Secretary, within the period specified; or

“(v) an unresolved area of noncompliance.

“(g) CURRENT GRANTEEES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act and notwithstanding any previous grant award or renewals of such award under this subtitle, the Secretary shall require all entities operating a Job Corps center under this subtitle to submit an application under subsection (d) to carry out the requirements of this section.”.

SEC. 431. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.

Section 148 (29 U.S.C. 2888) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) ACTIVITIES PROVIDED THROUGH JOB CORPS CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Job Corps center shall provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized, and supervised program of education, career and technical education and training, work experience, recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. Each Job Corps center shall provide enrollees assigned to the center with access to work ready services described in section 134(c)(2).

“(2) RELATIONSHIP TO OPPORTUNITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The activities provided under this subsection shall be targeted to helping enrollees, on completion of their enrollment—

“(i) secure and maintain meaningful unsubsidized employment;

“(ii) complete secondary education and obtain a regular secondary school diploma;

“(iii) enroll in and complete postsecondary education or training programs, including obtaining recognized postsecondary credentials (such as industry-recognized credentials and certificates from registered apprenticeship programs); or

“(iv) satisfy Armed Forces requirements.

“(B) LINK TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.—The career and technical education and training provided shall be linked to the employment opportunities in in-demand industries in the State in which the Job Corps center is located.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL” and inserting “ACADEMIC AND CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND”;

(B) by striking “may” after “The Secretary” and inserting “shall”; and

(C) by striking “vocational” each place it appears and inserting “career and technical”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) of subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(3) DEMONSTRATION.—Each year, any operator seeking to enroll additional enrollees in an advanced career training program shall demonstrate, before the operator may carry out such additional enrollment, that—

“(A) participants in such program have achieved a satisfactory rate of completion and placement in training-related jobs; and

“(B) such operator has met or exceeded the indicators of performance described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 159(c) for the previous year.”.

SEC. 432. COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT.

Section 149 (29 U.S.C. 2889) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “vocational” and inserting “career and technical education and”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “make every effort to arrange to”; and

(B) by striking “to assist” and inserting “assist”; and

(3) by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 433. SUPPORT.

Subsection (b) of section 150 (29 U.S.C. 2890) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **TRANSITION ALLOWANCES AND SUPPORT FOR GRADUATES.**—The Secretary shall arrange for a transition allowance to be paid to graduates. The transition allowance shall be incentive-based to reflect a graduate’s completion of academic, career and technical education or training, and attainment of a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential.”

SEC. 434. OPERATIONS.

Section 151 (29 U.S.C. 2891) is amended—

(1) in the header, by striking “**OPERATING PLAN.**” and inserting “**OPERATIONS.**”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “**IN GENERAL.**—” and inserting “**OPERATING PLAN.**—”;

(3) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(4) by amending subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading by inserting “**OF OPERATING PLAN**” after “**AVAILABILITY**”; and

(B) by striking “subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

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

“(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allotted under section 147 to an entity selected to operate a Job Corps center may be used by the entity for administrative costs under this subtitle.”

SEC. 435. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

Section 153 (29 U.S.C. 2893) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 153. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

“The director of each Job Corps center shall encourage and cooperate in activities to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers in the State and nearby communities. Such activities may include the use of any local workforce development boards established under section 117 to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest.”

SEC. 436. WORKFORCE COUNCILS.

Section 154 (29 U.S.C. 2894) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 154. WORKFORCE COUNCILS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Job Corps center shall have a workforce council appointed by the Governor of the State in which the Job Corps center is located.

“(b) **WORKFORCE COUNCIL COMPOSITION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A workforce council shall be comprised of—

“(A) business members of the State board described in section 111(b)(1)(B)(i);

“(B) business members of the local boards described in section 117(b)(2)(A) located in the State;

“(C) a representative of the State board described in section 111(f); and

“(D) such other representatives and State agency officials as the Governor may designate.

“(2) **MAJORITY.**—A ¾ majority of the members of the workforce council shall be representatives described in paragraph (1)(A).

“(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the workforce council shall be—

“(1) to review all the relevant labor market information, including related information in the State plan described in section 112, to—

“(A) determine the in-demand industries in the State in which enrollees intend to seek employment after graduation;

“(B) determine the skills and education that are necessary to obtain the employment opportunities described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) determine the type or types of career and technical education and training that will be implemented at the center to enable the enrollees to obtain the employment opportunities; and

“(2) to meet at least once a year to re-evaluate the labor market information, and other relevant information, to determine any necessary changes in the career and technical education and training provided at the center.”

SEC. 437. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 156 (29 U.S.C. 2896) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 156. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO CENTERS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—From the funds reserved under section 132(a)(3), the Secretary shall provide, directly or through grants, contracts, or other agreements or arrangements as the Secretary considers appropriate, technical assistance and training for the Job Corps program for the purposes of improving program quality.

“(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In providing training and technical assistance and for allocating resources for such assistance, the Secretary shall—

“(1) assist entities, including those entities not currently operating a Job Corps center, in developing the application described in section 147(d);

“(2) assist Job Corps centers and programs in correcting deficiencies and violations under this subtitle;

“(3) assist Job Corps centers and programs in meeting or exceeding the indicators of performance described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 159(c); and

“(4) assist Job Corps centers and programs in the development of sound management practices, including financial management procedures.”

SEC. 438. SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

Section 158(c)(1) (29 U.S.C. 2989(c)(1)) is amended by striking “title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481 et seq.)” and inserting “chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code.”

SEC. 439. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGEMENT.

Section 159 (29 U.S.C. 2899) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**” and inserting “**PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY AND MANAGEMENT**”;

(2) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or operating costs for such centers result in a budgetary shortfall”;

(3) by striking subsections (c) through (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.**—

“(1) **PRIMARY INDICATORS.**—The annual primary indicators of performance for Job Corps centers shall include—

“(A) the percentage and number of enrollees who graduate from the Job Corps center;

“(B) the percentage and number of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment related to the career and technical education and training received through the Job Corps center, except that such calculation shall not include enrollment in education, the military, or volunteer service;

“(C) the percentage and number of graduates who obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program; and

“(D) the cost per successful performance outcome, which is calculated by comparing the number of graduates who were placed in unsubsidized employment or obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential, to total program costs, including all operations, construction, and administration costs at each Job Corps center.

“(2) **SECONDARY INDICATORS.**—The annual secondary indicators of performance for Job Corps centers shall include—

“(A) the percentage and number of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment not related to the career and technical education and training received through the Job Corps center;

“(B) the percentage and number of graduates who entered into postsecondary education;

“(C) the percentage and number of graduates who entered into the military;

“(D) the average wage of graduates who are in unsubsidized employment—

“(i) on the first day of employment; and

“(ii) 6 months after the first day;

“(E) the number and percentage of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment and were retained in the unsubsidized employment—

“(i) 6 months after the first day of employment; and

“(ii) 12 months after the first day of employment;

“(F) the percentage and number of enrollees compared to the percentage and number of enrollees the Secretary has established as targets in section 145(c)(1);

“(G) the cost per training slot, which is calculated by comparing the program’s maximum number of enrollees that can be enrolled in a Job Corps center at any given time during the program year to the number of enrollees in the same program year; and

“(H) the number and percentage of former enrollees, including the number dismissed under the zero tolerance policy described in section 152(b).

“(3) **INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR RECRUITERS.**—The annual indicators of performance for recruiters shall include the measurements described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H) of paragraph (2).

“(4) **INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE OF CAREER TRANSITION SERVICE PROVIDERS.**—The annual indicators of performance of career transition service providers shall include the measurements described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (2).

“(d) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall collect, and submit in the report described in subsection (f), information on the performance of each Job Corps center, and the Job Corps program, regarding—

“(1) the number and percentage of former enrollees who obtained a regular secondary school diploma;

“(2) the number and percentage of former enrollees who entered unsubsidized employment;

“(3) the number and percentage of former enrollees who obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential;

“(4) the number and percentage of former enrollees who entered into military service; and

“(5) any additional information required by the Secretary.

“(e) **METHODS.**—The Secretary shall collect the information described in subsections (c) and (d), using methods described in section 136(f)(2) and consistent with State law, by entering into agreements with the States to access such data for Job Corps enrollees, former enrollees, and graduates.

“(f) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—“(1) REPORT.—The Secretary shall collect and annually submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and make available to the public by electronic means, a report containing—

“(A) information on the performance of each Job Corps center, and the Job Corps program, on the performance indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c);

“(B) a comparison of each Job Corps center, by rank, on the performance indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c);

“(C) a comparison of each Job Corps center, by rank, on the average performance of all primary indicators described in paragraph (1) of subsection (c);

“(D) information on the performance of the service providers described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c) on the performance indicators established under such paragraphs; and

“(E) a comparison of each service provider, by rank, on the performance of all service providers described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c) on the performance indicators established under such paragraphs.

“(2) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an annual assessment of the performance of each Job Corps center which shall include information on the Job Corps centers that—

“(A) are ranked in the bottom 10 percent on the performance indicator described in paragraph (1)(C); or

“(B) have failed a safety and health code review described in subsection (g).

“(3) PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.—With respect to a Job Corps center that is identified under paragraph (2) or reports less than 50 percent on the performance indicators described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall develop and implement a 1 year performance improvement plan. Such a plan shall require action including—

“(A) providing technical assistance to the center;

“(B) changing the management staff of the center;

“(C) replacing the operator of the center;

“(D) reducing the capacity of the center; or

“(E) closing the center.

“(4) CLOSURE OF JOB CORPS CENTERS.—Job Corps centers that have been identified under paragraph (2) for more than 4 consecutive years shall be closed. The Secretary shall ensure—

“(A) that the proposed decision to close the center is announced in advance to the general public through publication in the Federal Register and other appropriate means; and

“(B) the establishment of a reasonable comment period, not to exceed 30 days, for interested individuals to submit written comments to the Secretary.

“(g) PARTICIPANT HEALTH AND SAFETY.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the General Services Administration or the appropriate State agency responsible for inspecting public buildings and safeguarding the health of disadvantaged students, to conduct an in-person review of the physical condition and health-related activities of each Job Corps center annually. Such review shall include a passing rate of occupancy under Federal and State ordinances.”.

CHAPTER 4—NATIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 441. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 170 (29 U.S.C. 2915) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) by striking:

“(a) GENERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subsections (a), (b), and (c) respectively, and moving such subsections 2 ems to the left, and conforming the casing style of the headings of such subsections to the casing style of the heading of subsection (d), as added by paragraph (7) of this section;

(4) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by inserting “the training of staff providing rapid response services and additional assistance, the training of other staff of recipients of funds under this title, assistance regarding accounting and program operation practices (when such assistance would not be duplicative to assistance provided by the State), technical assistance to States that do not meet State performance measures described in section 136,” after “localities,”; and

(B) by striking “from carrying out activities” and all that follows up to the period and inserting “to implement the amendments made by the SKILLS Act”;

(5) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(B) by striking “, or recipient of financial assistance under any of sections 166 through 169,”; and

(C) by striking “or grant recipient”;

(6) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(7) by inserting, after subsection (c) (as so redesignated), the following:

“(d) BEST PRACTICES COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) establish a system through which States may share information regarding best practices with regard to the operation of workforce investment activities under this Act; and

“(2) evaluate and disseminate information regarding best practices and identify knowledge gaps.”.

SEC. 442. EVALUATIONS.

Section 172 (29 U.S.C. 2917) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “the Secretary shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs and activities, including those programs and activities carried out under section 171” and inserting “the Secretary, through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, shall conduct, at least once every 5 years, an independent evaluation of the programs and activities funded under this Act”;

(2) by amending subsection (a)(4) to read as follows:

“(4) the impact of receiving services and not receiving services under such programs and activities on the community, businesses, and individuals;”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) TECHNIQUES.—Evaluations conducted under this section shall utilize appropriate and rigorous methodology and research designs, including the use of control groups chosen by scientific random assignment methodologies, quasi-experimental methods, impact analysis and the use of administrative data. The Secretary shall conduct an impact analysis, as described in subsection (a)(4), of the formula grant program under subtitle B not later than 2016, and thereafter shall conduct such an analysis not less than once every 4 years.”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate” and inserting “the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate”;

(5) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR LATE REPORTING.—If a report required to be transmitted to Congress under this section is not transmitted on or before the time period specified for that report, amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title shall be reduced by 10 percent for the fiscal year that begins after the date on which the final report required under this section is required to be transmitted and reduced by an additional 10 percent each subsequent fiscal year until each such report is transmitted to Congress.”; and

(6) by adding at the end, the following:

“(h) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The results of the evaluations conducted under this section shall be made publicly available, including by posting such results on the Department’s website.”.

CHAPTER 5—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 446. REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS.

Section 181 (29 U.S.C. 2931) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “, including representatives of businesses and of labor organizations,”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “training for” and inserting “the entry into employment, retention in employment, or increases in earnings of”;

and

(B) by striking “subtitle B” and inserting

“this Act”;

(4) in subsection (f)(4), by striking “134(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “133(a)(4)”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) SALARY AND BONUS LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds provided under this title shall be used by a recipient or subrecipient of such funds to pay the salary and bonuses of an individual, either as direct costs or indirect costs, at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed in level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) VENDORS.—The limitation described in paragraph (1) shall not apply to vendors providing goods and services as defined in OMB Circular A-133.

“(3) LOWER LIMIT.—In a case in which a State is a recipient of such funds, the State may establish a lower limit than is provided in paragraph (1) for salaries and bonuses of those receiving salaries and bonuses from a subrecipient of such funds, taking into account factors including the relative cost of living in the State, the compensation levels for comparable State or local government employees, and the size of the organizations that administer the Federal programs involved.

“(h) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor (referred to in this Act as the ‘Administration’) shall administer all programs authorized under title I and the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.). The Administration shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Except for title II and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), the Administration shall be the principal agency, and the Assistant Secretary shall be the principal officer, of such Department for carrying out this Act.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Assistant Secretary shall be an individual with substantial experience in workforce development and in workforce development management. The Assistant Secretary shall also, to the maximum extent possible, possess knowledge and have worked in or with the State or local workforce investment system or have been a member of the business community.

“(3) FUNCTIONS.—In the performance of the functions of the office, the Assistant Secretary shall be directly responsible to the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Labor, as determined by the Secretary. The functions of the Assistant Secretary shall not be delegated to any officer not directly responsible, both with respect to program operation and administration, to the Assistant Secretary. Any reference in this Act to duties to be carried out by the Assistant Secretary shall be considered to be a reference to duties to be carried out by the Secretary acting through the Assistant Secretary.”

SEC. 447. PROMPT ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

Section 182 (29 U.S.C. 2932) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “127 or”; and

(B) by striking “, except that” and all that follows and inserting a period; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “sections 128 and 133” and inserting “section 133”; and

(B) by striking “127 or”.

SEC. 448. FISCAL CONTROLS; SANCTIONS.

Section 184(a)(2) (29 U.S.C. 2934(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(A)” and all that follows through “Each” and inserting “Each”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

SEC. 449. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 185 (29 U.S.C. 2935) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) shall have the option to submit or disseminate electronically any reports, records, plans, or other data that are required to be collected or disseminated under this title.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting “and the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate,” after “Secretary.”

SEC. 450. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

Section 189 (29 U.S.C. 2939) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations for any fiscal year for programs and activities carried out under this title shall be available for obligation only on the basis of a program year. The program year shall begin on October 1 in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “each State” and inserting “each recipient (except as otherwise provided in this paragraph)”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “171 or”;

(2) in subsection (i)—

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

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2);

(C) by amending paragraph (2)(A), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a period at the end;

(ii) by striking “requirements of subparagraph (B)” and all that follows through “any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of subtitle B” and inserting “requirements of subparagraph (B) or (D), any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of subtitle B”; and

(iii) by striking clause (ii); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) EXPEDITED PROCESS FOR EXTENDING APPROVED WAIVERS TO ADDITIONAL STATES.—

The Secretary may establish an expedited procedure for the purpose of extending to additional States the waiver of statutory or regulatory requirements that have been approved for a State pursuant to a request under subparagraph (B), in lieu of requiring the additional States to meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C). Such procedure shall ensure that the extension of such a waiver to additional States is accompanied by appropriate conditions relating to the implementation of such waiver.

“(E) EXTERNAL CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall not require or impose new or additional requirements, that are not specified under this Act, on a State in exchange for providing a waiver to the State or a local area in the State under this paragraph.”

SEC. 451. STATE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.

Section 191(a) (29 U.S.C. 2941(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “consistent with the provisions of this title” and inserting “consistent with State law and the provisions of this title”; and

(2) by striking “consistent with the terms and conditions required under this title” and inserting “consistent with State law and the terms and conditions required under this title”.

SEC. 452. GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 195 (29 U.S.C. 2945) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting at the end the following:

“(D) Funds received under a program by a public or private nonprofit entity that are not described in subparagraph (B), such as funds privately raised from philanthropic foundations, businesses, or other private entities, shall not be considered to be income under this title and shall not be subject to the requirements of this paragraph.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (12), respectively; and

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

“(13) Funds provided under this title shall not be used to establish or operate stand-alone fee-for-service enterprises that compete with private sector employment agencies within the meaning of section 701(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)), except that for purposes of this paragraph, such an enterprise does not include a one-stop center.

“(14) Any report required to be submitted to Congress, or to a Committee of Congress, under this title shall be submitted to both the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.”

SEC. 453. FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF AND RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

Subtitle E of title I (29 U.S.C. 2931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 196. FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF.

“The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

“(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the SKILLS Act—

“(A) identify the number of Federal government employees who, on the day before the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act, worked on or administered each of the programs and activities that were authorized under this Act or were authorized under a provision listed in section ___71 of the SKILLS Act; and

“(B) identify the number of full-time equivalent employees who on the day before that date of enactment, worked on or admin-

istered each of the programs and activities described in subparagraph (A), on functions for which the authorizing provision has been repealed, or for which an amount has been consolidated (if such employee is in a duplicate position), on or after such date of enactment;

“(2) not later than 90 after such date of enactment, publish the information described in paragraph (1) on the Office of Management and Budget website; and

“(3) not later than 1 year after such date of enactment—

“(A) reduce the workforce of the Federal Government by the number of full-time equivalent employees identified under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(B) submit to Congress a report on how the Director carried out the requirements of subparagraph (A).

“SEC. 197. RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

“(a) LOBBYING RESTRICTIONS.—

“(1) PUBLICITY RESTRICTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no funds provided under this Act shall be used or proposed for use, for—

“(i) publicity or propaganda purposes; or

“(ii) the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, electronic communication, radio, television, or video presentation designed to support or defeat the enactment of legislation before the Congress or any State or local legislature or legislative body.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to—

“(i) normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships;

“(ii) the preparation, distribution, or use of the materials described in subparagraph (A)(i) in presentation to the Congress or any State or local legislature or legislative body (except that this subparagraph does not apply with respect to such preparation, distribution, or use in presentation to the executive branch of any State or local government); or

“(iii) such preparation, distribution, or use of such materials, that are designed to support or defeat any proposed or pending regulation, administrative action, or order issued by the executive branch of any State or local government.

“(2) SALARY PAYMENT RESTRICTION.—No funds provided under this Act shall be used, or proposed for use, to pay the salary or expenses of any grant or contract recipient, or agent acting for such recipient, related to any activity designed to influence the enactment or issuance of legislation, appropriations, regulations, administrative action, or an Executive order proposed or pending before the Congress or any State government, or a State or local legislature or legislative body, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships or participation by an agency or officer of a State, local, or tribal government in policymaking and administrative processes within the executive branch of that government.

“(b) POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds received by a participant of a program or activity under this Act shall be used for—

“(A) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office; or

“(B) any activity to provide voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election.

“(2) RESTRICTION ON VOTER REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.—No funds under this Act shall be used to conduct voter registration activities.

“(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘participant’ includes

any State, local area, or government, non-profit, or for-profit entity receiving funds under this Act.”

CHAPTER 6—STATE UNIFIED PLAN

SEC. 456. STATE UNIFIED PLAN.

Section 501 (20 U.S.C. 9271) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall receive and approve State unified plans developed and submitted in accordance with this section.”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) STATE UNIFIED PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may develop and submit to the Secretary a State unified plan for 2 or more of the activities or programs set forth in paragraph (2). The State unified plan shall cover one or more of the activities or programs set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and shall cover one or more of the activities or programs set forth in subparagraphs (C) through (N) of paragraph (2).

“(2) ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘activity or program’ means any 1 of the following 14 activities or programs:

“(A) Activities and programs authorized under title I.

“(B) Activities and programs authorized under title II.

“(C) Programs authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 710 et seq.).

“(D) Secondary career and technical education programs authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

“(E) Postsecondary career and technical education programs authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

“(F) Activities and programs authorized under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).

“(G) Programs and activities authorized under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the ‘National Apprenticeship Act’; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.).

“(H) Programs authorized under the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.).

“(I) Programs authorized under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

“(J) Programs authorized under State unemployment compensation laws (in accordance with applicable Federal law).

“(K) Work programs authorized under section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)).

“(L) Activities and programs authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

“(M) Activities and programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.).

“(N) Activities authorized under chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code.”;

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) APPROVAL.—

“(1) JURISDICTION.—In approving a State unified plan under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) submit the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity or program described in subsection (b)(2) to the head of the Federal agency who exercises administrative authority over the activity or program for the approval of such portion by such Federal agency head; or

“(B) coordinate approval of the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity

or program described in subsection (b)(2) with the head of the Federal agency who exercises administrative authority over the activity or program.

“(2) TIMELINE.—A State unified plan shall be considered to be approved by the Secretary at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the day the Secretary receives the plan, unless the Secretary makes a written determination, during the 90-day period, that details how the plan is not consistent with the requirements of the Federal statute authorizing an activity or program described in subsection (b)(2) and covered under the plan or how the plan is not consistent with the requirements of subsection (c)(3).

“(3) SCOPE OF PORTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity or program shall be considered to include the plan described in subsection (c)(3) and any proposal described in subsection (e)(2), as that part and proposal relate to the activity or program.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS.—

“(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to reduce inefficiencies in the administration of federally funded State and local employment and training programs.

“(2) IN GENERAL.—In developing a State unified plan for the activities or programs described in subsection (b)(2), and subject to paragraph (4) and to the State plan approval process under subsection (d), a State may propose to consolidate the amount, in whole or part, provided for the activities or programs covered by the plan into the Workforce Investment Fund under section 132(b) to improve the administration of State and local employment and training programs.

“(3) REQUIREMENTS.—A State that has a State unified plan approved under subsection (d) with a proposal for consolidation under paragraph (2), and that is carrying out such consolidation, shall—

“(A) in providing an activity or program for which an amount is consolidated into the Workforce Investment Fund—

“(i) continue to meet the program requirements, limitations, and prohibitions of any Federal statute authorizing the activity or program; and

“(ii) meet the intent and purpose for the activity or program; and

“(B) continue to make reservations and allotments under subsections (a) and (b) of section 133.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—A State may not consolidate an amount under paragraph (2) that is allocated to the State under—

“(A) the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); or

“(B) title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 710 et seq.).”

Subtitle B—Adult Education and Family Literacy Education

SEC. 461. AMENDMENT.

Title II (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE II—ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION

“SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

“This title may be cited as the ‘Adult Education and Family Literacy Education Act’.

“SEC. 202. PURPOSE.

“It is the purpose of this title to provide instructional opportunities for adults seeking to improve their literacy skills, including their basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, and support States and local communities in providing, on a voluntary basis, adult education and family literacy education programs, in order to—

“(1) increase the literacy of adults, including the basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, to a level of proficiency necessary for adults to obtain employment and self-sufficiency and to successfully advance in the workforce;

“(2) assist adults in the completion of a secondary school education (or its equivalent) and the transition to a postsecondary educational institution;

“(3) assist adults who are parents to enable them to support the educational development of their children and make informed choices regarding their children’s education including, through instruction in basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills; and

“(4) assist adults who are not proficient in English in improving their reading, writing, speaking, listening, comprehension, and mathematics skills.

“SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—The term ‘adult education and family literacy education programs’ means a sequence of academic instruction and educational services below the postsecondary level that increase an individual’s ability to read, write, and speak English and perform mathematical computations leading to a level of proficiency equivalent to at least a secondary school completion that is provided for individuals—

“(A) who are at least 16 years of age;

“(B) who are not enrolled or required to be enrolled in secondary school under State law; and

“(C) who—

“(i) lack sufficient mastery of basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills to enable the individuals to function effectively in society;

“(ii) do not have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent and have not achieved an equivalent level of education; or

“(iii) are English learners.

“(2) ELIGIBLE AGENCY.—The term ‘eligible agency’—

“(A) means the primary entity or agency in a State or an outlying area responsible for administering or supervising policy for adult education and family literacy education programs in the State or outlying area, respectively, consistent with the law of the State or outlying area, respectively; and

“(B) may be the State educational agency, the State agency responsible for administering workforce investment activities, or the State agency responsible for administering community or technical colleges.

“(3) ELIGIBLE PROVIDER.—The term ‘eligible provider’ means an organization of demonstrated effectiveness that is—

“(A) a local educational agency;

“(B) a community-based or faith-based organization;

“(C) a volunteer literacy organization;

“(D) an institution of higher education;

“(E) a public or private educational agency;

“(F) a library;

“(G) a public housing authority;

“(H) an institution that is not described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (G) and has the ability to provide adult education, basic skills, and family literacy education programs to adults and families; or

“(I) a consortium of the agencies, organizations, institutions, libraries, or authorities described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (H).

“(4) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘English language acquisition program’ means a program of instruction—

“(A) designed to help English learners achieve competence in reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension of the English language; and

“(B) that may lead to—

“(i) attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent;

“(ii) transition to success in postsecondary education and training; and

“(iii) employment or career advancement.

“(5) FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term ‘family literacy education program’ means an educational program that—

“(A) assists parents and students, on a voluntary basis, in achieving the purpose of this title as described in section 202; and

“(B) is of sufficient intensity in terms of hours and of sufficient quality to make sustainable changes in a family, is evidence-based, and, for the purpose of substantially increasing the ability of parents and children to read, write, and speak English, integrates—

“(i) interactive literacy activities between parents and their children;

“(ii) training for parents regarding how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children;

“(iii) parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency; and

“(iv) an age-appropriate education to prepare children for success in school and life experiences.

“(6) GOVERNOR.—The term ‘Governor’ means the chief executive officer of a State or outlying area.

“(7) INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘individual with a disability’ means an individual with any disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990).

“(B) INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—The term ‘individuals with disabilities’ means more than one individual with a disability.

“(8) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term ‘English learner’ means an adult or out-of-school youth who has limited ability in reading, writing, speaking, or understanding the English language, and—

“(A) whose native language is a language other than English; or

“(B) who lives in a family or community environment where a language other than English is the dominant language.

“(9) INTEGRATED EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—The term ‘integrated education and training’ means services that provide adult education and literacy activities contextually and concurrently with workforce preparation activities and workforce training for a specific occupation or occupational cluster. Such services may include offering adult education services concurrent with postsecondary education and training, including through co-instruction.

“(10) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(11) LITERACY.—The term ‘literacy’ means an individual’s ability to read, write, and speak in English, compute, and solve problems at a level of proficiency necessary to obtain employment and to successfully make the transition to postsecondary education.

“(12) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘local educational agency’ has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

“(13) OUTLYING AREA.—The term ‘outlying area’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of this Act.

“(14) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘postsecondary educational institution’ means—

“(A) an institution of higher education that provides not less than a 2-year program of instruction that is acceptable for credit toward a bachelor’s degree;

“(B) a tribally controlled community college; or

“(C) a nonprofit educational institution offering certificate or apprenticeship programs at the postsecondary level.

“(15) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Education.

“(16) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

“(17) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘State educational agency’ has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

“(18) WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM.—The term ‘workplace literacy program’ means an educational program that is offered in collaboration between eligible providers and employers or employee organizations for the purpose of improving the productivity of the workforce through the improvement of reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills.

“SEC. 204. HOME SCHOOLS.

“Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect home schools, whether or not a home school is treated as a home school or a private school under State law, or to compel a parent engaged in home schooling to participate in adult education and family literacy education activities under this title.

“SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, \$606,294,933 for fiscal year 2015 and for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

“Subtitle A—Federal Provisions

“SEC. 211. RESERVATION OF FUNDS; GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE AGENCIES; ALLOTMENTS.

“(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 2.0 percent to carry out section 242.

“(b) GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE AGENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 and not reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall award a grant to each eligible agency having a State plan approved under section 224 in an amount equal to the sum of the initial allotment under subsection (c)(1) and the additional allotment under subsection (c)(2) for the eligible agency for the fiscal year, subject to subsections (f) and (g).

“(2) PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—The Secretary may award a grant under paragraph (1) only if the eligible agency involved agrees to expend the grant in accordance with the provisions of this title.

“(c) ALLOTMENTS.—

“(1) INITIAL ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 and not reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each eligible agency having a State plan approved under section 224—

“(A) \$100,000, in the case of an eligible agency serving an outlying area; and

“(B) \$250,000, in the case of any other eligible agency.

“(2) ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205, not reserved under subsection (a), and not allotted under paragraph (1), for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each eligible agency that receives an initial allotment under paragraph (1) an additional amount that bears the same relationship to such sums as the number of qualifying adults in the State or outlying area served by the eligible agen-

cy bears to the number of such adults in all States and outlying areas.

“(d) QUALIFYING ADULT.—For the purpose of subsection (c)(2), the term ‘qualifying adult’ means an adult who—

“(1) is at least 16 years of age;

“(2) is beyond the age of compulsory school attendance under the law of the State or outlying area;

“(3) does not have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent; and

“(4) is not enrolled in secondary school.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (c) for the Republic of Palau, the Secretary shall award grants to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Republic of Palau to carry out activities described in this title in accordance with the provisions of this title as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Republic of Palau shall be eligible to receive a grant under this title until an agreement for the extension of United States education assistance under the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau becomes effective.

“(f) HOLD-HARMLESS PROVISIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) and subject to paragraph (2), for—

“(A) fiscal year 2015, no eligible agency shall receive an allotment under this title that is less than 90 percent of the allotment the eligible agency received for fiscal year 2012 under this title; and

“(B) fiscal year 2016 and each succeeding fiscal year, no eligible agency shall receive an allotment under this title that is less than 90 percent of the allotment the eligible agency received for the preceding fiscal year under this title.

“(2) RATABLE REDUCTION.—If, for any fiscal year the amount available for allotment under this title is insufficient to satisfy the provisions of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ratably reduce the payments to all eligible agencies, as necessary.

“(g) REALLOTMENT.—The portion of any eligible agency’s allotment under this title for a fiscal year that the Secretary determines will not be required for the period such allotment is available for carrying out activities under this title, shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Secretary shall fix, to other eligible agencies in proportion to the original allotments to such agencies under this title for such year.

“SEC. 212. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.

“Programs and activities authorized under this title are subject to the performance accountability provisions described in paragraphs (2)(A) and (3) of section 136(b) and may, at a State’s discretion, include additional indicators identified in the State plan approved under section 224.

“Subtitle B—State Provisions

“SEC. 221. STATE ADMINISTRATION.

“Each eligible agency shall be responsible for the following activities under this title:

“(1) The development, submission, implementation, and monitoring of the State plan.

“(2) Consultation with other appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals that are involved in, or interested in, the development and implementation of activities assisted under this title.

“(3) Coordination and avoidance of duplication with other Federal and State education, training, corrections, public housing, and social service programs.

“SEC. 222. STATE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS; MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

“(a) STATE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—Each eligible agency receiving a grant under this title for a fiscal year—

“(1) shall use not less than 82.5 percent of the grant funds to award grants and contracts under section 231 and to carry out section 225, of which not more than 10 percent of such amount shall be available to carry out section 225;

“(2) shall use not more than 12.5 percent of the grant funds to carry out State leadership activities under section 223; and

“(3) shall use not more than 5 percent of the grant funds, or \$65,000, whichever is greater, for the administrative expenses of the eligible agency.

“(b) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive a grant from the Secretary under section 211(b), each eligible agency shall provide, for the costs to be incurred by the eligible agency in carrying out the adult education and family literacy education programs for which the grant is awarded, a non-Federal contribution in an amount that is not less than—

“(A) in the case of an eligible agency serving an outlying area, 12 percent of the total amount of funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs in the outlying area, except that the Secretary may decrease the amount of funds required under this subparagraph for an eligible agency; and

“(B) in the case of an eligible agency serving a State, 25 percent of the total amount of funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs in the State.

“(2) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible agency’s non-Federal contribution required under paragraph (1) may be provided in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, and shall include only non-Federal funds that are used for adult education and family literacy education programs in a manner that is consistent with the purpose of this title.

“SEC. 223. STATE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency may use funds made available under section 222(a)(2) for any of the following adult education and family literacy education programs:

“(1) The establishment or operation of professional development programs to improve the quality of instruction provided pursuant to local activities required under section 231(b).

“(2) The provision of technical assistance to eligible providers of adult education and family literacy education programs, including for the development and dissemination of evidence based research instructional practices in reading, writing, speaking, mathematics, and English language acquisition programs.

“(3) The provision of assistance to eligible providers in developing, implementing, and reporting measurable progress in achieving the objectives of this title.

“(4) The monitoring and evaluation of the quality of, and the improvement in, adult education and literacy activities.

“(5) The provision of technology assistance, including staff training, to eligible providers of adult education and family literacy education programs, including distance education activities, to enable the eligible providers to improve the quality of such activities.

“(6) The development and implementation of technology applications or distance education, including professional development to support the use of instructional technology.

“(7) Coordination with other public programs, including programs under title I of

this Act, and other welfare-to-work, workforce development, and job training programs.

“(8) Coordination with existing support services, such as transportation, child care, and other assistance designed to increase rates of enrollment in, and successful completion of, adult education and family literacy education programs, for adults enrolled in such activities.

“(9) The development and implementation of a system to assist in the transition from adult basic education to postsecondary education.

“(10) Activities to promote workplace literacy programs.

“(11) Other activities of statewide significance, including assisting eligible providers in achieving progress in improving the skill levels of adults who participate in programs under this title.

“(12) Integration of literacy, instructional, and occupational skill training and promotion of linkages with employees.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, eligible agencies shall coordinate where possible, and avoid duplicating efforts, in order to maximize the impact of the activities described in subsection (a).

“(c) STATE-IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever a State or outlying area implements any rule or policy relating to the administration or operation of a program authorized under this title that has the effect of imposing a requirement that is not imposed under Federal law (including any rule or policy based on a State or outlying area interpretation of a Federal statute, regulation, or guideline), the State or outlying area shall identify, to eligible providers, the rule or policy as being imposed by the State or outlying area.

“SEC. 224. STATE PLAN.

“(a) 3-YEAR PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency desiring a grant under this title for any fiscal year shall submit to, or have on file with, the Secretary a 3-year State plan.

“(2) STATE UNIFIED PLAN.—The eligible agency may submit the State plan as part of a State unified plan described in section 501.

“(b) PLAN CONTENTS.—The eligible agency shall include in the State plan or any revisions to the State plan—

“(1) an objective assessment of the needs of individuals in the State or outlying area for adult education and family literacy education programs, including individuals most in need or hardest to serve;

“(2) a description of the adult education and family literacy education programs that will be carried out with funds received under this title;

“(3) an assurance that the funds received under this title will not be expended for any purpose other than for activities under this title;

“(4) a description of how the eligible agency will annually evaluate and measure the effectiveness and improvement of the adult education and family literacy education programs funded under this title using the indicators of performance described in section 136, including how the eligible agency will conduct such annual evaluations and measures for each grant received under this title;

“(5) a description of how the eligible agency will fund local activities in accordance with the measurable goals described in section 231(d);

“(6) an assurance that the eligible agency will expend the funds under this title only in a manner consistent with fiscal requirements in section 241;

“(7) a description of the process that will be used for public participation and comment with respect to the State plan, which—

“(A) shall include consultation with the State workforce investment board, the State board responsible for administering community or technical colleges, the Governor, the State educational agency, the State board or agency responsible for administering block grants for temporary assistance to needy families under title IV of the Social Security Act, the State council on disabilities, the State vocational rehabilitation agency, and other State agencies that promote the improvement of adult education and family literacy education programs, and direct providers of such programs; and

“(B) may include consultation with the State agency on higher education, institutions responsible for professional development of adult education and family literacy education programs instructors, representatives of business and industry, refugee assistance programs, and faith-based organizations;

“(8) a description of the eligible agency’s strategies for serving populations that include, at a minimum—

“(A) low-income individuals;

“(B) individuals with disabilities;

“(C) the unemployed;

“(D) the underemployed; and

“(E) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including English learners;

“(9) a description of how the adult education and family literacy education programs that will be carried out with any funds received under this title will be integrated with other adult education, career development, and employment and training activities in the State or outlying area served by the eligible agency;

“(10) a description of the steps the eligible agency will take to ensure direct and equitable access, as required in section 231(c)(1), including—

“(A) how the State will build the capacity of community-based and faith-based organizations to provide adult education and family literacy education programs; and

“(B) how the State will increase the participation of business and industry in adult education and family literacy education programs;

“(11) an assessment of the adequacy of the system of the State or outlying area to ensure teacher quality and a description of how the State or outlying area will use funds received under this subtitle to improve teacher quality, including evidence-based professional development to improve instruction; and

“(12) a description of how the eligible agency will consult with any State agency responsible for postsecondary education to develop adult education that prepares students to enter postsecondary education without the need for remediation upon completion of secondary school equivalency programs.

“(c) PLAN REVISIONS.—When changes in conditions or other factors require substantial revisions to an approved State plan, the eligible agency shall submit the revisions of the State plan to the Secretary.

“(d) CONSULTATION.—The eligible agency shall—

“(1) submit the State plan, and any revisions to the State plan, to the Governor, the chief State school officer, or the State officer responsible for administering community or technical colleges, or outlying area for review and comment; and

“(2) ensure that any comments regarding the State plan by the Governor, the chief State school officer, or the State officer responsible for administering community or technical colleges, and any revision to the State plan, are submitted to the Secretary.

“(e) PLAN APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) approve a State plan within 90 days after receiving the plan unless the Secretary makes a written determination within 30 days after receiving the plan that the plan does not meet the requirements of this section or is inconsistent with specific provisions of this subtitle; and

“(2) not finally disapprove of a State plan before offering the eligible agency the opportunity, prior to the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the eligible agency received the written determination described in paragraph (1), to review the plan and providing technical assistance in order to assist the eligible agency in meeting the requirements of this subtitle.

“SEC. 225. PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONS EDUCATION AND OTHER INSTITUTIONALIZED INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From funds made available under section 222(a)(1) for a fiscal year, each eligible agency shall carry out corrections education and education for other institutionalized individuals.

“(b) USES OF FUNDS.—The funds described in subsection (a) shall be used for the cost of educational programs for criminal offenders in correctional institutions and for other institutionalized individuals, including academic programs for—

- “(1) basic skills education;
- “(2) special education programs as determined by the eligible agency;
- “(3) reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics programs;
- “(4) secondary school credit or diploma programs or their recognized equivalent; and
- “(5) integrated education and training.

“(c) PRIORITY.—Each eligible agency that is using assistance provided under this section to carry out a program for criminal offenders within a correctional institution shall give priority to serving individuals who are likely to leave the correctional institution within 5 years of participation in the program.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘correctional institution’ means any—

- “(A) prison;
- “(B) jail;
- “(C) reformatory;
- “(D) work farm;
- “(E) detention center; or
- “(F) halfway house, community-based rehabilitation center, or any other similar institution designed for the confinement or rehabilitation of criminal offenders.

“(2) CRIMINAL OFFENDER.—The term ‘criminal offender’ means any individual who is charged with, or convicted of, any criminal offense.

“Subtitle C—Local Provisions

“SEC. 231. GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.

“(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—From grant funds made available under section 222(a)(1), each eligible agency shall award multi-year grants or contracts, on a competitive basis, to eligible providers within the State or outlying area that meet the conditions and requirements of this title to enable the eligible providers to develop, implement, and improve adult education and family literacy education programs within the State.

“(b) LOCAL ACTIVITIES.—The eligible agency shall require eligible providers receiving a grant or contract under subsection (a) to establish or operate—

- “(1) programs that provide adult education and literacy activities;
- “(2) programs that provide integrated education and training activities; or
- “(3) credit-bearing postsecondary coursework.

“(c) DIRECT AND EQUITABLE ACCESS; SAME PROCESS.—Each eligible agency receiving funds under this title shall ensure that—

“(1) all eligible providers have direct and equitable access to apply for grants or contracts under this section; and

“(2) the same grant or contract announcement process and application process is used for all eligible providers in the State or outlying area.

“(d) MEASURABLE GOALS.—The eligible agency shall require eligible providers receiving a grant or contract under subsection (a) to demonstrate—

“(1) the eligible provider’s measurable goals for participant outcomes to be achieved annually on the core indicators of performance described in section 136(b)(2)(A);

“(2) the past effectiveness of the eligible provider in improving the basic academic skills of adults and, for eligible providers receiving grants in the prior year, the success of the eligible provider receiving funding under this title in exceeding its performance goals in the prior year;

“(3) the commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are the most in need of basic academic skills instruction services, including individuals with disabilities and individuals who are low-income or have minimal reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, or are English learners;

“(4) the program is of sufficient intensity and quality for participants to achieve substantial learning gains;

“(5) educational practices are evidence-based;

“(6) the activities of the eligible provider effectively employ advances in technology, and delivery systems including distance education;

“(7) the activities provide instruction in real-life contexts, including integrated education and training when appropriate, to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;

“(8) the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors, and administrators who meet minimum qualifications established by the State;

“(9) the activities are coordinated with other available resources in the community, such as through strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, local workforce investment boards, one-stop centers, job training programs, community-based and faith-based organizations, and social service agencies;

“(10) the activities offer flexible schedules and support services (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or other special needs, to attend and complete programs;

“(11) the activities include a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report measurable participant outcomes (consistent with section 136) and to monitor program performance;

“(12) the local communities have a demonstrated need for additional English language acquisition programs, and integrated education and training programs;

“(13) the capacity of the eligible provider to produce valid information on performance results, including enrollments and measurable participant outcomes;

“(14) adult education and family literacy education programs offer rigorous reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics content that are evidence based; and

“(15) applications of technology, and services to be provided by the eligible providers, are of sufficient intensity and duration to increase the amount and quality of learning and lead to measurable learning gains within specified time periods.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE.—Eligible providers may use grant funds under this title to serve children participating in family literacy programs assisted under this part, provided that other sources of funds available to provide similar services for such children are used first.

“SEC. 232. LOCAL APPLICATION.

“Each eligible provider desiring a grant or contract under this title shall submit an application to the eligible agency containing such information and assurances as the eligible agency may require, including—

“(1) a description of how funds awarded under this title will be spent consistent with the requirements of this title;

“(2) a description of any cooperative arrangements the eligible provider has with other agencies, institutions, or organizations for the delivery of adult education and family literacy education programs; and

“(3) each of the demonstrations required by section 231(d).

“SEC. 233. LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMITS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), of the amount that is made available under this title to an eligible provider—

“(1) at least 95 percent shall be expended for carrying out adult education and family literacy education programs; and

“(2) the remaining amount shall be used for planning, administration, personnel and professional development, development of measurable goals in reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics, and interagency coordination.

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In cases where the cost limits described in subsection (a) are too restrictive to allow for adequate planning, administration, personnel development, and interagency coordination, the eligible provider may negotiate with the eligible agency in order to determine an adequate level of funds to be used for noninstructional purposes.

“Subtitle D—General Provisions

“SEC. 241. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

“Funds made available for adult education and family literacy education programs under this title shall supplement and not supplant other State or local public funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs.

“SEC. 242. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

“The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program of national activities that may include the following:

“(1) Providing technical assistance to eligible entities, on request, to—

“(A) improve their fiscal management, research-based instruction, and reporting requirements to carry out the requirements of this title;

“(B) improve its performance on the core indicators of performance described in section 136;

“(C) provide adult education professional development; and

“(D) use distance education and improve the application of technology in the classroom, including instruction in English language acquisition for English learners.

“(2) Providing for the conduct of research on national literacy basic skill acquisition levels among adults, including the number of adult English learners functioning at different levels of reading proficiency.

“(3) Improving the coordination, efficiency, and effectiveness of adult education and workforce development services at the national, State, and local levels.

“(4) Determining how participation in adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs prepares individuals for entry into and success in postsecondary education and employment, and in the case of prison-based services, the effect on recidivism.

“(5) Evaluating how different types of providers, including community and faith-based organizations or private for-profit agencies measurably improve the skills of participants in adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs.

“(6) Identifying model integrated basic and workplace skills education programs, including programs for English learners coordinated literacy and employment services, and effective strategies for serving adults with disabilities.

“(7) Initiating other activities designed to improve the measurable quality and effectiveness of adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs nationwide.”

Subtitle C—Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act

SEC. 466. AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT.

Section 15 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491-2) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 15. WORKFORCE AND LABOR MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEM.

“(a) SYSTEM CONTENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’), in accordance with the provisions of this section, shall oversee the development, maintenance, and continuous improvement of a nationwide workforce and labor market information system that includes—

“(A) statistical data from cooperative statistical survey and projection programs and data from administrative reporting systems that, taken together, enumerate, estimate, and project employment opportunities and conditions at national, State, and local levels in a timely manner, including statistics on—

“(i) employment and unemployment status of national, State, and local populations, including self-employed, part-time, and seasonal workers;

“(ii) industrial distribution of occupations, as well as current and projected employment opportunities, wages, benefits (where data is available), and skill trends by occupation and industry, with particular attention paid to State and local conditions;

“(iii) the incidence of, industrial and geographical location of, and number of workers displaced by, permanent layoffs and plant closings; and

“(iv) employment and earnings information maintained in a longitudinal manner to be used for research and program evaluation;

“(B) information on State and local employment opportunities, and other appropriate statistical data related to labor market dynamics, which—

“(i) shall be current and comprehensive;

“(ii) shall meet the needs identified through the consultations described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (e)(1); and

“(iii) shall meet the needs for the information identified in section 121(e)(1)(E) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(e)(1)(E));

“(C) technical standards (which the Secretary shall publish annually) for data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) that, at a minimum, meet the criteria of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code;

“(D) procedures to ensure compatibility and additivity of the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) from national, State, and local levels;

“(E) procedures to support standardization and aggregation of data from administrative reporting systems described in subparagraph (A) of employment-related programs;

“(F) analysis of data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) for uses such as—

“(i) national, State, and local policy-making;

“(ii) implementation of Federal policies (including allocation formulas);

“(iii) program planning and evaluation; and

“(iv) researching labor market dynamics;

“(G) wide dissemination of such data, information, and analysis in a user-friendly manner and voluntary technical standards for dissemination mechanisms; and

“(H) programs of—

“(i) training for effective data dissemination;

“(ii) research and demonstration; and

“(iii) programs and technical assistance.

“(2) INFORMATION TO BE CONFIDENTIAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No officer or employee of the Federal Government or agent of the Federal Government may—

“(i) use any submission that is furnished for exclusively statistical purposes under the provisions of this section for any purpose other than the statistical purposes for which the submission is furnished;

“(ii) disclose to the public any publication or media transmittal of the data contained in the submission described in clause (i) that permits information concerning an individual subject to be reasonably inferred by either direct or indirect means; or

“(iii) permit anyone other than a sworn officer, employee, or agent of any Federal department or agency, or a contractor (including an employee of a contractor) of such department or agency, to examine an individual submission described in clause (i), without the consent of the individual, agency, or other person who is the subject of the submission or provides that submission.

“(B) IMMUNITY FROM LEGAL PROCESS.—Any submission (including any data derived from the submission) that is collected and retained by a Federal department or agency, or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of such a department or agency, for exclusively statistical purposes under this section shall be immune from the legal process and shall not, without the consent of the individual, agency, or other person who is the subject of the submission or provides that submission, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide immunity from the legal process for such submission (including any data derived from the submission) if the submission is in the possession of any person, agency, or entity other than the Federal Government or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of the Federal Government, or if the submission is independently collected, retained, or produced for purposes other than the purposes of this Act.

“(b) SYSTEM RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) shall be planned, administered, overseen, and evaluated through a cooperative governance structure involving the Federal Government and States.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Secretary, with respect to data collection, analysis, and dissemination of workforce and labor market information for the system, shall carry out the following duties:

“(A) Assign responsibilities within the Department of Labor for elements of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) to ensure that all statistical and administrative data collected is consistent with appropriate Bureau of Labor Statistics standards and definitions.

“(B) Actively seek the cooperation of other Federal agencies to establish and maintain mechanisms for ensuring complementarity and nonduplication in the development and operation of statistical and administrative data collection activities.

“(C) Eliminate gaps and duplication in statistical undertakings, with the systemization of wage surveys as an early priority.

“(D) In collaboration with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and States, develop and maintain the elements of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a), including the development of consistent procedures and definitions for use by the States in collecting the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1).

“(E) Establish procedures for the system to ensure that—

“(i) such data and information are timely;

“(ii) paperwork and reporting for the system are reduced to a minimum; and

“(iii) States and localities are fully involved in the development and continuous improvement of the system at all levels.

“(c) NATIONAL ELECTRONIC TOOLS TO PROVIDE SERVICES.—The Secretary is authorized to assist in the development of national electronic tools that may be used to facilitate the delivery of work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)(2)) and to provide workforce and labor market information to individuals through the one-stop delivery systems described in section 121 and through other appropriate delivery systems.

“(d) COORDINATION WITH THE STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, working through the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Employment and Training Administration, shall regularly consult with representatives of State agencies carrying out workforce information activities regarding strategies for improving the workforce and labor market information system.

“(2) FORMAL CONSULTATIONS.—At least twice each year, the Secretary, working through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall conduct formal consultations regarding programs carried out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with representatives of each of the Federal regions of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, elected (pursuant to a process established by the Secretary) from the State directors affiliated with State agencies that perform the duties described in subsection (e)(1).

“(e) STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive Federal financial assistance under this section, the Governor of a State shall—

“(A) be responsible for the management of the portions of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) that comprise a statewide workforce and labor market information system;

“(B) establish a process for the oversight of such system;

“(C) consult with State and local employers, participants, and local workforce investment boards about the labor market relevance of the data to be collected and disseminated through the statewide workforce and labor market information system;

“(D) consult with State educational agencies and local educational agencies concerning the provision of workforce and labor market information in order to meet the needs of secondary school and postsecondary school students who seek such information;

“(E) collect and disseminate for the system, on behalf of the State and localities in the State, the information and data described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1);

“(F) maintain and continuously improve the statewide workforce and labor market information system in accordance with this section;

“(G) perform contract and grant responsibilities for data collection, analysis, and dissemination for such system;

“(H) conduct such other data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities as will ensure an effective statewide workforce and labor market information system;

“(I) actively seek the participation of other State and local agencies in data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities in order to ensure complementarity, compatibility, and usefulness of data;

“(J) participate in the development of, and submit to the Secretary, an annual plan to carry out the requirements and authorities of this subsection; and

“(K) utilize the quarterly records described in section 136(f)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(f)(2)) to assist the State and other States in measuring State progress on State performance measures.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the ability of a Governor to conduct additional data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities with State funds or with Federal funds from sources other than this section.

“(f) NONDUPLICATION REQUIREMENT.—None of the functions and activities carried out pursuant to this section shall duplicate the functions and activities carried out under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$60,153,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.”

Subtitle D—Repeals and Conforming Amendments

SEC. 471. REPEALS.

The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Chapter 4 of subtitle B of title I, and sections 123, 155, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 173A, 174, 192, 194, 502, 503, and 506 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act.

(2) Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.).

(3) Sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.).

(4) The Twenty-First Century Workforce Commission Act (29 U.S.C. 2701 note).

(5) Public Law 91-378, 16 U.S.C. 1701 et seq. (popularly known as the “Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970”).

(6) Section 821 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 1151).

(7) The Women in Apprenticeship and Non-traditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(8) Sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 472. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 3(t) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(t)) is amended—

(A) by striking “means (1) the agency” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) the agency”;

(B) by striking “programs, and (2) the tribal” and inserting the following: “programs;

“(B) the tribal”;

(C) by striking “this Act.” and inserting the following: “this Act; and

“(C) in the context of employment and training activities under section 6(d)(4), a State board as defined in section 101 of the

Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).”

(2) ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(14) by striking “section 6(d)(4)(I)” and inserting “section 6(d)(4)(C)”, and

(B) in subsection (g)(3), in the first sentence, by striking “constitutes adequate participation in an employment and training program under section 6(d)” and inserting “allows the individual to participate in employment and training activities under section 6(d)(4)”.

(3) ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS.—Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—

“(i) IMPLEMENTATION.—Each State agency shall provide employment and training services authorized under section 134 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864) to eligible members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining skills, training, work, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment.

“(ii) STATEWIDE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM.—Consistent with subparagraph (A), employment and training services shall be provided through the statewide workforce development system, including the one-stop delivery system authorized by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

“(iii) REIMBURSEMENTS.—

“(I) ACTUAL COSTS.—The State agency shall provide payments or reimbursement to participants served under this paragraph for—

“(aa) the actual costs of transportation and other actual costs (other than dependent care costs) that are reasonably necessary and directly related to the individual participating in employment and training activities; and

“(bb) the actual costs of such dependent care expenses as are determined by the State agency to be necessary for the individual to participate in employment and training activities (other than an individual who is the caretaker relative of a dependent in a family receiving benefits under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in a local area where an employment, training, or education program under title IV of that Act is in operation), except that no such payment or reimbursement shall exceed the applicable local market rate.

“(II) SERVICE CONTRACTS AND VOUCHERS.—In lieu of providing reimbursements or payments for dependent care expenses under clause (i), a State agency may, at the option of the State agency, arrange for dependent care through providers by the use of purchase of service contracts or vouchers or by providing vouchers to the household.

“(III) VALUE OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—The value of any dependent care services provided for or arranged under clause (ii), or any amount received as a payment or reimbursement under clause (i), shall—

“(aa) not be treated as income for the purposes of any other Federal or federally assisted program that bases eligibility for, or the amount of benefits on, need; and

“(bb) not be claimed as an employment-related expense for the purposes of the credit provided under section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 21).”

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 11(e)(19) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(11)) is amended to read as follows:

“(S) the plans of the State agency for providing employment and training services under section 6(d)(4);”

(5) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND QUALITY CONTROL.—Section 16(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “carry out employment and training programs” and inserting “provide employment and training services to eligible households under section 6(d)(4);” and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “operating an employment and training program” and inserting “providing employment and training services consistent with section 6(d)(4);”

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “participation in an employment and training program” and inserting “the individual participating in employment and training activities”; and

(ii) by striking “section 6(d)(4)(I)(i)(II)” and inserting “section 6(d)(4)(C)(i)(II)”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “for operating an employment and training program” and inserting “to provide employment and training services”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(E) MONITORING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor, shall monitor each State agency responsible for administering employment and training services under section 6(d)(4) to ensure funds are being spent effectively and efficiently.

“(ii) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Each program of employment and training receiving funds under section 6(d)(4) shall be subject to the requirements of the performance accountability system, including having to meet the State performance measures described in section 136 of the Workforce Investment Act (29 U.S.C. 2871).”

(6) RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B)(iv)(III)(dd), by striking “, (4)(F)(i), or (4)(K)” and inserting “or (4)”; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in subsection (g), in the first sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “programs established” and inserting “activities provided to eligible households”; and

(ii) by inserting “, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor,” after “Secretary”.

(7) MINNESOTA FAMILY INVESTMENT PROJECT.—Section 22(b)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(b)(4)) is amended by striking “equivalent to those offered under the employment and training program”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 412 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

(1) CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS.—Section 412(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “make available sufficient resources for employment training and placement” and inserting “provide refugees with the opportunity to access employment and training services, including job placement,”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “services;” and inserting “services provided through the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);”

(B) in paragraph (2)(C)(iii)(II), by inserting “and training” after “employment”;

(C) in paragraph (6)(A)(ii)—

(i) by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(ii) by inserting “and training” after “employment”; and

(iii) by inserting after “available” the following: “through the one-stop delivery system under section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841)”;

(D) in paragraph (9), by inserting “the Secretary of Labor,” after “Education.”

(2) PROGRAM OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT.—Section 412(b)(2) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking “orientation, instruction” and inserting “orientation and instruction”; and

(B) by striking “, and job training for refugees, and such other education and training of refugees, as facilitates” and inserting “for refugees to facilitate”.

(3) PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES FOR REFUGEES.—Section 412(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting “and training” after “employment”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “paragraph—” and all that follows through “in a manner” and inserting “paragraph in a manner”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that employment and training services are provided through the statewide workforce development system, as appropriate, authorized by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.). Such action may include—

“(i) making employment and training activities described in section 134 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864) available to refugees; and

“(ii) providing refugees with access to a one-stop delivery system established under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841).”

(4) CASH ASSISTANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES.—Section 412(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A)(i), by inserting “and training” after “providing employment”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “The” and inserting “Consistent with subsection (c)(3), the”.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE SECOND CHANCE ACT OF 2007.—

(1) FEDERAL PRISONER REENTRY INITIATIVE.—Section 231 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17541) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(E)—

(i) by inserting “the Department of Labor and” before “other Federal agencies”; and

(ii) by inserting “State and local workforce investment boards,” after “community-based organizations,”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking at the end “and”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking at the end the period and inserting “; and”;

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

“(D) to coordinate reentry programs with the employment and training services provided through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.)”;

(C) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(F) INTERACTION WITH THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEM.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that employment and training services, including such employment and services offered through reentry programs, are provided, as appropriate, through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), which may include—

“(I) making employment and training services available to prisoners prior to and immediately following the release of such prisoners; or

“(II) providing prisoners with access by remote means to a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841) in the State in which the prison involved is located.

“(ii) SERVICE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘employment and training services’ means those services described in section 134 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864) offered by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

“(I) the skills assessment described in subsection (a)(1)(A);

“(II) the skills development plan described in subsection (a)(1)(B); and

“(III) the enhancement, development, and implementation of reentry and skills development programs.”

(2) DUTIES OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS.—Section 4042(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E), as added by section 231(d)(1)(C) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199; 122 Stat. 685), as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(B) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(C) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “Employment” and inserting “Employment and training services (as defined in paragraph (6) of section 231(d) of the Second Chance Act of 2007), including basic skills attainment, consistent with such paragraph”; and

(ii) by striking clause (iii); and

(D) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968.—Section 2976 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “vocational” and inserting “career and technical education (as defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)) and training”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(D) coordinating employment and training services provided through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), including a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841), for offenders upon release from prison, jail, or a juvenile facility, as appropriate;”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting “, including local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832),” after “nonprofit organizations”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “victims services, and employment services” and inserting “and victim services”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(D) provides employment and training services through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I

of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), including a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841);”;

(4) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “, in accordance with paragraph (2)” after “under this section”;

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

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(B) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall require each grantee under this section to measure the core indicators of performance as described in section 136(b)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)(2)(A)) with respect to the program of such grantee funded with a grant under this section.”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3672(d)(1), by striking “disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists under section 4103A” and inserting “veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998”;

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41, by striking the items relating to sections 4103A and 4104;

(3) in section 4102A—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (5), (6), and (7); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (5);

(B) by striking subsections (c) and (h);

(C) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f); and

(D) in subsection (e)(1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “, including disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists and local veterans’ employment representatives providing employment, training, and placement services under this chapter in a State”; and

(ii) by striking “for purposes of subsection (c)”;

(4) in section 4104A—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(i) the appropriate veteran employment specialist (in carrying out the functions described in section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998);”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(i) collaborate with the appropriate veteran employment specialist (as described in section 134(f) and the appropriate State boards and local boards (as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801));”;

(5) in section 4109—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists and local veterans’ employment representative” and inserting “veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists and local veterans’ employment representatives” and inserting “veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998”; and

(6) in section 4112(d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “disabled veterans’ outreach program specialist” and inserting “veteran employment specialist appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(f) COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT OF 1980.—Section 104(k)(6)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(6)(A)) is amended by striking “training, research, and” and inserting “research and”.

SEC. 473. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

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

“TITLE I—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEMS

“Subtitle A—Workforce Investment Definitions

“Sec. 101. Definitions.

“Subtitle B—Statewide and Local Workforce Investment Systems

“Sec. 106. Purpose.

“CHAPTER 1—STATE PROVISIONS

“Sec. 111. State workforce investment boards.

“Sec. 112. State plan.

“CHAPTER 2—LOCAL PROVISIONS

“Sec. 116. Local workforce investment areas.

“Sec. 117. Local workforce investment boards.

“Sec. 118. Local plan.

“CHAPTER 3—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES PROVIDERS

“Sec. 121. Establishment of one-stop delivery systems.

“Sec. 122. Identification of eligible providers of training services.

“CHAPTER 5—EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

“Sec. 131. General authorization.

“Sec. 132. State allotments.

“Sec. 133. Within State allocations.

“Sec. 134. Use of funds for employment and training activities.

“CHAPTER 6—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec. 136. Performance accountability system.

“Sec. 137. Authorization of appropriations.

“Subtitle C—Job Corps

“Sec. 141. Purposes.

“Sec. 142. Definitions.

“Sec. 143. Establishment.

“Sec. 144. Individuals eligible for the Job Corps.

“Sec. 145. Recruitment, screening, selection, and assignment of enrollees.

“Sec. 146. Enrollment.

“Sec. 147. Job Corps centers.

“Sec. 148. Program activities.

“Sec. 149. Counseling and job placement.

“Sec. 150. Support.

“Sec. 151. Operations.

“Sec. 152. Standards of conduct.

“Sec. 153. Community participation.

“Sec. 154. Workforce councils.

“Sec. 156. Technical assistance to centers.

“Sec. 157. Application of provisions of Federal law.

“Sec. 158. Special provisions.

“Sec. 159. Performance accountability and management.

“Sec. 160. General provisions.

“Sec. 161. Authorization of appropriations.

“Subtitle D—National Programs

“Sec. 170. Technical assistance.

“Sec. 172. Evaluations.

“Subtitle E—Administration

“Sec. 181. Requirements and restrictions.

“Sec. 182. Prompt allocation of funds.

“Sec. 183. Monitoring.

“Sec. 184. Fiscal controls; sanctions.

“Sec. 185. Reports; recordkeeping; investigations.

“Sec. 186. Administrative adjudication.

“Sec. 187. Judicial review.

“Sec. 188. Nondiscrimination.

“Sec. 189. Administrative provisions.

“Sec. 190. References.

“Sec. 191. State legislative authority.

“Sec. 193. Transfer of Federal equity in State employment security real property to the States.

“Sec. 195. General program requirements.

“Sec. 196. Federal agency staff.

“Sec. 197. Restrictions on lobbying and political activities.

“Subtitle F—Repeals and Conforming Amendments

“Sec. 199. Repeals.

“Sec. 199A. Conforming amendments.

“TITLE II—ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION

“Sec. 201. Short title.

“Sec. 202. Purpose.

“Sec. 203. Definitions.

“Sec. 204. Home schools.

“Sec. 205. Authorization of appropriations.

“Subtitle A—Federal Provisions

“Sec. 211. Reservation of funds; grants to eligible agencies; allotments.

“Sec. 212. Performance accountability system.

“Subtitle B—State Provisions

“Sec. 221. State administration.

“Sec. 222. State distribution of funds; matching requirement.

“Sec. 223. State leadership activities.

“Sec. 224. State plan.

“Sec. 225. Programs for corrections education and other institutionalized individuals.

“Subtitle C—Local Provisions

“Sec. 231. Grants and contracts for eligible providers.

“Sec. 232. Local application.

“Sec. 233. Local administrative cost limits.

“Subtitle D—General Provisions

“Sec. 241. Administrative provisions.

“Sec. 242. National activities.

“TITLE III—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

“Subtitle A—Wagner-Peyser Act

“Sec. 301. Definitions.

“Sec. 302. Functions.

“Sec. 303. Designation of State agencies.

“Sec. 304. Appropriations.

“Sec. 305. Disposition of allotted funds.

“Sec. 306. State plans.

“Sec. 307. Repeal of Federal advisory council.

“Sec. 308. Regulations.

“Sec. 309. Employment statistics.

“Sec. 310. Technical amendments.

“Sec. 311. Effective date.

“Subtitle B—Linkages With Other Programs

“Sec. 321. Trade Act of 1974.

“Sec. 322. Veterans’ employment programs.

“Sec. 323. Older Americans Act of 1965.

“Subtitle D—Application of Civil Rights and Labor-Management Laws to the Smithsonian Institution

“Sec. 341. Application of civil rights and labor-management laws to the Smithsonian Institution.

“TITLE IV—REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1998

“Sec. 401. Short title.

“Sec. 402. Title.

“Sec. 403. General provisions.

“Sec. 404. Vocational rehabilitation services.

“Sec. 405. Research and training.

“Sec. 406. Professional development and special projects and demonstrations.

“Sec. 407. National Council on Disability.

“Sec. 408. Rights and advocacy.

“Sec. 409. Employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

“Sec. 410. Independent living services and centers for independent living.

“Sec. 411. Repeal.

“Sec. 412. Helen Keller National Center Act.

“Sec. 413. President’s Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities.

“Sec. 414. Conforming amendments.

“TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec. 501. State unified plan.

“Sec. 504. Privacy.

“Sec. 505. Buy-American requirements.

“Sec. 507. Effective date.”

Subtitle E—Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

SEC. 476. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) there is a substantial need to improve and expand services for students with disabilities under this Act.”

SEC. 477. REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a) (29 U.S.C. 702(a))—

(A) by striking “Office of the Secretary” and inserting “Department of Education”;

(B) by striking “President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate” and inserting “Secretary”; and

(C) by striking “, and the Commissioner shall be the principal officer.”;

(2) by striking “Commissioner” each place it appears (except in section 21) and inserting “Director”;

(3) in section 12(c) (29 U.S.C. 709(c)), by striking “Commissioner’s” and inserting “Director’s”;

(4) in section 21 (29 U.S.C. 718)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) by striking “Commissioner” the first place it appears and inserting “Director of the Rehabilitation Services Administration”;

(ii) by striking “(referred to in this subsection as the ‘Director’)”; and

(iii) by striking “The Commissioner and the Director” and inserting “Both such Directors”; and

(B) by striking “the Commissioner and the Director” each place it appears and inserting “both such Directors”;

(5) in the heading for subparagraph (B) of section 100(d)(2) (29 U.S.C. 720(d)(2)), by striking “COMMISSIONER” and inserting “DIRECTOR”;

(6) in section 401(a)(1) (29 U.S.C. 781(a)(1)), by inserting “of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research” after “Director”;

(7) in the heading for section 706 (29 U.S.C. 796d-1), by striking “COMMISSIONER” and inserting “DIRECTOR”;

(8) in the heading for paragraph (3) of section 723(a) (29 U.S.C. 796f-2(a)), by striking “COMMISSIONER” and inserting “DIRECTOR”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply with respect to the appointments of Directors of the Rehabilitation Services

Administration made on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and the Directors so appointed.

SEC. 478. DEFINITIONS.

Section 7 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 705) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (35) through (39) as paragraphs (36) through (40), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii) of paragraph (36) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking “paragraph (36)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (37)(C)”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (34) the following:

“(35)(A) The term ‘student with a disability’ means an individual with a disability who—

“(i) is not younger than 16 and not older than 21;

“(ii) has been determined to be eligible under section 102(a) for assistance under this title; and

“(iii)(I) is eligible for, and is receiving, special education under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.); or

“(II) is an individual with a disability, for purposes of section 504.

“(B) The term ‘students with disabilities’ means more than 1 student with a disability.”

SEC. 479. CARRYOVER.

Section 19(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 716(a)(1)) is amended by striking “part B of title VI.”

SEC. 480. TRADITIONALLY UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

Section 21 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 718) is amended, in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (b), and in subsection (c), by striking “VI.”

SEC. 481. STATE PLAN.

Section 101(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 721(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “on the eligible individuals” and all that follows and inserting “of information necessary to assess the State’s performance on the core indicators of performance described in section 136(b)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)(2)(A)).”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking “, to the extent the measures are applicable to individuals with disabilities”;

(2) in paragraph (11)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, which may be provided using alternative means of meeting participation (such as participation through video conferences and conference calls)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) COORDINATION WITH ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—The State plan shall include an assurance that the designated State unit and the lead agency or implementing entity responsible for carrying out duties under the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) have developed working relationships and coordinate their activities.”;

(3) in paragraph (15)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (1)—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in subclause (III), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) students with disabilities, including their need for transition services.”;

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) include an assessment of the transition services provided under this Act, and coordinated with transition services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), about the extent to which those 2 types of services meet the needs of individuals with disabilities.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “and under part B of title VI”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) the methods to be used to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities, including the coordination of services designed to facilitate the transition of such students from the receipt of educational services in school to the receipt of vocational rehabilitation services under this title or to postsecondary education or employment.”; and

(iii) in clause (v), as redesignated by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by striking “evaluation standards” and inserting “performance standards”;

(4) in paragraph (22)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “STATE PLAN SUPPLEMENT”;

(B) by striking “carrying out part B of title VI, including”; and

(C) by striking “that part to supplement funds made available under part B of”;

(5) in paragraph (24)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “CONTRACTS” and inserting “GRANTS”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “CONTRACTS” and inserting “GRANTS”; and

(ii) by striking “part A of title VI” and inserting “section 109A”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(25) COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.—The State plan shall describe how the designated State agency will carry out the provisions of section 109A, including—

“(A) the criteria such agency will use to award grants under such section; and

“(B) how the activities carried out under such grants will be coordinated with other services provided under this title.

“(26) SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES.—The State plan shall provide an assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that the State—

“(A) has developed and implemented strategies to address the needs identified in the assessments described in paragraph (15), and achieve the goals and priorities identified by the State in that paragraph, to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities on a statewide basis in accordance with paragraph (15); and

“(B) from funds reserved under section 110A, shall carry out programs or activities designed to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities that—

“(i) facilitate the transition of students with disabilities from the receipt of educational services in school, to the receipt of vocational rehabilitation services under this title, including, at a minimum, those services specified in the interagency agreement required in paragraph (11)(D);

“(ii) improve the achievement of post-school goals of students with disabilities, including improving the achievement through participation (as appropriate when career goals are discussed) in meetings regarding individualized education programs developed under section 614 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1414);

“(iii) provide career guidance, career exploration services, job search skills and

strategies, and technical assistance to students with disabilities;

“(iv) support the provision of training and technical assistance to State and local educational agencies and designated State agency personnel responsible for the planning and provision of services to students with disabilities; and

“(v) support outreach activities to students with disabilities who are eligible for, and need, services under this title.”

SEC. 482. SCOPE OF SERVICES.

Section 103 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 723) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (15) and inserting the following:

“(15) transition services for students with disabilities, that facilitate the achievement of the employment outcome identified in the individualized plan for employment involved, including services described in clauses (i) through (iii) of section 101(a)(26)(B).”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6)(A)(i) Consultation and technical assistance services to assist State and local educational agencies in planning for the transition of students with disabilities from school to post-school activities, including employment.

“(ii) Training and technical assistance described in section 101(a)(26)(B)(iv).

“(B) Services for groups of individuals with disabilities who meet the requirements of clauses (i) and (iii) of section 7(35)(A), including services described in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (v) of section 101(a)(26)(B), to assist in the transition from school to post-school activities.”; and

(3) in subsection (b), by inserting at the end the following:

“(7) The establishment, development, or improvement of assistive technology demonstration, loan, reutilization, or financing programs in coordination with activities authorized under the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) to promote access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities and employers.”.

SEC. 483. STANDARDS AND INDICATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 726) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “EVALUATION STANDARDS” and inserting “PERFORMANCE STANDARDS”;

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) STANDARDS AND INDICATORS.—The performance standards and indicators for the vocational rehabilitation program carried out under this title—

“(1) shall be subject to paragraphs (2)(A) and (3) of section 136(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)); and

“(2) may, at a State’s discretion, include additional indicators identified in the State plan submitted under section 101.”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) on a biannual basis, review the program improvement efforts of the State and, if the State has not improved its performance to acceptable levels, as determined by the Director, direct the State to make revisions to the plan to improve performance; and”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 107 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 727) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2), by striking “evaluation standards” and inserting “performance standards”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking “an evaluation standard” and inserting “a performance standard”.

SEC. 484. EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS.

Section 108(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 728(a)) is amended by striking “under part B of title VI, or”.

SEC. 485. COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended by inserting after section 109 (29 U.S.C. 728a) the following:

“SEC. 109A. COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.

“(a) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.**—For the purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a for-profit business, alone or in partnership with one or more of the following:

“(1) Community rehabilitation program providers.

“(2) Indian tribes.

“(3) Tribal organizations.

“(b) **AUTHORITY.**—A State shall use not less than one-half of one percent of the payment the State receives under section 111 for a fiscal year to award grants to eligible entities to pay for the Federal share of the cost of carrying out collaborative programs, to create practical job and career readiness and training programs, and to provide job placements and career advancement.

“(c) **AWARDS.**—Grants under this section shall—

“(1) be awarded for a period not to exceed 5 years; and

“(2) be awarded competitively.

“(d) **APPLICATION.**—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to a designated State agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as such agency shall require. Such application shall include, at a minimum—

“(1) a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the collaborative program;

“(2) a plan for collecting and reporting the data and information described under subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(a)(10), as determined appropriate by the designated State agency; and

“(3) a plan for providing for the non-Federal share of the costs of the program.

“(e) **ACTIVITIES.**—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to carry out a program that provides one or more of the following:

“(1) Job development, job placement, and career advancement services for individuals with disabilities.

“(2) Training in realistic work settings in order to prepare individuals with disabilities for employment and career advancement in the competitive market.

“(3) Providing individuals with disabilities with such support services as may be required in order to maintain the employment and career advancement for which the individuals have received training.

“(f) **ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.**—An individual shall be eligible for services provided under a program under this section if the individual is determined under section 102(a)(1) to be eligible for assistance under this title.

“(g) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share for a program under this section shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of the program.”.

SEC. 486. RESERVATION FOR EXPANDED TRANSITION SERVICES.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended by inserting after section 110 (29 U.S.C. 730) the following:

“SEC. 110A. RESERVATION FOR EXPANDED TRANSITION SERVICES.

“Each State shall reserve not less than 10 percent of the funds allotted to the State under section 110(a) to carry out programs or activities under sections 101(a)(26)(B) and 103(b)(6).”.

SEC. 487. CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 112(e)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 732(e)(1)) is amended by re-

designating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) The Secretary shall make grants to the protection and advocacy system serving the American Indian Consortium under the Developmental Disabilities and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15001 et seq.) to provide services in accordance with this section, as determined by the Secretary. The amount of such grants shall be the same as the amount provided to territories under this subsection.”.

SEC. 488. RESEARCH.

Section 204(a)(2)(A) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 764(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “VI.”.

SEC. 489. TITLE III AMENDMENTS.

Title III of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 771 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(a) (21 U.S.C. 771(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and” at the end;

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3);

(2) in section 302 (29 U.S.C. 772)—

(A) in subsection (g)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING”; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking “section 306” and inserting “section 304”;

(3) in section 303 (29 U.S.C. 773)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “section 306” and inserting “section 304”; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by amending subparagraph (A)(ii) to read as follows:
 “(i) to coordinate activities and work closely with the parent training and information centers established pursuant to section 671 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1471), the community parent resource centers established pursuant to section 672 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1472), and the eligible entities receiving awards under section 673 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1473); and”;

(II) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “, and demonstrate the capacity for serving,” after “serve”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **RESERVATION.**—From the amount appropriated to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year, 20 percent of such amount or \$500,000, whichever is less, shall be reserved to carry out paragraph (6).”;

(4) by striking sections 304 and 305 (29 U.S.C. 774, 775); and

(5) by redesignating section 306 (29 U.S.C. 776) as section 304.

SEC. 490. REPEAL OF TITLE VI.

Title VI of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 795 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 491. TITLE VII GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—Section 701(3) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796(3)) is amended by striking “State programs of supported employment services receiving assistance under part B of title VI.”.

(b) **CHAIRPERSON.**—Section 705(b)(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796d(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Council shall select a chairperson from among the voting membership of the Council.”.

SEC. 492. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) is further amended—

(1) in section 100 (29 U.S.C. 720)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$3,066,192,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking “2003” and inserting “2021”;

(2) in section 110(c) (29 U.S.C. 730(c)), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) The sum referred to in paragraph (1) shall be, as determined by the Secretary, not less than 1 percent and not more than 1.5 percent of the amount referred to in paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.”;

(3) in section 112(h) (29 U.S.C. 732(h)), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$11,600,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(4) by amending subsection (a) of section 201 (29 U.S.C. 761(a)) to read as follows: “(a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$103,125,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years to carry out this title.”;

(5) in section 302(i) (29 U.S.C. 772(i)), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$33,657,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(6) in section 303(e) (29 U.S.C. 773(e)), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$5,046,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(7) in section 405 (29 U.S.C. 785), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$3,081,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(8) in section 502(j) (29 U.S.C. 792(j)), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$7,013,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(9) in section 509(1) (29 U.S.C. 794e(1)), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$17,088,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(10) in section 714 (29 U.S.C. 796e-3), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$22,137,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”;

(11) in section 727 (29 U.S.C. 796f-6), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$75,772,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”; and

(12) in section 753 (29 U.S.C. 796l), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003” and inserting “\$32,239,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years”.

SEC. 493. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 1(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 109 the following:

“Sec. 109A. Collaboration with industry.”;

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 110 the following:

“Sec. 110A. Reservation for expanded transition services.”;

(3) by striking the item related to section 304 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 304. Measuring of project outcomes and performance.”;

(4) by striking the items related to sections 305 and 306;

(5) by striking the items related to title VI; and

(6) by striking the item related to section 706 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 706. Responsibilities of the Director.”.

Subtitle F—Studies by the Comptroller General

SEC. 496. STUDY BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON EXHAUSTING FEDERAL PELL GRANTS BEFORE ACCESSING WIA FUNDS.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of subparagraph (B) of section 134(d)(4) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(B)) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), including—

(A) a review of the regulations and guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor to State and local areas on how to comply with such subparagraph;

(B) a review of State policies to determine how local areas are required to comply with such subparagraph;

(C) a review of local area policies to determine how one-stop operators are required to comply with such subparagraph; and

(D) a review of a sampling of individuals receiving training services under section 134(d)(4) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)) to determine if, before receiving such training services, such individuals have exhausted funds received through the Federal Pell Grant program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(2) makes appropriate recommendations with respect to the matters evaluated under paragraph (1).

SEC. 497. STUDY BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON ADMINISTRATIVE COST SAVINGS.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that—

(1) determines the amount of administrative costs at the Federal and State levels for the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available for—

(A) each of the programs authorized under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) or repealed under section 71, as such programs were in effect for such fiscal year; and

(B) each of the programs described in subparagraph (A) that have been repealed or consolidated on or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) determines the amount of administrative cost savings at the Federal and State levels as a result of repealing and consolidating programs by calculating the differences in the amount of administrative costs between subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1); and

(3) estimates the administrative cost savings at the Federal and State levels for a fiscal year as a result of States consolidating amounts under section 501(e) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9271(e)) to reduce inefficiencies in the administration of federally-funded State and local employment and training programs.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “administrative costs” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).

Subtitle G—Entrepreneurial Training

SEC. 499. ENTREPRENEURIAL TRAINING.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Entrepreneurial Training Improvement Act of 2014”.

(b) **RULEMAKING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish alternate standards for measuring the progress of State and local performance for entrepreneurial training services, as authorized in section 134(d)(4)(D)(vi) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(D)(vi)), and provide the State and local workforce investment boards with specific guidance on successful approaches to collecting performance information on entrepreneurial training services.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining the alternate standards, the Secretary shall consider using standards based, for participants in such services, on—

(A) obtaining a State license, or a Federal or State tax identification number, for a corresponding business;

(B) documenting income from a corresponding business; or

(C) filing a Federal or State tax return for a corresponding business.

(3) **AUTHORITIES.**—In determining the alternate standards, the Secretary shall consider utilizing authorities granted under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), including a State’s waiver authority, as authorized in section 189(i)(4) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2939(i)(4)).

(4) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall prepare a report on the progress of State and local workforce investment boards in implementing new programs of entrepreneurial training services and any ongoing challenges to offering such programs, with recommendations on how best to address those challenges. Not later than 12 months after publication of the final regulations establishing the alternate standards, the Secretary shall submit the report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.

SA 2965. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 3, add the following:

SEC. 3A. FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING PARENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer, consistent with other provisions of this Act.”.

SA 2966. Mr. LEE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair

Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Between sections 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 3A. WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY.

(a) **COMPENSATORY TIME.**—Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.**—

“(1) **GENERAL RULE.**—An employee may receive, in accordance with this subsection and in lieu of monetary overtime compensation, compensatory time off at a rate not less than one and one-half hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

“(2) **CONDITIONS.**—An employer may provide compensatory time to employees under paragraph (1)(A) only if such time is provided in accordance with—

“(A) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between the employer and the labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees under applicable law; or

“(B) in the case of employees who are not represented by a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of such employees under applicable law, an agreement arrived at between the employer and employee before the performance of the work and affirmed by a written or otherwise verifiable record maintained in accordance with section 11(c)—

“(i) in which the employer has offered and the employee has chosen to receive compensatory time in lieu of monetary overtime compensation; and

“(ii) entered into knowingly and voluntarily by such employees and not as a condition of employment.

No employee may receive or agree to receive compensatory time off under this subsection unless the employee has worked at least 1,000 hours for the employee’s employer during a period of continuous employment with the employer in the 12-month period before the date of agreement or receipt of compensatory time off.

“(3) **HOURLIMIT.**—

“(A) **MAXIMUM HOURS.**—An employee may accrue not more than 160 hours of compensatory time.

“(B) **COMPENSATION DATE.**—Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employee’s employer shall provide monetary compensation for any unused compensatory time off accrued during the preceding calendar year that was not used prior to December 31 of the preceding year at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6). An employer may designate and communicate to the employer’s employees a 12-month period other than the calendar year, in which case such compensation shall be provided not later than 31 days after the end of such 12-month period.

“(C) **EXCESS OF 80 HOURS.**—The employer may provide monetary compensation for an employee’s unused compensatory time in excess of 80 hours at any time after giving the employee at least 30 days notice. Such compensation shall be provided at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6).

“(D) **POLICY.**—Except where a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, an employer that has adopted a policy offering compensatory time to employees may discontinue such policy upon giving employees 30 days notice.

“(E) WRITTEN REQUEST.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (2)(B) at any time. An employee may also request in writing that monetary compensation be provided, at any time, for all compensatory time accrued that has not yet been used. Within 30 days of receiving the written request, the employer shall provide the employee the monetary compensation due in accordance with paragraph (6).

“(4) PRIVATE EMPLOYER ACTIONS.—An employer that provides compensatory time under paragraph (1) to employees shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of—

“(A) interfering with such employee’s rights under this subsection to request or not request compensatory time off in lieu of payment of monetary overtime compensation for overtime hours; or

“(B) requiring any employee to use such compensatory time.

“(5) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—An employee who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1) shall, upon the voluntary or involuntary termination of employment, be paid for the unused compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (6).

“(6) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—

“(A) GENERAL RULE.—If compensation is to be paid to an employee for accrued compensatory time off, such compensation shall be paid at a rate of compensation not less than—

“(i) the regular rate received by such employee when the compensatory time was earned; or

“(ii) the final regular rate received by such employee, whichever is higher.

“(B) CONSIDERATION OF PAYMENT.—Any payment owed to an employee under this subsection for unused compensatory time shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation.

“(7) USE OF TIME.—An employee—

“(A) who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1); and

“(B) who has requested the use of such compensatory time,

shall be permitted by the employee’s employer to use such time within a reasonable period after making the request if the use of the compensatory time does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency; and

“(B) the terms ‘overtime compensation’ and ‘compensatory time’ shall have the meanings given such terms by subsection (o)(7).”

(b) REMEDIES.—Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “(b) Any employer” and inserting “(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), any employer”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) An employer that violates section 7(s)(4) shall be liable to the employee affected in the amount of the rate of compensation (determined in accordance with section 7(s)(6)(A)) for each hour of compensatory time accrued by the employee and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages reduced by the amount of such rate of compensation for each hour of compensatory time used by such employee.”

(c) NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall revise the

materials the Secretary provides, under regulations published in section 516.4 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, to employers for purposes of a notice explaining the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees so that such notice reflects the amendments made to such Act by this section.

(d) GAO REPORT.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and each of the 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress providing, with respect to the reporting period immediately prior to each such report—

(1) data concerning the extent to which employers provide compensatory time pursuant to section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as added by this section, and the extent to which employees opt to receive compensatory time;

(2) the number of complaints alleging a violation of such section filed by any employee with the Secretary of Labor;

(3) the number of enforcement actions commenced by the Secretary or commenced by the Secretary on behalf of any employee for alleged violations of such section;

(4) the disposition or status of such complaints and actions described in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(5) an account of any unpaid wages, damages, penalties, injunctive relief, or other remedies obtained or sought by the Secretary in connection with such actions described in paragraph (3).

(e) SUNSET.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2967. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “End Pay Discrimination Through Information Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) People in the United States understand that intentional workplace discrimination is wrong.

(2) Equal pay for equal work is a principle and practice that should be observed by all employers.

(3) Women constitute a significant portion of the workforce of the United States.

(4) An increasing number of families in the United States depend on the income of a working woman.

(5) Many women are pursuing or have attained postsecondary degrees or specialized training to make them strong candidates for good jobs that will provide for their families.

(6) Employers that intentionally discriminate on the basis of sex should be held accountable for their wrongdoing.

SEC. 3. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “employee has filed” and all that follows through “committee;” and inserting “employee—

“(A) has made a charge or filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be insti-

tuted any investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under or related to this Act, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or has testified or is planning to testify or has assisted or participated in any manner in any such investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action, or has served or is planning to serve on an industry committee; or

“(B) has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed the wages of the employee or another employee;”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Subsection (a)(3)(B) shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee’s essential job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to an individual who does not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a charge or complaint or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employer. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.”

SA 2968. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . PAYMENT OF HIGHER WAGES.

Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding a labor organization’s exclusive representation of employees in a unit, or the terms and conditions of any collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect, nothing in either—

“(A) section 8(a)(1) or 8(a)(5), or

“(B) a collective bargaining contract or agreement renewed or entered into after the date of enactment of this paragraph,

shall prohibit an employer from paying an employee in the unit greater wages, pay, or other compensation for, or by reason of, his or her services as an employee of such employer, than provided for in such contract or agreement.”

SA 2969. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 361, recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People’s Republic of China and urging the Government of the People’s Republic of China to take meaningful steps to improve freedom of expression as fitting of a responsible international stakeholder; as follows:

On page 3, line 3, strike “by the United States Government”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 9:45 a.m. in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Advanced Biofuels: Creating Jobs and Lower Prices at the Pump."

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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 April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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 April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Protecting Taxpayers from Incom-

petent and Unethical Return Preparers."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "National Security and Foreign Policy Priorities in the FY 2015 International Affairs Budget."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 3:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 8, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paul Osadebe and Emily Schwartz, interns with the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2014 first quarter Mass Mailing report is Friday, April 25, 2014. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to

the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records will be open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 713; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order regarding the nomination; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

RECOGNIZING THE THREATS TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND EXPRESSION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 322.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 361) recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People's Republic of China and urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to take meaningful steps to improve freedom of expression as fitting of a responsible international stakeholder.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cardin amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble 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. 2969) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 3, line 3, strike “by the United States Government”.

The resolution (S. Res. 361), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 361

Whereas, in its 2013 World Press Freedom Index, Reporters Without Borders ranked China 173rd out of 179 countries in terms of press freedoms;

Whereas China’s media regulator, the State Administration of Press, Publication, Radio, Film and Television, enforces a system of strict controls, including an extensive licensing system and government supervision by the Chinese Communist Party;

Whereas domestic radio and television broadcast journalists in China must pass a government-sponsored exam that tests their basic knowledge of Marxist views of news and Communist Party principles;

Whereas this state supervision of the media distorts and blocks free and open coverage of key issues including Tibet, political unrest, and corruption by government officials, as well as Chinese foreign policy;

Whereas China’s media regulator officially bans journalists from using foreign media reports without authorization and forbids news editors from reporting information online that has not been verified through official channels;

Whereas the Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC) has documented several instances of reprisals against and harassment of independent journalists and newspaper staff by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, including Chinese journalists working for foreign-based websites and newspapers;

Whereas the Foreign Correspondents’ Club of China has noted that foreign journalists continue to face challenging work conditions, visa denials or delays, and various forms of harassment, and 70 percent of journalists surveyed in the FCCC’s 2013 annual survey stated that “conditions have worsened or stayed the same as the year before”;

Whereas, according to the CECC, authorities in China appeared to maintain or enhance policies to block and filter online content, particularly sensitive information about rights activists, official corruption, or collective organizing;

Whereas China is the world’s second largest economy and the United States second largest trading partner and has been a member of the World Trade Organization since 2001;

Whereas China’s growing economic importance increases the need for the Government of the People’s Republic of China to act transparently and respect international trading regulations; and

Whereas official government censorship denies the people of China, including nearly 600,000,000 Internet users, their freedom of expression, undermines confidence in China’s safety standards, and causes increasingly serious economic harm to private firms that rely on unfettered access to social media as a business model: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the importance of freedom of the press to efforts to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world;

(2) expresses concern about the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People’s Republic of China;

(3) condemns actions taken by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to suppress freedom of the press, including the increased harassment of Chinese and inter-

national journalists through denial of visas, harassment of sources, physical threats, and other methods; and

(4) urges the President to use all appropriate instruments of United States influence to support, promote, and strengthen principles, practices, and values that promote the free flow of information to the people of China without interference or discrimination, including through the Internet and other electronic media.

AUTHORIZING USE OF
EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 2223

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that S. 2223 is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2223) 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this legislation is sponsored by Senators HARKIN and MERKLEY.

I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in accordance with Public Law 93-618, as amended by Public Law 100-418, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, appoints the following members of the Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations to international conferences, meetings and negotiation ses-

sions relating to trade agreements: the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROCKEFELLER; the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER; the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL
9, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, April 9, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2199, the equal pay bill, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees prior to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2199.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first rollcall vote will be at 11 a.m. tomorrow. Additional rollcall votes are expected during tomorrow’s session.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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, following the remarks of, first, Senator BENNET and then those of Senator CASEY.

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

The Senator from Colorado.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I want to return today to the subject of immigration. Today marks the 285th day since the immigration bill passed right here in the Senate with almost 70 votes, and 285 days later we are still waiting for the House of Representatives to act on that bipartisan piece of legislation.

Every single day the House drags its feet on immigration, our borders remain less secure, our visa system keeps us less competitive, our economy suffers, and millions of families remain in the shadows.

Hard-working immigrants who came here to live the American dream and who are part of the fabric of our communities all over the State of Colorado and all over the United States of America are suffering because Congress has not passed a bill, families such as Dulce Saenz’s family from Hudson, CO.

When Dulce's father was deported, she and one of her sisters stayed in Colorado to start college while her mom and younger sister moved to Mexico to be with their dad. It was a heart-breaking decision for the family to separate, but that is what they needed to do. Now all three sisters have gone to the University of Denver in Colorado. They have started careers in public service. But they rarely see their parents. They worry about their safety.

It is clear to everybody I talk to here and at home that our current immigration system is broken. It is also clear to me and I think to many people that separating families does not reflect our history and it does not do honor to the values that shape that history. So while the House stalls, the Secretary of Homeland Security is reviewing our deportation policy and exploring other ways we can help keep families together. It is a good step in the absence of a bill. We should prioritize deportation in a way that reflects our values as a country, upholds the rule of law, and keeps families together. But in the end, the only way to come to a full and permanent solution is to pass this immigration reform bill.

Of course, this is not unusual in Washington these days when we have become so used to getting the bare minimum accomplished, keeping the lights on for another week or for another month. But what is so frustrating on this issue is that we have bipartisan agreement that the current immigration system is broken and that it is doing no favors to this country.

The coalition we built in favor of reform is unprecedented. I was not surprised. When we started this in Colorado, first I would travel around the State and I would hear peach growers in Palisade say one thing about what they hoped for in an immigration bill, I would hear the cattle ranchers say something else, the ski resorts say something else, our high-tech community, our immigrant rights community—everybody coming together to say: You know what, it is long past time to get this fixed.

When we brought this to the national level, working together with the so-called group or gang of 8 on immigration, we were able to build a coalition that really is unprecedented. In the 5 years I have been here, I have not seen universal agreement on anything like we have seen on the immigration bill.

In June of last year, right here in the Senate, we passed a strong bipartisan bill—a bill that strengthens our economy and reduces our debt, a bill that keeps families together, protects our borders and our communities, and gives families who came to this country for a better life a chance to earn citizenship and contribute to our economy and to our society.

As I mentioned, I was part of that Gang of 8 who negotiated the bill. For those who despair about the lack of leadership in Congress—and I hear about this all the time, as I know all of

my colleagues do—I tell them that for my part, as one American, the greatest sign or signal of legislative leadership that I have seen in the past 5 years was the leadership provided by JOHN MCCAIN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, MARCO RUBIO, and JEFF FLAKE, the four Republicans who sat at that table for 7 or 8 months and negotiated the immigration bill. It was a lot harder for them to stay there than it was for the Democrats. But those four Republicans sat at the table for 8 months and negotiated a bill because they knew it was the right thing to do for the country and, parenthetically, the right thing to do for their party in that order.

Yet here we are. After all that bipartisan agreement, after all that bipartisan work, after a great bipartisan vote on the floor of the Senate on one of the most immediate issues facing this country, 9 months after our bill passed the Senate we still do not have a bill at the President's desk.

The House of Representatives is privileged to have the opportunity to rise above politics as usual and to do something big, something real, something consequential that will last for this country. The House of Representatives has the privilege to show that stalemate does not have to be standard operating procedure in Washington, DC.

This issue is completely bipartisan at home. I hear about this as much from Republicans—maybe even more from Republicans in farm country than I do from Democrats, the chance to do something important for our Nation and for our future. But until the House acts, families, farmers, and businesses all across my State and all across the United States will continue to suffer, farmers such as Eric Hanagan and Michael Hirakata outside of Rocky Ford, who cannot get the seasonal workers they need and are forced to watch crops—in their case, melons—die in the field.

Colorado's high-tech companies on the front range—ranging from bioscience, engineering, and aerospace—cannot always find the employees they need. In fact, they often cannot find the employees, which introduces an entirely different subject that relates to our K-12 education system, but that is not the topic of the speech today.

We know that almost one-quarter of STEM graduates from Colorado's STEM—math and science graduates from Colorado's leading universities are immigrants who are graduating in the United States, many of whose education has been subsidized by us. Instead of saying to them, "Please stay here; build our business here; go work for one of our high-tech companies here," we are saying to them, "Go home. We would much rather have you compete with us from India. Go home. We would much rather have you compete with us from China." It is ridiculous. It makes no sense.

The Senate bill, the bill we passed, changes that. The bill we passed says: If you are a STEM graduate from an-

other country and you graduate from an American university and you have a job offer in the United States of America, we will staple the green card to your diploma.

That is what we need in this country. That is what the high-tech industry in Colorado needs out of the House of Representatives.

I mentioned tourism at our ski resorts. They will continue to suffer. This is Colorado's second largest industry.

There are a lot of reasons to act, there are a lot of economic reasons to act, but I think there are also fundamental reasons that have to do with who we are as a country. It is often said that America is a nation of immigrants. Of course that is true. There is literally no other country in the world for which immigration is so central to its history and to its identity.

I have heard enough speeches in this Chamber to know that for a lot of us, for a lot of the 100 of us, it is very personal as well. I am a first-generation American. I know there are many others who are here. There is not a person in this Chamber who does not have immigration as part of their family's history.

But this is not just a theoretical idea, that we are a nation of immigrants. I want to take a moment to reflect on what this really means. This is a photo I am proud to say I actually managed to take with my cell phone. My daughters would be shocked to know that I was able not only to get the picture taken, but it is not even blurry.

I had an occasion—I hope the Presiding Officer has had the opportunity to do it—to do something I never imagined I would ever have the chance to do. I attended a naturalization ceremony held for Active-Duty servicemembers at Fort Carson, CO. Let's be clear. These are men and women who are serving the United States of America in uniform. On that day they became citizens of the United States. Until that day they were not citizens but still they were serving and are serving in our Armed Forces. The 13 soldiers and spouses who became U.S. citizens that day represented 12 different countries. This is a picture of them—12 different countries among the 13.

I am going to read the list. I was so blown away by the list that I asked one of the people from the INS who was there to give me what is called the oath ceremony nationality report from which they read the names of the countries. It is an astonishing list. Here are the countries these folks are from: China, the People's Republic of China, Colombia, Haiti, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Philippines, South Korea, Togo, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom—12 different countries.

Every single one of them came here in pursuit of the American dream, just as generations of people from around

the world have sought out the United States to build their future. These are the people—and people just like them all across the United States of America—who are going to determine our future, just as every generation of immigrants has helped us to determine our future. Whether it is refugees fleeing persecution, whether it is parents seeking opportunity for their children, it is those stepping forward to sacrifice for our shared values, as all of these young men and women are, who make America the country we love. There is no way to argue that our current immigration policies reflect that history or our values.

Let me paint a picture of what our country would look like if this immigration bill were passed. Just to be clear, again, it is not imaginary; we passed the bill in the Senate.

If people on the other side have issues with the bill, what I say is we have no monopoly on wisdom. Bring your ideas; improve the bill. I can think of some things I would do to improve that bill, but you can't just do nothing. You can't do nothing, because if we pass the bill in the House, those who come to this country for a better life, including young people—whose parents brought them here as children, and they are here through no fault of their own—would have the opportunity to enter a tough but fair path to citizenship. With a path in place we would then see higher wages, more consumption of goods and increased taxes.

It would reduce our debt. This bill—and this is not me talking, MICHAEL BENNET from Colorado, this is the Congressional Budget Office—would reduce our debt by nearly \$1 trillion over 20 years. I am unaware of any other piece of legislation that has passed with a bipartisan majority in the Congress that reduces our debt by \$1 trillion but this would. It wouldn't do it in across-the-board cuts. It would do it because of the growth it would create in our economy, the incremental economic growth. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has said that if we pass this bill, we would see an increase of almost 6 percent of incremental GDP growth over this 20-year period, 3 percent in the first 10 years and 5 percent in the second 10 years.

Second, our bill would put into place an efficient and flexible visa system that would catapult our competitiveness in a changing 21st century economy. Canada, our neighbor to the North, is figuring out how to attract the world's talent to its shores. That is what they are spending their time doing. We, a historic nation of immigrants, are saying please go home and compete with us from someplace else or maybe go to Canada and compete with us from there. Talented entrepreneurs and innovators from around the world would have the opportunity to stay if we passed this bill and create jobs to fuel our economy. It is well-documented how many Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants, but

millions of small businesses across the United States have been started by immigrants as well. High-skilled workers in science, technology, engineering, and math and lower skilled workers in industries such as hospitality and tourism would come into the country to fill jobs where there are no available U.S. workers. This was a bill that labor and the chamber endorsed. That is the first time that has happened. It was a difficult and painful negotiation, but we were able to get it done, and they agreed we ought to get it done.

It is very important for Colorado and a lot of other States. We would stabilize the challenges facing our agricultural industry with a new streamlined program for agricultural guest workers that is more usable for employees and protects our workers.

Again, this is the first bill ever. We call this portion the AgJOBS bill, the first one—first one—to be endorsed by the growers and the farm workers. That has never happened before, but working with Senator RUBIO, Senator HATCH, and Senator FEINSTEIN, we were able to get that done.

Finally, and more importantly, our borders would be more secure with new fencing, double the number of border agents, and increased spending on new technology. We have what they call full situational awareness on the border to allow us to interdict threats rapidly and successfully—and, very importantly, with a mandatory employment verification system and more effective entry-exit system, we would prevent future waves in illegal immigration so we don't end back up in the problem we are facing today. Then our small businesses all across the country can stop being the INS and concentrate on building their businesses. These are all changes our Nation urgently needs, and there are more.

I am not here to argue for some partisan piece of legislation that didn't attract votes on both sides. This bill was entirely bipartisan from beginning to end. I have heard a laundry list of excuses out of people in the House why they haven't addressed immigration reform, but at some point it is time for those excuses to stop and for the stalling to stop. If they want to show the country they are serious about growing our economy and keeping families together, then they need to show us they are serious about immigration reform.

I actually think the Speaker wants to pass a bill. In fact, I think he could pass a bill if he put it on the floor tomorrow and let the House work its will. But it is not my job, obviously, to try to tell him how to do his job. It is no one's job in the Senate to tell him how to do his job, but I suppose it is our job to give him encouragement, to say we will be there to support you if you can find a way to get this bill passed.

If they want to show the country they are serious about growing our economy and keeping families together, then they need to show us they

are serious about immigration reform. It doesn't have to be a carbon copy of what we passed, although if they look at it, what they will find is the elements that are in there hang very well together.

Look at this photo. Again, this is what America looks like. This is what Colorado looks like. This is what America looks like. It is what it is all about. These are faces of people who want to contribute. This diversity is how we thrive as a country, and it is how we are going to thrive in the future. It has always been our strength, and it is what sets us apart in many ways from countries all over the world.

These new citizens want to contribute to our economy and to our communities. They want to serve our country, they want to pay taxes and abide by the law, and they want to build a better life here for themselves and their families.

This picture is exactly why we need reform. These brave men and women say it all. They say it much better than I do.

I see my colleague from Pennsylvania is in the Chamber, so I will wrap up.

Let me say that two of the things that set us apart from countries all over the world, two of the essential components that make us the United States of America, are our commitment to the rule of law and our understanding of ourselves as being a nation of immigrants. Almost no other country in the world can say what we can say about that. I can tell you no other country in the world was having that naturalization ceremony the day we were having it at Fort Carson.

This bill gives us a chance to reaffirm those two ideas that we are a nation committed to the rule of law and that we are a nation of immigrants.

I had the chance this weekend to spend some time in my wife's hometown in the Mississippi Delta. It is one of the poorer parts of the country, and it has been for a very long time. It is a tough place in a lot of ways. We have a lot of great family there. After we finished, we went to Memphis to visit the civil rights museum, which has just reopened. If anybody has the chance to go, they should go to visit it, because what you see is the history of a struggle from the 1600s forward—generation upon generation—trying to perfect this country and keep it true to the idea that in this case we are all created equal.

For a long time we weren't able to perfect that. We still are having to perfect it. We are making progress, and that is what we are meant to do. Today we have that chance. The House has that chance tomorrow or next week or next month to make sure that we honor our commitment, this generation's commitment to a generation of immigrants and to the generations that are coming after them. I hope they will take up that challenge.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania and the Presiding Officer as well for his patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to say a word of commendation for the remarks the Senator from Colorado just made about a very important issue, and that photograph he took is, indeed, an inspiration to all Americans. Each of us can be inspired by that photograph, what it represents, by the sacrifice that undergirds that photograph, and also for his reminding us about those sacrifices and those commitments, so we want to thank him.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this legislation on equal pay is about justice, in a word. We could almost say that equal pay equals justice. There is probably no simpler way to say it. It is really, when you consider what this means, a very simple concept: If a woman does the same job, the same work, does all of that in the same way a man does and is hired by a company, she should be paid the same wage.

It seems so simple, so elementary, but unfortunately we have had more than one generation now where that has not been the case. Depending on what study or what year we are talking about, women make, on average, 76 cents for every dollar a man makes, or 77 cents. It has always been in that band of similar numbers.

I think for a lot of families it is disturbing. How do I tell, in my case, my four daughters to just do well in school and work hard, as they have, and get good grades, and once you are on a career path, you will be fairly compensated for your work because of all that hard work you did and the good work you do for an employer. What can I say if they come to me—I hope this never happens—10 or 20 years from now and say: You know, what you told me isn't true. I did well in school, I worked hard, I got hired and worked hard in the job I have had, and I am getting paid 76 cents for the \$1 a man makes doing the same work in the same place at the same time. It makes no sense.

So really, in essence, it is about whether we are going to be true to our words and true to the values of this country, and it is about giving people a fair shot on something as fundamental as the wages they are paid for their labor—to use an expression from the Bible, laboring in the vineyards; laboring at a job and being paid in a fair manner.

There was a report not too long ago—not this year but a few years ago—that looked at a State-by-State weekly pay comparison. In that report, Pennsylvania women made, on average, \$694 a week, while men in Pennsylvania were paid \$849 a week—an 18.3-percent differential. But that is not the end of the story. It gets worse. For people 50 years

and older, just looking at that age category, for women workers 50 years and older in Pennsylvania at that time, just a few years ago, the differential was \$732 and \$984 for men—almost \$250 a week above in that age category—and for all women at that time, about \$150 of difference each and every week. Imagine what that does to someone's sense of achievement or sense of dignity when they know they are doing the same work every day and they are being underpaid over and over every week, every month, every year, and in some cases decade after decade. So when we say this is a matter of justice, in some ways that might be an understatement.

We have a chance to remedy that, and it is very simple. Are we going to take steps to remedy that or are we going to reject the steps it will take to bring a measure of justice, a fair shot for women? They are not asking for anything that a man wouldn't ask for or demand. They are just asking for basic fairness—to be treated the same for the same work.

I won't go into all the elements of the legislation, but some of them involve what happens in the event of a conflict—if a woman is discriminated against based upon her pay and she brings an action in a court, what will be the rules that govern that case. I think we should do everything possible to make sure that if an employer has a defense, they have to earn that defense, especially in this kind of litigation.

One part of the legislation prohibits retaliation for employee complaints. In other words, if a woman is inquiring about or discussing or disclosing the wages of herself or some other employee, she is not retaliated against. It is hard to believe we have to legislate and make that the subject of debate. One would think that if a woman is working in a company for years and she is aggrieved and has a claim to make and is asked what the foundation of her claim is, her questions, her inquiries, her comparisons between and among different sets of data, what she makes, what a man who does the same work has been paid—that those basic questions should never, ever be the subject of retaliation by an employer, but too often they are. So we have to legislate. We have to specifically prohibit that kind of conduct by an employer, as maddening and as frustrating as that is.

One would think that employers would want to make things right; that they would want to make sure that if a man is paid a buck for his work, a woman doing the same work is paid the same amount. She shouldn't have to ask. She shouldn't have to be worried about any kind of reprisal or retaliation or punishment. But the state of the law today is such that retaliation goes without sanction in the United States of America. It is very insulting to women and insulting to families.

So there is lots we can do, but the most important thing we can do is to

get a favorable vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act before us. I hope we get a bipartisan vote. This shouldn't be the subject of support of just one party. This should be bipartisan. The people who are asking for this help, who have been asking for it for decades, aren't members of just one party. They happen to represent one-half or more of the American people, when women have asked for that.

If any of my colleagues think for whatever reason that this is not the right thing to do for today, they should do it for future generations. Do it for your own daughters, your own granddaughters, maybe your great-granddaughters. But to forgo the opportunity to do something about this at long last—President Kennedy signed the original legislation. A lot of people in the United States weren't even born then. Yet here we are still debating, still striving to get a basic measure of justice in place. So I do believe equal pay equals justice.

AFGHANISTAN ELECTIONS

Mr. President, I will turn to another subject this evening. I know we have to wrap up, and I am the last speaker of the evening, but this is a topic that doesn't get enough attention even though it was the subject of a lot of coverage and attention in the last couple of weeks and especially the last couple of days; that is, the elections in Afghanistan.

Many people know that some of the reporting indicated that the results were good in terms of turnout. There are a lot of questions to review, but we don't know the results of the elections. It is, however, remarkable how the Afghan people turned out to choose their second democratically elected President. About 60 percent of the 12 million eligible voters defied Taliban threats to cast their votes. I am hopeful these elections are a step toward a smoother transfer of power later this year.

By the way, that voter turnout number in terms of eligible voters is a little higher than we had in the United States of America in 2012. Secretary Kerry said last week that this election has been "Afghan owned from the start."

The Afghan government security forces and civil society worked together to make these elections happen despite concerted efforts by the Taliban to sow fear and destroy democratic progress.

The service of our men and women in uniform set the stage for this progress. U.S. training and mentoring helped the Afghan National Security Forces get to the point where it could secure polling centers and allow these elections to happen.

We know in 2009 the international security forces bore the brunt of the election's security efforts, including, of course, American fighting men and women—our soldiers, at that time.

The State Department, USAID, and NGOs also put a tremendous amount of work in supporting Afghan institutions

in this process of carrying out an election.

The role Afghan women played in these elections is particularly remarkable. In the National Defense Authorization Act's amendment last year, I urged the administration to focus especially on ensuring there were enough female poll workers and security personnel to ensure all Afghan women who wanted to vote could do so safely and without fear of intimidation.

Female voters turned out in numbers never seen before in Afghanistan, which speaks to their tremendous bravery and unwavering commitment to fighting for their rights as Afghan citizens. This is an incredible number. About one third of the 7 million voters, according to the reports, were women. Many women were voting for the first time. I don't have an enlargement, but this is a photograph which appeared a day after the election which depicts a line of 50 or more women standing in the rain under a plastic tarp waiting to vote.

The American service men and women and, of course, taxpayers have made a tremendous investment in Afghanistan to make it the nascent democracy it is today. From harsh Taliban rule, Afghanistan is emerging as a fledgling democracy, with tremendous gains in education and health care.

Just imagine. Girls who were literally at zero in their representation in schools a little more than a decade ago now constitute 42 percent of Afghan children enrolled in school. That didn't happen because of just some policy in effect. There was a lot of bravery and valor demonstrated by families and by young girls going to school under terrible threats—threats of death and intimidation. We all know about the terrible stories of young girls walking or riding to school and having acid thrown in their faces. Despite specific attacks on girls or young women, they keep going to school.

It also happened because of the great sacrifice of our fighting men and women—those killed in action or wounded in action, tens of thousands of Americans. In Pennsylvania to date we have lost 91 soldiers killed in action and almost 740 wounded in action.

So all of these results—whether it is about democracy or whether it is about girls in school, women being able to vote, or a range of other metrics, health care and otherwise—came with tremendous sacrifice, the kind of sacrifice most of us don't really have a sense of. At least I don't.

The results will be returned later this month on the election in Afghanistan. If a runoff is necessary, I hope all parties will work together to ensure the process is credible, transparent, and free from violence.

Once President Karzai's successor is in place, the Afghan government and the Afghan people should move quickly to sign the bilateral security agreement and affirm the commitments the

Afghan government has made to the international community and, by doing so, recognize the tremendous sacrifice of our fighting men and women and those of the coalition forces as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article about the election from the New York Times dated April 5, 2014.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 2014]

AFGHAN TURNOUT IS HIGH AS VOTERS DEFY THE TALIBAN

(By Rod Nordland, Azam Ahmed and Matthew Rosenberg)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—Defying a campaign of Taliban violence that unleashed 39 suicide bombers in the two months before Election Day, Afghan voters on Saturday turned out in such high numbers to choose a new president and provincial councils that polling hours were extended nationwide, in a triumph of determination over intimidation.

Militants failed to mount a single major attack anywhere in Afghanistan by the time polls closed, and voters lined up despite heavy rain and cold in the capital and elsewhere.

"Whenever there has been a new king or president, it has been accompanied by death and violence," said Abdul Wakil Amiri, a government official who turned out early to vote at a Kabul mosque. "For the first time, we are experiencing democracy."

After 12 years with President Hamid Karzai in power, and decades of upheaval, coup and war, Afghans on Saturday were for the first time voting on a relatively open field of candidates.

Election officials said that by midday more than three and a half million voters had turned out—already approaching the total for the 2009 vote. The election commission chairman, Mohammad Yusuf Nuristani, said the total could reach seven million. "The enemies of Afghanistan have been defeated," he declared.

But even as they celebrated the outpouring of votes, many acknowledged the long process looming ahead, with the potential for problems all along the way.

International observers, many of whom had fled Afghanistan after a wave of attacks on foreigners during the campaign, cautioned that how those votes were tallied and reported would bear close watching.

It is likely to take at least a week before even incomplete official results are announced, and weeks more to adjudicate Election Day complaints. Some of the candidates were already filing fraud complaints on Saturday.

With eight candidates in the race, the five minor candidates' shares of the vote made it even more difficult for any one candidate to reach the 50 percent threshold that would allow an outright victory. A runoff vote is unlikely to take place until the end of May at the earliest.

The leading candidates going into the vote were Ashraf Ghani, 64, a technocrat and former official in Mr. Karzai's government; Abdullah Abdullah, 53, a former foreign minister who was the second biggest vote-getter against Mr. Karzai in the 2009 election; and Zalmay Rassoul, 70, another former foreign minister.

Both Mr. Ghani and Mr. Abdullah praised the vote. "A proud day for a proud nation," Mr. Ghani said.

Still, a shortage of ballots at polling places was widespread across the country by midday Saturday, and some voters were in line when polls closed.

More worrisome, the threat of violence in many rural areas had forced election authorities to close nearly 1,000 out of a planned-for 7,500 polling places, raising fears that a big chunk of the electorate would remain disenfranchised.

But when it came to attacks on Election Day, the Taliban's threats seemed to be greatly overstated. Only one suicide bombing attempt could be confirmed—in Khost—and the bomber managed to kill only himself when the police stopped him outside a polling place.

In three scattered attacks on polling places, four voters were reported killed. Two rockets fired randomly into the city of Jalalabad wounded eight civilians. One border policeman, in southern Kandahar Province, and another policeman in remote western Farah Province were confirmed killed in Taliban attacks, according to preliminary reports.

Bad as all that was, it was a lower casualty toll than on a normal day in Afghanistan, let alone an election on which both the insurgents and the government had staked their credibility. Interior Minister Umar Daudzai said there were 140 attacks nationwide on Saturday, compared with 500 attacks recorded by the American military in 2009.

In preparation for the election, the Afghan government mobilized its entire military and police forces, some 350,000 in all, backed up by 53,000 NATO coalition troops—although the Americans and their allies stayed out of it, leaving Afghans for the first time entirely in charge of securing their own election.

"Voting on this day will be a slap in the faces of the terrorists," said Rahmatullah Nabil, the acting head of the National Directorate of Security, the Afghan domestic intelligence agency.

Sensitive to concerns about potential fraud—more than a million ballots were thrown out in the 2009 presidential vote and then again in the 2010 parliamentary elections—the police were quick to report their efforts to crack down on Saturday.

Among those arrested were four people in Khost who were caught with 1,067 voter registration cards. Several people, including an election official, were caught trying to stuff ballot boxes in Wardak Province.

"This has been the best and most incident-free election in Afghanistan's modern history and it could set the precedent for a historic, peaceful transition of power in Afghanistan," said Mohammad Fahim Sadeq, head of the Afghanistan National Participation Organization, an observer group.

In many places where voting was nearly impossible in 2009, the turnout was reported to be strong. One was Panjwai district, a once-violent haven of the Taliban just outside Kandahar City, where hundreds lined up to vote. "I left everything behind, my fears and my work, and came to use my vote," said Hajji Mahbob, 60, a farmer. "I want change and a good government and I am asking the man I am going to elect as the next president to bring an end to the suffering of this war."

Even where the Taliban did manage to strike, voters still turned out afterward. A bomb set off at a polling place in the Mohammad Agha district of Logar Province killed two voters and wounded two others, according to the district governor, Abdul Hamid. "The explosion dispersed the voters who were holding their voting cards and waiting to vote," said Zalmay Stanakzai, a car repair shop owner who was there. "Some of us left, the others stayed. I was concerned about our safety, but we considered voting our duty."

Insurgents set off a series of five blasts in the Shomali plain, just north of Kabul city,

in the village of Qarabagh. "After the explosions, the polling stations reopened and people rushed to vote," said Mohasmmad Sangar, 32, a used-car salesman there. "It was a great day today."

Nicholas Haysom, the United Nations' top election official here, said: "We know that the Taliban have made a very explicit and express threat to disrupt it. The failure to disrupt the elections will mean that they will have egg on their face after the elections."

While there were reports of disrupted voting in troubled places like Logar Province and neighboring Wardak, in Helmand Province in the south and Nangarhar Province in the east, at the same time voters were showing up in unexpectedly high numbers in other places, like Zabul, Uruzgan and Kandahar Provinces in the south, and Kunar Province in the northeast, despite strong insurgent presences in those areas.

In Uruzgan, election authorities had to open additional polling places to accommodate unexpected numbers, while in Daikundi they ran out of ballots in some remote districts and election authorities had to race new ones out to them. In northern Mazar-i-Sharif, voters were still lined up after dark.

Underwritten by \$100 million from the United Nations and foreign donors, the election was a huge enterprise, stretching across extremely forbidding terrain. Some 3,200 donkeys were pressed into service to deliver ballots to remote mountain villages, along with battalions of trucks and minibuses to 6,500 polling places in all. The American military pitched in with air transport of ballots to four regional distribution centers, and to two difficult-to-reach provinces.

Though many international observers left Afghanistan in the wake of attacks on foreigners, or found themselves confined to quarters in Kabul, years of expensive preparations and training of an army of some 70,000 Afghan election observers were expected to compensate, according to Western diplomats and Afghan election officials. "We have so many controls now, it's going to be much safer this time," said Noor Ahmad Noor, the spokesman for the Independent Election Commission.

The American ambassador, James B. Cunningham, called the elections a "really historic opportunity for the people of Afghanistan to move forward with something we've been trying to create together with them for several years now."

Still up in the air is the question of whether an American troop force will remain in Afghanistan after 2014. Mr. Karzai's refusal to sign a long-term security deal to allow that presence was a major point of tension between the American and Afghan govern-

ments. Each of the leading candidates has agreed to sign the deal once in office, though inauguration day may not take place until well into the year.

The election on Saturday was notable also for how many Afghan women were taking part. More female candidates than ever before are on provincial ballots, and two are running for vice president, the first time a woman was ever put up for national office here, which has generated a great deal of enthusiasm, especially in urban areas.

At the women's polling station in the Nadaria High School, in Kabul's Qala-e-Fatullah neighborhood, among those lining up to vote was a young mother, Parwash Naseri, 21. Although wearing the blue burqa that is traditional here, she was still willing to speak out through the privacy mesh covering her face.

She was voting, for the first time, for her children and for women's rights, she said, speaking in a whisper. "I believe in the right of women to take part just as men do, to get themselves educated and to work."

Mr. CASEY. I wish to highlight two quotes. The first is from a 21-year-old woman who is voting for the first time in this election:

She was voting, for the first time, for her children and for women's rights, she said, speaking in a whisper. "I believe in the right of women to take part just as men do, to get themselves educated and to work."

A remarkable inspiration from a 21-year-old woman voting for the first time in Afghanistan.

The second quotation is from a 60-year-old farmer who was asked by a reporter what it was like to vote under the threats that were either proximate—meaning something happening in almost real time or in the recent past—or just the overall threat posed by the Taliban and other extremists. This farmer said:

I left everything behind, my fears and my work, and came to use my vote. I want a change and a good government . . .

He goes on from there to describe what he hopes will happen. But just imagine that. He said:

I left everything behind, my fears and my work, and came to use my vote.

When I read that, I thought about something Thomas Jefferson said in a letter to John Adams when he was an older man. He was describing the fear of old age—not the kind of fear of reprisal if you were voting but the fear of

growing old. He talked about how he dealt with the fear of growing old in nautical terms. He said: "I steer my bark with hope in the head, leaving fear astern." That is all I thought about when I heard what the 60-year-old farmer said; that even though he had fears—the fear of death, the fear of reprisal against him, his family or people in his neighborhood—he was willing to say his right to vote was so important he was willing to leave those fears and his work behind so he could vote.

What a tremendous inspiration on a subject—the conflict in Afghanistan and all which comes from it that often is not the subject of positive commentary or inspiration. For once and all too infrequently, this is one of those occasions where we can be positive about a result.

We have more work to do to make sure the bilateral security agreement is signed, but we should draw some measure of inspiration from what happened in Afghanistan and the progress which has been made there.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:49 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 9, 2014, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FRANK G. KLOTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NEIL GREGORY KORNZE, OF NEVADA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING
TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address H.R. 1872, the Budget Accounting Transparency Act. While the current accounting methodology for federal credit programs does not fully capture the financial risk assumed by the Federal Government, I am concerned that the fair-value estimates required by this legislation could over calculate the risk of default, potentially resulting in an over-estimation of the costs associated with certain federal credit programs. I will be following this legislation and any methodological transition to fair-value estimates closely.

CONGRATULATING WARDEN RICARDO RIOS OF PEKIN, ILLINOIS,
ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Warden Ricardo Rios of Pekin, Illinois, who will be retiring from the Federal Correctional Institution in Pekin on April 30th.

Warden Rios has spent 35 years serving communities across the country in his work for the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He began his public service career in 1988 as an Accountant Trainee in the Federal Correctional Institution in Bastrop, Texas. Over the next 30 years, Warden Rios held positions of increasing responsibility in Correctional Centers around the country, including California, Florida and Minnesota. In 2010, he took over as Warden at FCI-Pekin, where he has served for the last four years.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Warden Ricardo Rios for his years of committed service and congratulate him again on his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO CINDY HUGHES
ANLIKER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Cindy Hughes Anliker of Des Moines Performing Arts for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Cindy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Hughes Anliker for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Cindy on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF THE
HONORABLE WILLIAM W. "BILL"
BLANTON

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Bill Blanton who passed away on April 4, 2014. It was my privilege to have known Bill for over thirty years. He was a long standing pillar of the Carrollton, Texas community and will be greatly missed.

Bill was born March 11, 1924 and leaves behind a lasting legacy to his community and country. He served his country in the U.S. Army Air Corps, and then would serve his local community and Texas for many years thereafter. Bill served on the Carrollton/Farmers Branch Independent School District Board for ten years and then would continue his service to the community as their elected representative to the Texas House of Representatives. Bill served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1977 to 1987. During his service in Austin, Bill continued his commitment to improving the lives of our students by serving as the Chairman of the Public Education Committee. In 1986, the Metrocrest Chamber of Commerce honored Bill as the "Citizen of the Year." Upon Bill's retirement from the Texas House of Representatives, I was honored to succeed him in Austin. Throughout all of his service to the community, many will remember him forever from one of their first times to hear Bill—as the voice of Carrollton High School on Friday evenings. Bill served as the voice of the Carrollton High School football team during the 1950s and

1960s on their old football field which now belongs to DeWitt Perry Junior High School.

The people of Carrollton will continue to benefit from the legacy of Bill and the entire Blanton family for many years to come. The Old Downtown Square in Carrollton features the Blanton Grain Tower. The Blanton Grain Tower serves as a tribute to the rich history and original roots of Carrollton and many other North Texas cities. Originally Carrollton was a town which served as a collection of many small and large family farms which fed into the great grain-growing plains of Middle America. Though many grain towers that were essential for the storage and distribution of grain have since been demolished or relocated to rural areas, the Blanton Grain Tower still stands and thrives in the heart of Carrollton. Long since closed for its original purpose, the Blanton Grain Tower was redesigned to now be billed as the world's largest indoor climbing gym. Ten giant grain silos with 110 foot ceilings will continue to challenge indoor rock climbers for years to come. For many years Bill worked for the family grain company—while at the same time being an active member of Lion's Club, Rotary Club, and the Carrollton Chamber of Commerce. So many have been touched by Bill, and many will continue to benefit from his legacy.

My heartfelt condolences are with the Blanton family at this difficult time. Bill was a loving husband to his wife Clovis, father of four, grandfather of five, and a great-grandfather of seven.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the lasting legacy and public service of William W. Blanton.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 165 (Democrat Motion to Recommit), which took place Monday April 7, 2014; I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". On rollcall No. 166 (Final Passage of H.R. 1872), I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 166, I was unable to attend.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate Equal Pay Day, the typical time three months into the year when a woman's wages finally catch up to what men were paid the previous year. This symbolic day illustrates the blatant gap that still remains between men and women's pay earnings, with women continuing to make 77 cents for every dollar a man makes. It is an urgent reminder that we must work together to secure equal pay for equal work.

When you discriminate against a woman, you discriminate against her entire family. Today women serve as the sole or primary breadwinners in 40 percent of all households with children under the age of 18. In addition, two out of three families now depend on the wages of working moms. Our country is evolving; today only a fifth of American families have a male breadwinner and female homemaker. It is time to promote pay equity on behalf of these families.

Closing the wage gap between men and women would cut the poverty rate in half. The U.S. Census Bureau reported that the poverty rate among women is the highest it's been in 17 years, with 17 million women living in poverty last year compared with 12.6 million men. The 77 cents to the dollar that women make relative to men adds up to \$11,084 a year in loss of income. This impacts her lifetime earnings and hurts her retirement savings. Over the age of 65, nearly 52 percent of women are categorized as economically vulnerable by the supplemental poverty measure versus almost 42 percent of men at the same age. If the slow pace of increase continues, it will not be until 2058 that hard-working women receive pay equity and are able to close the wage gap that will allow them to enjoy a well-deserved retirement.

It is estimated that greater pay equity between men and women would add nearly half a trillion dollars to the U.S. economy. The first female Chair of the Federal Reserve, Janet Yellen, has been vocal in her praise of women's increasing participation in the workplace and contributions to our overall economy. Between 1970 and 2009, women's participation in the workforce jumped to nearly half of all workers, going from holding 37 percent of jobs to nearly 48 percent. Women have made similar advances in higher education and receive almost 60 percent of the bachelor's degrees granted in the United States. Still, one year after college, female graduates receive just 82 percent of what their male counterparts make. This unjust pay gap only increases as they become older; women are paid just 69 percent of what men earn 10 years after college graduation.

In this year's State of the Union, President Obama drew attention to the wage gap, saying that this level of inequality in 2014 is unacceptable. He prioritized congressional and private sector action on fair pay and fair leave policies so that women can achieve the equality they deserve.

Women make tremendous contributions to our economic wellbeing. Unequal pay is a reality in modern America but it doesn't have to

be. There is wide support for equal reimbursement—73 percent of Americans favor equal pay for equal work. I agree, and that's why I support the Paycheck Fairness Act. It is time for us to prioritize the long-term well-being of the nation's hardworking women, many of whom are heads of households, and immediately pass this critical legislation to help ensure equality in the workplace.

CONGRATULATING PRINCIPAL DON FARR FOR HIS ACHIEVEMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Don Farr, the principal of Monmouth-Roseville Junior High School, who has been named the Middle School Principal of the Year by Horace Mann and the Illinois Principals Association.

Principal Farr has served as a principal for 17 years. He is active in the Illinois Principals Association as well as numerous community organizations, including the Roseville Community Center, the Warren County YMCA, the Roseville Masonic Lodge and the Monmouth Chamber of Commerce. He also passes on his experience by teaching classes in Middle School Methods and Strategies at Monmouth College.

As a proud mother of three sons who were educated by our public schools, I know firsthand the importance of administrators who work with teachers and the community to create a positive school climate and do what is best for our students. I'm glad that the Illinois Principals Association and Horace Mann are recognizing and honoring Principal Farr for his excellent work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again congratulate Principal Farr for his outstanding efforts on behalf of students in our community and wish him the best in the National Middle School Principal of the Year awards.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER JAMES

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Christopher James of Davis Brown Law Firm in Des Moines, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Christopher in the United

States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. James for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Christopher on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

SYDNEY AND THALIA POTTER

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Mr. Sydney Potter. As our neighbors in the Tampa Bay area know, you cannot talk about Sydney without also talking about his amazing wife, Thalia. Sydney and Thalia were true partners dedicated to their family and to serving our community. Sydney passed recently, but today I am happy to honor their countless accomplishments and unsurpassed reputation for improving Hillsborough County.

Sydney and Thalia Potter married in 1944 and raised their family along the banks of the Hillsborough River in 1955. Both Sydney and Thalia had distinguished professional careers. Sydney served most of his career as Secretary-Treasurer of I.W. Phillips & Company before managing a distribution office for Ace Hardware. Thalia had an outstanding career as a legislative aide which began with Florida State Representative Ed Blackburn in the early 1970's and continued with State Senator Pat Frank as well as State Representative Jim Davis before her retirement. Throughout her career, Thalia was known for her scrupulous ethics, impeccable attention to detail, and unparalleled skill for serving constituents with kindness and poise.

Sydney and Thalia's love of the Hillsborough River led them to be longtime advocates for environmental stewardship. In the words of close friends, Sydney and Thalia "were green before green was cool." Their activism led to the passage of environmental protection bills for the Hillsborough River as well as led to the completion of projects that successfully reversed erosion along a local riverfront park and pushed local officials to allow more freshwater to flow from the upriver dam to replenish the river's ecosystem. In 1997, they also helped organize Citizens for the Responsible Application of Malathion (CRAM), which successfully stopped the spraying of dangerous pesticides over the citizens of Hillsborough County. Sydney and Thalia's leadership in environmental conservation and preservation has had an immeasurable impact on the community and the future of the Tampa Bay Watershed.

Sydney and Thalia's dedication and community service has led to their recognition by several prestigious organizations. Thalia was awarded the Sierra Club's Pine Tree Award in 1998 for achievement in group activism and, later that year, Sydney was awarded the Club's Gopher Tortoise Award for support of a member in important activist effort. In 2008, The League of Women Voters of Hillsborough County announced the establishment of the

“Sydney and Thalia Potter Civic Leadership Award for their commitment to good government, protection of the environment, and community activism.

Sydney was a gentleman in the finest sense of the word and was remarkably knowledgeable in his understanding of the key issues affecting our community and country. His poignant, tough questions to public officials at Suncoast Tiger Bay Club meetings led to him winning more Garfield Awards than any other member. Thalia is a woman of true grace and grit from a remarkable family with an unmatched history of commitment to helping children and families. Sydney and Thalia are consummate examples of servant leadership. At every turn, they acted with the best interest of the community and country at heart. Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing two irreplaceable and inspirational leaders of the Tampa Bay community for a lifetime of dedicated public service.

COMMEMORATING EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, it is simply unfathomable that today is Equal Pay Day, the day when, more than three months into the year, women’s wages finally catch up to what men were paid in the previous year. This is flat out unacceptable.

Today is not a celebration or a happy occasion at all. It is a glaring reminder of the hard work that still needs to be done in order to achieve gender parity in pay.

Women are half the population! How has this inequity been allowed to stand for so long? When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963, women on average made 59 cents for every dollar earned by men. It has been 51 years since the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, and yet women still earn on average only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men, amounting to a yearly gap of \$11,607 between full-time working men and women. We’ve made some progress—but not nearly enough.

Equal pay is not simply a women’s issue—it is a family issue. Families increasingly rely on women’s wages to make ends meet, and with less take-home pay women have less money for the everyday needs of their families.

According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, in California, women in are paid 84 cents for every dollar paid to men, amounting to an annual wage gap of \$8,183 between men and women who work full time in the state. In addition, Californian women who are employed full time lose a combined total of approximately \$37,658,902,470 every year due to the wage gap.

The sad reality is that the pay gap is not simply an education issue. Nationally, women with master’s degrees who work full time are paid just 70 cents for every dollar paid to men with master’s degrees. Further, women with doctoral degrees are paid less than men with

master’s degrees, and women with master’s degrees are paid less than men with bachelor’s degrees.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Paycheck Fairness Act is so critical. It will close loopholes and strengthen the Equal Pay Act, which hasn’t been updated in 51 years. The bill has 207 cosponsors. It is simply shocking that out of 207 cosponsors, not one—let me repeat that—not one is a Republican. This is not an issue that only affects Democrats. It affects all hard-working American women—regardless of their political party. Does the Majority simply not care about this problem, or is it yet another continuation of the War on Women?

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH SHORE SANITARY DISTRICT

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 100th anniversary of the North Shore Sanitary District (NSSD), a critically-important municipal utility that serves the suburban Chicago district I represent.

Chartered in 1914, NSSD has grown into the second largest sanitary treatment district in the State of Illinois. The wastewater treatment process is critical to the health of our families and our environment. The average American produces 100 gallons of wastewater per day, and NSSD serves more than 300,000 people.

NSSD operates three major facilities in the district I represent, with 125 miles of sewers and the capacity to deal with more than 60 million gallons of wastewater each day.

For 100 years, NSSD has diligently worked to protect our inland waterways and Lake Michigan from storm and wastewater runoff. The water reclamation process is integral to our modern ecosystems, and NSSD conducts this process with unmatched skill, precision and care.

To more appropriately reflect NSSD’s breadth of work and commitment to water quality, NSSD will officially change its name to the North Shore Water Reclamation District.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate NSSD on a century of outstanding service to the North Shore, and I look forward to another 100 years of success as the North Shore Water Reclamation District.

RECOGNIZING RORY RESHOVSKY ON HIS THIRD PRIZE AWARD IN C-SPAN’S NATIONAL STUDENTCAM COMPETITION

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Rory Reshovsky, who has achieved national recognition for a short documentary he produced in response to the question, “What’s the most important issue the

United States Congress should consider in 2014?”

Rory took home the Third Prize award in C-SPAN’s national 2014 StudentCam competition, which is a wonderful competition that challenges our youth to think critically about issues of national importance. I find it inspiring that so many young people are engaged in these debates and contributing their voices as part of our democratic process. Our democracy is strengthened when active citizens like Rory take time to participate in the process.

Rory’s thoughtful documentary, “I Do,” provides a really insightful focus on the issue of marriage equality. I was particularly proud to play a role in the documentary and highlight just how important it is to ensure all committed loving couples are able to marry.

After all, I want my daughters to grow up in a country where discrimination is a thing of the past—where people can’t be treated differently because of their gender, where they come from, or who they love.

The StudentCam competition recognizes the most impressive student filmmakers across the country. Rory has been named one of the top honorees nationwide in a competition that included 2,355 documentaries entered by nearly 5,000 students in 46 states.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud Rory for his work producing the documentary. Rory’s actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities and the national dialogue.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL DAYTON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Michael Dayton of Nyemaster Goode in Des Moines, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Michael in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Dayton for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Michael on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING THE WATER ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH FOUNDATION

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very important organization based in my congressional district. Founded in Alexandria, Virginia, in 1989, The Water Environment Research Foundation (WERF) coordinates unbiased, scientifically rigorous water quality research among teams of federal, state, and local agencies that represent over 75 percent of the U.S. population served by waste water treatments plants, of the U.S. Under the leadership of founding Executive Director Glenn Reinhardt, WERF has grown from a few employees to a highly respected national center of water quality research with a full-time staff of 23 and an annual budget of over \$10 million. The foundation's efforts have improved human and ecological health, fostered new water quality management processes and spear-headed the development of new technologies.

WERF has managed nearly 550 research projects, valued at more than \$130 million, with \$19 million (cash and in-kind) work ongoing annually. Its research has helped create many new tools for restoring water quality and informed better state and federal regulation, saving the U.S. water quality community well as much as \$2 billion over the last twenty years. For instance, WERF's watershed trading demonstration projects led to hundreds of millions in regulatory savings while its investment of only \$92,500 into new sewer designs, materials, and rehabilitation techniques reduced annual costs at wastewater collection systems nationwide by at least \$75 million.

In times when federal spending on wastewater infrastructure continues to fall in real and inflation adjusted terms WERF research provides one of the few means to control or reduce the staggering cost of essential infrastructure upgrades, which by some estimates approach \$500 billion over the next twenty years.

WERF focuses on the critical issues as identified by its subscribers, including wastewater infrastructure management, wet weather (runoff) control, biosolids handling, and wastewater utility responses to climate change. Newer challenges rising up the research agenda include nutrient removal, wastewater utility operations optimization, trace organics effects, wastewater services and costs, green infrastructure, and recovering energy from wastewater.

For many years, WERF received federal funding through Appropriation Committees on which I have served. Those funds have been leveraged at a 3:1 or better rate with monies largely from local wastewater treatment facilities. This highly successful public/private partnership should be celebrated and expanded, and I ask Congress to redouble its efforts to support water quality research. My congratulations to the entire WERF staff and volunteers for their fine work on behalf of us all and for reaching this significant milestone.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for a job well done.

HONORING COACH KEVIN SCHLAGEL UPON HIS 40-YEAR ASSOCIATION WITH ST. CLOUD STATE'S MEN'S BASKETBALL PROGRAM

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Coach Kevin Schlagel of St. Cloud, Minnesota, upon his retirement after 40 years of service to the St. Cloud State University Men's Basketball Program.

Kevin Schlagel's dedication to Huskies basketball began when he was a player from 1972–1976 and helped bring home the Northern Intercollegiate Conference title his senior year. After 18 seasons as their top assistant coach, he was named the head coach of the Huskies during the 1997–1998 season. Under Coach Schlagel's leadership the Huskies earned a selection in the NCAA tournament eight times, and won the NCC Wells Fargo Finals Tournament twice, the NSIC Sanford Health Tournament twice, and the North Central Conference regular season title once.

In the Huskies' most prolific season ever, 2009–2010, they won a school record 29 games and made it to the NCAA Division II Final Four. After 17 years as the head coach, Kevin Schlagel is the winningest Men's Basketball coach in Huskies history with an overall record of 321–149.

Coach Schlagel is a great example of the important role that coaches play in our communities. He has been a true leader to young people, helping them develop skills that will enable them to be successful long after their last game.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to join me in honoring Coach Kevin Schlagel upon his successful career at St. Cloud State University.

CELEBRATING GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Gallaudet University's sesquicentennial.

I am proud to serve as one of the U.S. Congress's members of their board of trustees during this momentous occasion. I acknowledge them both for their achievements as the Nation's premier institution for the Deaf, and for their storied history of excellence in education, improving access throughout America and the world.

In 1856, philanthropist and former postmaster general Amos Kendall donated land on his estate in northeast Washington, D.C. for a place to educate the city's Deaf youth, and, eight years later, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill authorized by the U.S. Congress for the institution to grant college degrees.

Theology graduate Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet was inspired to dedicate his life to educating Deaf people after tutoring Alice Cogswell, a nine-year-old Deaf neighbor, and traveled to France, where he learned a man-

ual communication method of instruction developed by renowned French educators Abbe Sicard, Laurent Clerc, and Jean Massieu. Upon returning to the United States, Gallaudet established the American School for the Deaf, the nation's first permanent school for Deaf children, in Hartford, Connecticut.

In 1857, Gallaudet's youngest son, Edward Miner Gallaudet, took up his father's cause when he and his Deaf mother, Sophia Fowler Gallaudet, were invited by Kendall to run the newly established Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb and the Blind in Washington, D.C., and with Kendall's resources and Gallaudet's leadership and vision, the fledgling school grew and flourished, expanding to provide instruction for aspiring teachers of the Deaf and to become the world's first—and today retains the status of the only—institution of higher education devoted to Deaf and hard of hearing students, and to hearing students who pursue careers as professionals serving the Deaf community.

Gallaudet presided over the first commencement in June 1869. Those graduating that day received diplomas signed by President Ulysses S. Grant, and to this day the diplomas of all Gallaudet graduates are signed by the current U.S. President.

In 1969, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act (MSSD), and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Gallaudet President Leonard Elstad signed an agreement authorizing the establishment and operation of the MSSD on the Gallaudet campus. One year later, President Nixon signed the bill that authorized the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School. Those two schools are part of Gallaudet's Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center, which is devoted to the creation and dissemination of educational opportunities for Deaf students nationwide.

By an act of Congress, Gallaudet was granted university status in October 1986 and presently Gallaudet's undergraduate students have their choice of more than 40 majors. Graduate programs offer certificates and master of arts, master of science, doctoral, and specialist degrees in many specialties regarding professional service to Deaf and hard of hearing people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for Gallaudet University and their essential mission here in our nation's capital. I congratulate all of the faculty, staff, students, and all involved with the Gallaudet community on their sesquicentennial.

TRIBUTE TO CARRIE CLOGG

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Carrie Clogg of the Civic Music Association for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers.

Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Carrie in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Clogg for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Carrie on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN MEMORY OF THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DR. JAMES SCHLESINGER

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I reflect on the recent passing of a great American servant and defender, Mr. James Schlesinger. While I am sure that I don't need to enumerate each of his many accomplishments in the service of his nation—Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Energy—I would like to spend a moment reflecting on his remarkable service to the national security of the American people.

When I took over at the beginning of this Congress as the Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, which oversees, among other vital national programs, the nation's nuclear forces, I knew that I needed to find the best of this nation's leaders to seek their advice and counsel. Of course, Dr. Schlesinger was at the top of this list. I was grateful that despite struggles with his health, he took the time to come and conduct a seminar for my colleagues on the subcommittee and me. We are able to better do our important work because of the ground he tread in his lifetime of service and because of the counsel he lent us selflessly.

As the former Secretary told us, "[n]uclear weapons are used every day . . . to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer protection." These are true words from the man the Wall Street Journal referred to as the "Yoda" of nuclear deterrence.

Mr. Speaker, we've lost a great advocate for this country's security. But, we are fortunate that we have his example and his work to guide us. Never more than today do we realize the value in what James Schlesinger stood for across his 85 years. We thank God that we live in a nation led and protected by such men as Dr. Schlesinger. I take the liberty of speaking for the whole House when I say to his family, thank you for allowing him to spend his life in service to his country.

I submit a Wall Street Journal op-ed ("Why We Don't Want a Nuclear-Free World", July 13, 2009) and an obituary that appeared on the same page on March 28th.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2009]

WHY WE DON'T WANT A NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD

(By Melanie Kirkpatrick)

"Nuclear weapons are used every day." So says former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, speaking last month at his office in a wooded enclave of Maclean, Va. It's a serene setting for Doomsday talk, and Mr. Schlesinger's matter-of-fact tone belies the enormity of the concepts he's explaining—concepts that were seemingly ignored in this week's Moscow summit between Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev.

We use nuclear weapons every day, Mr. Schlesinger goes on to explain, "to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer protection."

Mr. Obama likes to talk about his vision of a nuclear-free world, and in Moscow he and Mr. Medvedev signed an agreement setting targets for sweeping reductions in the world's largest nuclear arsenals. Reflecting on the hour I spent with Mr. Schlesinger, I can't help but think: Do we really want to do this?

For nuclear strategists, Mr. Schlesinger is Yoda, the master of their universe. In addition to being a former defense secretary (Nixon and Ford), he is a former energy secretary (Carter) and former director of central intelligence (Nixon). He has been studying the U.S. nuclear posture since the early 1960s, when he was at the RAND Corporation, a California think tank that often does research for the U.S. government. He's the expert whom Defense Secretary Robert Gates called on last year to lead an investigation into the Air Force's mishandling of nuclear weapons after nuclear-armed cruise missiles were mistakenly flown across the country on a B-52 and nuclear fuses were accidentally shipped to Taiwan. Most recently, he's vice chairman of a bipartisan congressional commission that in May issued an urgent warning about the need to maintain a strong U.S. deterrent.

But above all, Mr. Schlesinger is a nuclear realist. Are we heading toward a nuclear-free world anytime soon? He shoots back a one-word answer: "No." I keep silent, hoping he will go on. "We will need a strong deterrent," he finally says, "and that is measured at least in decades—in my judgment, in fact, more or less in perpetuity. The notion that we can abolish nuclear weapons reflects on a combination of American utopianism and American parochialism. . . . It's like the [1929] Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. . . . It's not based upon an understanding of reality."

In other words: Go ahead and wish for a nuclear-free world, but pray that you don't get what you wish for. A world without nukes would be even more dangerous than a world with them, Mr. Schlesinger argues.

"If, by some miracle, we were able to eliminate nuclear weapons," he says, "what we would have is a number of countries sitting around with breakout capabilities or rumors of breakout capabilities—for intimidation purposes . . . and finally, probably, a number of small clandestine stockpiles." This would make the U.S. more vulnerable.

Mr. Schlesinger makes the case for a strong U.S. deterrent. Yes, the Cold War has ended and, yes, while "we worry about Russia's nuclear posture to some degree, it is not just as prominent as it once was." The U.S. still needs to deter Russia, which has the largest nuclear capability of any potential adversary, and the Chinese, who have a modest (and growing) capability. The U.S. nuclear deterrent has no influence on North Korea or Iran, he says, or on nonstate actors. "They're not going to be deterred by the possibility of a nuclear response to actions that they might take," he says.

Mr. Schlesinger refers to the unanimous conclusion of the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, which he co-led with Chairman William Perry. The commission "strongly" recommended that further discussions with the Russians on arms control are "desirable," he says, and that "we should proceed with negotiations on an extension of the START Treaty." That's what Mr. Obama set in motion in Moscow this week. The pact—whose full name is the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty—expires in December. But what's the hurry? Mr. Schlesinger warns about rushing to agree on cuts. "The treaty . . . can be extended for five years. And, if need be, I would extend it for five years."

There's another compelling reason for a strong U.S. deterrent: the U.S. nuclear umbrella, which protects more than 30 allies worldwide. "If we were only protecting the North American continent," he says, "we could do so with far fewer weapons than we have at present in the stockpile." But a principal aim of the U.S. nuclear deterrent is "to provide the necessary reassurance to our allies, both in Asia and in Europe." That includes "our new NATO allies such as Poland and the Baltic States," which, he notes dryly, continue to be concerned about their Russian neighbor. "Indeed, they inform us regularly that they understand the Russians far better than do we."

The congressional commission warned of a coming "tipping point" in proliferation, when more nations might decide to go nuclear if they were to lose confidence in the U.S. deterrent, or in Washington's will to use it. If U.S. allies lose confidence in Washington's ability to protect them, they'll kick off a new nuclear arms race.

That's a reason Mr. Schlesinger wants to bring Japan into the nuclear conversation. "One of the recommendations of the commission is that we start to have a dialogue with the Japanese about strategic capabilities in order both to help enlighten them and to provide reassurance that they will be protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella. In the past, that has not been the case. Japan never was seriously threatened by Soviet capabilities and that the Soviets looked westward largely is a threat against Western Europe. But now that the Chinese forces have been growing into the many hundreds of weapons, we think that it's necessary to talk to the Japanese in the same way that we have talked to the Europeans over the years."

He reminds me of the comment of Japanese political leader Ichiro Ozawa, who said in 2002 that it would be "easy" for Japan to make nuclear warheads and that it had enough plutonium to make several thousand weapons. "When one contemplates a number like that," Mr. Schlesinger says, "one sees that a substantial role in nonproliferation has been the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Without that, some and perhaps a fair number of our allies would feel the necessity of having their own nuclear capabilities."

He worries about "contagion" in the Middle East, whereby countries will decide to go nuclear if Iran does. "We've long talked about Iran as a tipping point," he says, "in that it might induce Turkey, which has long been protected under NATO, Egypt [and] Saudi Arabia to respond in kind. There has been talk about extending the nuclear umbrella to the Middle East in the event that the Iranians are successful in developing that capacity."

Mr. Schlesinger expresses concerns, too, about the safety and reliability of U.S. nuclear weapons, all of which are more than 20 years old. "I am worried about the reliability of the weapons . . . as time passes. Not this year, not next year, but as time passes and the stockpile ages." There is a

worry, too, about the “intellectual infrastructure,” he says, as Americans who know how to make nuclear weapons either retire or die. And he notes that the “physical infrastructure” is now “well over 60 years” old. Some of it “comes out of the Manhattan Project.”

The U.S. is the only major nuclear power that is not modernizing its weapons. “The Russians have a shelf life for their weapons of about 10 years so they are continually replacing” them. The British and the French “stay up to date.” And the Chinese and the Indians “continue to add to their stockpiles.” But in the U.S., Congress won’t even so much as fund R&D for the Reliable Replacement Warhead. “The RRW has become a toxic term on Capitol Hill,” Mr. Schlesinger says. Give it a new name, he seems to be suggesting, and try again to get Congress to fund it. “We need to be much more vigorous about life-extension programs” for the weapons.

Finally, we chat about Mr. Schlesinger’s nearly half-century as a nuclear strategist. Are we living in a world where the use of nuclear weapons is more likely than it was back then? “The likelihood of a nuclear exchange has substantially gone away,” he says. That’s the good news. “However, the likelihood of a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States” is greater.

During his RAND years, in the 1960s, Mr. Schlesinger recalls that “we were working on mitigating the possible effects [of a nuclear attack] through civil defense, which, may I say parenthetically, we should be working on now with respect, certainly, to the possibility of a terrorist weapon used against the United States. . . . We should have a much more rapid response capability. . . . We’re not as well organized as we should be to respond.”

Mr. Schlesinger sees another difference between now and when he started in this business: “Public interest in our strategic posture has faded over the decades,” he says. “In the Cold War, it was a most prominent subject. Now, much of the public is barely interested in it. And that has been true of the Congress as well,” creating what he delicately refers to as “something of a stalemate in expenditures.”

He’s raising the alarm. Congress, the administration and Americans ignore it at their peril.

[From The Wall Street Journal, Mar. 28, 2014]

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER: A DEFENSE STRATEGIST WITHOUT ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE WORLD’S THREATS.

One can only imagine the wry, bemused expression that would have passed across former Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger at the irony of his death this past week at age 85. Jim Schlesinger, the ultimate Cold Warrior, left the public stage at the moment his successors in Washington are arguing among themselves whether Vladimir Putin of Russia, with some 50,000 troops arrayed on Ukraine’s border and a nuclear weapons arsenal in his pocket, is or is not a threat to the interests of the United States.

The phrase “he does not suffer fools gladly” wasn’t invented for Jim Schlesinger, though some in the Washington policy-making fraternity could have been forgiven for thinking so. Nuclear strategist, defense secretary to Presidents Nixon and Ford and then the first secretary of energy under Jimmy Carter, Schlesinger puffed on an ever-present pipe and offered unvarnished and sometimes uncomfortable advice through some of the most difficult events of the Cold War era.

Equivocation wasn’t a word he recognized. In the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, with the Soviet

Union supplying some of the Arab countries, the Schlesinger Defense Department airlifted supplies to Israel, a U.S. ally.

Above all, Schlesinger believed that the U.S. should do nothing to put its pre-eminence in national security at risk. He pushed hard for increased military spending and voiced doubts about the terms of nuclear-arms negotiations with the Soviet Union in the 1970s.

He believed in the idea of military deterrence, and that included the U.S. nuclear deterrent. In a typically blunt assertion during a Weekend Interview with the Journal in 2009, Schlesinger said, “Nuclear weapons are used every day.” They are used “to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer our protection.”

Schlesinger’s robust clarity about the nature of threat and adversaries is out of favor in Washington these days. Foreign-policy tastes now run more toward “nuance.” Jim Schlesinger, a card-carrying economist, had nothing against nuance. He simply wanted to do whatever is necessary to make sure the U.S. never ended up on the wrong side of it. That point of view is missed.

RECOGNIZING JAMES BEN MAGEL

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize retiring Councilman of Pleasanton, Texas, James Ben Magel. He has served the citizens of the city of Pleasanton well, and is now ending his tenure after 18 years. His tireless efforts have improved the community, and he has served to better the development and progress of Pleasanton.

“Jimmy” Magel was born in Kenedy, Texas. Shortly after his birth, his family moved to Pleasanton. After graduating from Pleasanton High School in 1966, he attended the University of Texas at Austin, earning a degree in Pharmacy in 1971. He returned to Pleasanton and worked at Henry’s Pharmacy. In 1974 he began working for Rexco Pharmacy, which he now owns. In 1970 he married Bernice Tieken. Together, they share two children and one grandchild. Currently, he serves as President of the Pleasanton Ex-Students Association and is a member of the St. John Lutheran Church Council in Jourdanston. One of his proudest achievements was earning the rank of Eagle Scout. A loving husband and father, Mr. Magel has been a devoted public servant and community leader.

As Councilman, Mr. Magel has played an integral role in leading change within the Pleasanton community. Particularly, Mr. Magel paved the way for multiple construction projects, such as the construction of a public works facility, the new police department, the expansion of Pleasanton City Hall, a new civic center and library. He was also instrumental in the assembly of the Regional Water Waste Collection Line and various other infrastructure projects. Mr. Magel’s commitment to the maintenance of public buildings and infrastructure has helped the city of Pleasanton continue to be a remarkable place to live and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mr. James “Jimmy” Ben Magel, retiring Councilman of Pleasanton. His years of dedication and commitment to our community have truly

impacted the quality of life for the people of the city.

TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN DIX

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Lincoln Dix of Staples Advantage in Urbandale, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Lincoln in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Dix for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Lincoln on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 165 and “aye” on rollcall No. 166, supporting the passage of the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of March 24, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: rollcall No. 136—On final passage of H.R. 3060—“yea”; rollcall No. 137—On final passage of H.R.1813—“yea”; rollcall No. 138—H.R. 2824—Lowenthal Amendment—“yea”; rollcall No. 139—H.R. 2824—Cartwright Amendment—“yea”; rollcall No. 140—H.R. 2824—On motion to recommit with instructions—“yea”; rollcall No. 141—On final passage of H.R. 2824—“nay”; rollcall No. 142—H. Res. 524—On ordering the previous question on the rule—“nay”; rollcall No. 143—

H. Res. 524—On agreeing to the resolution—“nay”; rollcall No. 144—On final passage of H.R. 1228—“yea”; rollcall No. 145—H.R. 1459—Tsongas Amendment—“yea”; rollcall No. 146—On motion to recommit with instructions for H.R. 1459—“yea”; rollcall No. 147—On final passage of H.R. 1459—“nay”; rollcall No. 148—On final passage of H.R. 4278—“yea”.

HONORING PAUL KINCAID

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Paul Kincaid for his service to Missouri State University and on receiving the Virginia Carter Smith Recognition Award from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education District VI.

Paul serves as the chief of staff and assistant to the president for university relations at Missouri State University. Paul serves as an important voice in the public affairs mission of the university, which is to instill in students the knowledge to be productive and competent leaders in the pursuit of careers in public affairs.

The Virginia Carter Smith Recognition Award from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) District VI is given to professionals who have shown outstanding service to CASE and who have retired or plan to retire. Paul plans to retire from Missouri State University in October.

I am honored to recognize Paul Kincaid for his service to Missouri State University and his 39 years working in higher education public relations. I know that education is a once in a lifetime experience, and with people like Paul at the university, its students are being prepared to excel in their chosen career paths.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID FARNSWORTH

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize David Farnsworth of McGown, Hurst, Clark, and Smith for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like David in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Farnsworth for uti-

lizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating David on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

CELEBRATING WAG-A-BAG STORES

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the founding of Wag-A-Bag convenience stores. One of central Texas' most beloved institutions, Wag-A-Bag is celebrating a half century of service to the Lone Star State.

First opening in 1964, Wag-A-Bag stores were the brainchild of Virg and Nancy Rabb. A true innovator, Virg realized that the rural small towns that dotted the Texas landscape needed convenience stores. My home town of Round Rock, TX had just 1800 residents, no traffic lights, and no police force when the first Wag-A-Bag store was built.

Since opening, Wag-A-Bag has enjoyed continuous but cautious growth. One store grew to nineteen and they expanded locations to Hutto, Pflugerville, Georgetown, Liberty Hill, and Austin. Each store has become an essential part of the fabric of community life. Wag-A-Bags have been the site of first jobs, last minute stops for ingredients before dinner, and countless cups of coffee to start the day.

Proudly a family business, Wag-A-Bag still operates under the guidance of Nancy Rabb and her son Cary, who stepped in following Virg's death in 1998. They also devote resources to making a difference and are committed partners with numerous civic and school organizations.

With its exemplary customer service as well as its commitment to being a contributor to the Central Texas community, Wag-A-Bag is truly an American success story. I wish their founders and employees a happy 50th birthday and all the best in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on April 7th, I was not present for rollcall votes 165 and 166. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “aye” on rollcall vote 165, “nay” on rollcall vote 166.

IN RECOGNITION OF EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today marks a holiday that I hope to see

stricken from the calendar. Today is Equal Pay Day, a day which marks the number of days into 2014 that it takes for the average woman to make as much as her male counterpart did in 2013. It is truly staggering that a woman does not earn the same annual amount as her male counterpart until four months into the following year. The fact that women earn only 77 percent of what men are paid has a staggering effect on society as a whole, our economy and our future.

Closing the wage gap would likely have an immensely positive effect on our economy. The additional \$400,000 that each woman would earn in her lifetime if paid the same as her male counterpart would be just the economic boost that our country needs as we recover from the recession. Economists estimate that closing the wage gap would have twice the stimulative effect as President Obama's \$800 billion Stimulus Bill. We simply cannot afford Congressional inaction on this issue.

Not only does wage inequality diminish a woman's spending power, it also has a devastating effect on women's retirement savings. Diminished earnings means that women are less equipped to contribute to retirement savings, but it also means that their Social Security and pensions, both of which are based on income, are diminished. The resulting effect is that retired women are more likely than retired men to live in poverty. The fact that we can let our mothers and grandmothers live in poverty during the final years of their lives is truly a travesty.

The wage gap is even more dramatic for women of color: African American women on average earn only 64 cents for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men. Latinas fare even worse, earning only 55 cents on the dollar. According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, that adds up to an average of \$18,817 and \$23,298, respectively, in annual lost wages. Put another way, the lost wages are the equivalent to 118 weeks' worth of food and 4,549 gallons of gasoline for African American women and 154 weeks' worth of food and 5,743 gallons of gasoline for Latina women. This inequity is intolerable.

The Equal Pay Act was passed in 1963 to address the issue of wage inequality, but progress has been slow. Since the Act's passage, the wage gap has closed by just 18 cents. According to the Institute for Women's Policy Research, at the current pace, the wage gap will not be closed until 2058. This is simply unacceptable. Congress cannot sit by idly while women's economic security, including their retirement savings, are threatened by gender inequity.

As the Senate prepares yet again to vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act, it is my hope that my colleagues in the Senate will recall the devastating effects that wage inequity has on women, particularly minority and elderly women, and vote in favor of S. 2199.

Paycheck inequity also means women are more economically vulnerable during breaks in employment. Women, earning less than their male counterparts, have less money to place into savings as a safeguard to protect themselves and their families from unexpected unemployment.

The House can act immediately to provide women and their families with economic safeguards by passing the Senate's 5-month extension of long-term jobless benefits. Not only do tens of thousands of women rely on long-

term unemployment insurance to satisfy their most basic needs, they also use these benefits to provide for the needs of their children. Many women, despite earning significantly less than their male counterparts, are the primary providers for their families. Congress should reward women for their hard work and extend long-term jobless benefits, a critical safety net for women and their families.

TRIBUTE TO KATE GAINER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Kate Gainer of the Iowa Pharmacy Association for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Kate in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Gainer for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Kate on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today this Equal Pay Day, I rise to recognize the full value of women's skills, their significant contributions to the labor force, and acknowledge the gross injustice of wage inequality.

Women—who make up nearly half of our Nation's workforce—on average still make only 77 cents for every dollar made by men.

For black women, it's 64 cents on the dollar. At a time when families across the United States are struggling to make ends meet, ensuring a fair wage is more important than ever.

Equal pay is more than a basic right—it is an economic necessity.

That is why I will continue to fight for the When Women Succeed, America Succeeds economic agenda, which includes enacting the Paycheck Fairness Act, to ensure equal pay for equal work for our nation's women, children, and families.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MRS.
CHASITY TUGGLE

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mrs. Chasity Tuggle of Berea, Kentucky. Mrs. Tuggle recently earned distinction as a 2014 Elizabeth Dole Foundation Fellow for her devotion as a caregiver to a special military veteran, her husband. With this honor, Mrs. Tuggle represents Kentucky in the Caring for Military Families Program.

Serving as a veteran caregiver can often prove physically and mentally challenging, resulting in significant hardship for the families involved. Mrs. Tuggle is among the one million individuals who voluntarily provide homecare to wounded Iraq and Afghanistan veterans throughout the nation.

All military and veteran caregivers deserve our appreciation and gratitude, but today I would like to especially salute Mrs. Tuggle for her selfless dedication and willingness to place the needs of a loved one over her own. I also applaud her exceptional work through the Elizabeth Dole Foundation, which allows her to give a voice to other veteran caregivers who have made a similar sacrifice. Mrs. Tuggle is truly an outstanding American and an inspiration to us all.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT MORRIS
UNIVERSITY MEN'S ACHA DIVISION 1 HOCKEY TEAM

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Robert Morris University Men's ACHA Division 1 hockey team as the 2014 National Champion Runners-Up. Robert Morris University is a private, non-profit, multi-campus university in Illinois, with an enrollment of approximately 6,000 students. Facing competition from prestigious universities with enrollments greater than 30,000, the Robert Morris players and coaches demonstrated remarkable stamina, character, and determination in realizing their goal of competing for the national title.

Off the ice these student-athletes distinguished themselves academically as well. During the first quarter of the year, 11 players earned a perfect 4.0 Grade Point Average, and 21 of these hockey players earned a 3.0 GPA or better. The team can also boast they have a 100 percent graduation rate, as all 9 seniors on the team will be graduating after 4 years.

The life of a student-athlete can be both physically and mentally exhausting, as they must balance a full-time course schedule, daily practices, 2–3 day road trips every other week, and quite often, part-time jobs. This is especially true for these young men, as their hockey season extends for over 6 months, the majority of their academic school year. Their ongoing dedication to excellence, both on and off the ice is a credit to themselves, their coaches, their school and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Robert Morris University student-athletes: Mitch Tews, Mason Riley, Christopher Cimoch, Ryan O'Connell, Tyler Martorano, Joey Francis, Kyle Hamilton, Derek Winkler, Nick Ernst, Tony Domico, Derek Diaz, Gehritt Sargis, Markus Ellis, T.J. Karavos, Robert Chapman, Andrew Montague, Adam Keasey, Chris Pontello, Chayce Coenen, Oleg Popov, Paul Isleib, Andy DiCristofaro, Anthony Petrak, Robert Kennedy, Zach Kuta, Head Coach Tom Adrahtas, Assistant Coach Chad Berman and Director of Player Personnel Tom Wendlandt. Your outstanding achievements this year are truly admirable.

TRIBUTE TO ABBEY GILROY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Abbey Gilroy of Neighborhood Development Corporation in Des Moines, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Abbey in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Gilroy for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Abbey on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

CONGRATULATING PRIME MINISTER VICTOR ORBAN OF HUNGARY

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hungary's newly re-elected Prime Minister Victor Orban. The Prime Minister, and the conservative governing Fidesz-Christian Democratic alliance, won this election with a decisive margin.

This makes Prime Minister Victor Orban the first conservative prime minister in Hungary to be re-elected since the regime change in 1990. In addition, it is important to recognize that this is the first election that all Hungarian Citizens living outside of Hungary could also participate in the electoral process.

Many of these Hungarian emigrants, like my Great Grandparents, traveled to the United States but retained a close tie to their homeland. It is wonderful that those who still retain their Hungarian identity have the ability to remain involved in this democratic process.

Hungary's significance cannot be overstated and the country's position as a world partner before WWII is important to always remember. Hungary has a rich culture and heritage that adds a great dynamic to the world.

As a Member of Congress with deep Hungarian roots, and as a proud Member of the Hungarian Caucus, our nations must continue to build upon our strong bilateral diplomatic and economic relations.

HONORING JIMMY JOE JOHNSON

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jimmy Joe Johnson, whose quick thinking, expertise, and determination helped save Lake Conway from free flowing crude oil on March 29, 2013, when the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline ruptured.

Jimmy Joe has been the Mayflower Street Department Supervisor for 15 years. His swift plan of action helped protect a critical natural resource in central Arkansas. Along with a crew of city, county and local volunteers, he deployed every resource available, including dump trucks and backhoes to construct a barricade that isolated the surging oil.

Racing against time, they first plugged a pair of 48-inch metal pipes that isolated the oil to a 30-acre cove beside Lake Conway, a 6,700-acre body of water.

He then instructed his crew to create a dike the length of a football field with gravel and pipes, allowing the oil to pool where it could be removed with vacuums and skimmers. By the time rain began falling that evening, the Mayflower Street Department had exhausted a supply of 75 tons of gravel.

Lake Conway was created by an Arkansas conservation agency and is the largest man-made lake in the United States. It is renowned for its catfish, crappie, bluegill, and bass. The lake is approximately eight miles long with 52 miles of shoreline.

Jimmy Joe claims that he did what anyone else would have done during the oil spill, but his swift actions demonstrated a tremendous amount of excellence and leadership in the midst of a crisis.

On behalf of Arkansans and Americans everywhere, I honor Jimmy Joe Johnson and his entire crew for their heroic actions.

CONGRATULATING DAVID HAFFNER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor Leggett and Platt CEO David Haffner for receiving the 2014 Richard M. Webster Citizen of the Year Award by the Carthage Chamber of Commerce.

Haffner is the CEO and Chairman of the Board of Leggett and Platt, a Carthage-based business with annual global sales of over \$4 billion. Prior to his appointment as Chairman of the Board, Haffner served as Leggett and Platt's president from 2002 until 2013, and its Chief Operating Officer from 1999 to 2006.

Leggett and Platt, Inc. is one of the largest manufacturing companies in the United States and is listed on the S&P 500. Today, it manufactures a diversified line of products ranging from bedding materials, steel wire products, commercial fixturing, and commercial vehicle products. Through David Haffner's leadership, Leggett and Platt continues to expand its global reach with over 18,000 employee-partners and 130 facilities in 17 countries.

Even as Leggett and Platt expands globally, David Haffner and the entire Leggett and Platt team never forget its importance to the Carthage community. I am certainly proud to recognize David Haffner for receiving the 2014 Richard M. Webster Citizen of the Year Award, and I hope the leadership principles practiced by David continue to inspire the Leggett and Platt team and the Carthage community.

TRIBUTE TO JASON GILES

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jason Giles of Nyemaster Goode in Des Moines, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jason in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Giles for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jason on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTRONIC PROVING GROUND

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the sixtieth anniversary of the

founding of the Electronic Proving Ground (EPG), located in my district at Fort Huachuca in Southern Arizona.

The Electronic Proving Ground (EPG) is the Army's C5ISR (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance) developmental tester under the Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC). C5ISR is one of the major components to Cyber Command and is absolutely essential to understanding and controlling the battlefield of the 21st Century.

The mission of EPG is to plan, conduct, and analyze the results of technical tests for C5ISR systems and Electronic Combat (EC)/Electronic Warfare (EW) equipment for the Department of Defense, other federal agencies and private industry.

Southern Arizona is home to an incredible array of national security assets and our community in Southern Arizona does all we can to support our defense industry, military installations and veterans. It is only fitting to mark and celebrate this important event.

Situated within a bowl-like valley enclosed by mountains more than four thousand feet above sea level, the Electronic Proving Ground is an open-air testing range that offers more than nine thousand square miles of land protected and free from outside electromagnetic interference. The terrain and vegetation of EPG is varied, with mountains, desert, and woodlands providing a unique and unparalleled opportunity for testing technology in a multitude of environments. Fort Huachuca also possesses 970 square miles of restricted airspace that is used for airborne Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) and Electronic Warfare systems testing. Combined, these assets help to create the nation's premier testing environment and community.

In 1954, the Army's Chief Signal Officer realized the incredibly unique environment located at Fort Huachuca for electronic and communications equipment testing and since then, EPG has been recognized as one of the best interference free environments in the nation, if not the world.

I am proud to represent the soldiers, civilians, and contractors that support the Electronic Proving Ground. I wish them all the utmost success as they continue to support our warfighter with the best testing capabilities that come from sixty years of experience, intelligence, savvy, and skill. The Army, the Department of Defense, the United States and mankind have benefitted from the work performed at EPG, and we are forever grateful.

TERMINAL VELOCITY

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of the Terminal Velocity team from the Cities of Franklin and Virginia Beach, Virginia. Team members Steve Motley, Steve Poe, Jason Truitt, Donnie Cagle, Bobby Williams, and Elijah Smith have, for an unprecedented fourth consecutive year, won the Operations Challenge competition held annually at the Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference. They competed against 41

other teams in a series of five water utility operations and maintenance events that demonstrate the variety of skills necessary to operate a modern water utility. They are joined today by Team HRSD of the Hampton Roads Sanitation Districts, winners of the competition's Division 2. Team members Kevin Hafner, Jason Hobor, Laura Laxa, and Tim Scott are also talented water quality professionals that provide a vital service to their community. I congratulate Terminal Velocity and Team HRSD for their commitment to high levels of professionalism and their efforts to protect environmental quality and public health.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 7, 2014 I missed two votes due to a family funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 165, the Motion to Recommit and "aye" on rollcall vote 166, the passage of H.R. 1872, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act.

TRIBUTE TO THE BAKERSFIELD
CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL EA-
GLES FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Bakersfield Christian High School Eagles football team, who courageously fought their way to its first California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Division IV State Football Championship Bowl Game this past December.

The Eagles utilized an exceptional team effort to get through their daunting season, finishing out with a record of 12 wins and 3 losses. Over the span of the 2013 season, Bakersfield Christian set an astonishing 37 new school records. But lost in this success was the adversity they faced in the beginning of the season. The Eagles started their regular season off with two tough consecutive losses, one of them being to their biggest rival. After their second loss, Coach Jerald Pierucci sat down with his small senior class and challenged them to provide the leadership the team needed to succeed. This proved to be a critical moment for the team, the figurative fork

in the road that would define their season. The path they chose speaks volumes to the team's character as a whole. In the following games, the seniors truly embodied what it meant to be leaders, and the team rallied together as one unit, going undefeated all the way to the State Championship.

When asked to define his team, Coach Pierucci without hesitation replied with one word: selfless. He elaborated that the team was just as rich in role players as it was in playmakers. There was a solid foundation of players each of whom did their job on every play—contributing to the success of their team. These were young men who personified the mantra of "team first" and never gave up in the face of adversity. Even when behind 20-0 in the Valley Championship game against a heavily-favored undefeated rival on a cold December evening, they kept working together and ultimately prevailed. This winning attitude and fierce determination displayed by the Eagles this season proved they earned the right to represent Southern California in the State Championship game.

I join our community in congratulating the coaches and players for their achievement. The 2013 Bakersfield Christian High School Eagles coaching staff includes: Head Coach Jerald Pierucci, Vince Aguilar, Roger Patterson, Tyler Hough, Mike Rodriguez, Sean Lozano, Rick Sotile, Nathan Munson, Larry Whitbey, Tom McCormack, and Ryan Clanton. The 2013 BCHS Eagles football team includes: Keith Blank, Donald Harris, Brad Western, Josh Jackson, Brandon Jones, Nathan DeJager, Tyler Lozano, Feike DeBoer, Kyle Pickinpaugh, Hayden Kuchta, Brock Duffield, John Fulce, Austin Duffield, Kobe Devries, Zach Balfanz, Matt Smith, Fernando Solis, Jordan Smith, Cameron Reeves, Devin Crabtree, Jonathan Loman, Steven Figures, Cole Wymore, Grant Bouma, Hayden Mazone, Chad Wielenga, John Martineau, Tyler Sweaney, Josh Mantle, West Williams, Brett Schuler, Lane Perey, Haiden Drake, Cole Kashwer, Ben Wind, DeAngelo Bragg, Noah Sheetz, Daniel Negron, Jacob Lanuza, Anthony Rodriguez, Jacob Mullins, Titus Goodman, Jack Chance, Carson Balfanz, Morgan Farmer, Brandt Oliver, Taeber Nylander, and William Crockett. You all have made our community proud! Go Eagles!

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took of-

ice, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,559,603,867,896.49. We've added \$6,932,726,818,983.41 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 1459

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1459, which would create arbitrary new rules to make it more difficult for presidents to protect our national heritage and resources through the Antiquities Act.

The Antiquities Act is a century-old tool that gives the president the ability to set aside already-public land for protection as a National Monument. Nearly every president since 1906, both Republican and Democratic, has used this authority to designate some of our nation's most iconic treasures, from the Grand Canyon to Acadia National Park. In my own Congressional district, President Eisenhower used the Antiquities Act to designate the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, the first step in a process to preserve what is now a thriving national park with a scenic towpath that showcases the rich history and natural beauty of the site.

Antiquities Act designations are good for surrounding communities, preserving natural resources, providing outdoor recreation opportunities, and boosting tourism. Moreover, the Antiquities Act complements, rather than overrides, Congressional action, as Congress retains the ability to declare monuments and manage resources for presidentially-proclaimed monuments.

Today's bill places arbitrary limits on designations and needlessly complicates the process, making it far more difficult to achieve permanent designations of heritage spaces. In the last three years, Congress has failed to create even one new unit of the National Park System. We should not prohibit the president from taking action to conserve public land and protect public resources. I urge a no vote.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2203–S2292

Measures Introduced: Six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2218–2223, and S. Res. 417–419. **Page S2239**

Measures Reported:

S. 1237, to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–146)

H.R. 697, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site. (S. Rept. No. 113–147)

S. 1294, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee. **Pages S2238–39**

Measures Passed:

Freedom of Press and Expression in People's Republic of China: Senate agreed to S. Res. 361, recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People's Republic of China and urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to take meaningful steps to improve freedom of expression as fitting of a responsible international stakeholder, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2286–87**

Reid (for Cardin) Amendment No. 2969, to make a technical correction. **Pages S2286–87**

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 90, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. **Page S2287**

Measures Considered:

Paycheck Fairness Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration to S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex. **Pages S2203–04, S2210–30**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 9, 2014, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders or their designees prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S2287**

Appointments:

Congressional Advisers on Trade Policy and Negotiations: The Chair, in accordance with Public Law 93–618, as amended by Public Law 100–418, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, appointed the following Members of the Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations to International conferences, meetings and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements: Senators Wyden, Rockefeller, Schumer, Hatch, and Grassley. **Page S2287**

Friedland Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S2230**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, April 10, 2014. **Page S2230**

Weil Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor. **Page S2230**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S2230**

Felton Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader,

in consultation with the Republican Leader, this week, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; that there be one hour for debate, with 15 minutes under the control of the Democratic Leader, or his designee, and 45 minutes under the control of the Republican Leader, or his designee; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S2230**

McSweeny Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, on Wednesday, April 9, 2014, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner; that there be two minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; that no further motions be in order. **Page S2230**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 71 yeas to 28 nays (Vote No. EX. 102), Neil Gregory Kornze, of Nevada, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management. **Pages S2223, S2292**

Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security. **Pages S2223, S2292**

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general. **Pages S2286, S2292**

Messages from the House: **Page S2233**

Measures Referred: **Page S2233**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S2203, S2233**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2233, S2287**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2233–35**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2235–38**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2239**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2240–41**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2241–42**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2232–33**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2242–85**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2286**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2286**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—102) **Page S2223**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:49 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 9, 2014. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2287.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1294, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee; and

The nominations of Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be Chairman, Sharon Y. Bowen, of New York, and J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, all to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ADVANCED BIOFUELS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advanced biofuels, focusing on creating jobs and lower prices at the pump, after receiving testimony from Richard Childress, Richard Childress Racing, Welcome, North Carolina; Jan Koninckx, DuPont Industrial Biosciences, Wilmington, Delaware; Brooke Coleman, Advanced Ethanol Council, Boston, Massachusetts; Sumesh M. Arora, Innovate Mississippi, Ridgeland; and Nancy N. Young, Airlines for America, Washington, DC.

APPROPRIATIONS: UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the United States Agency for International Development, after receiving testimony from Rajiv Shah, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, AND THE OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the Open World Leadership Center, after receiving testimony from Stephen T. Ayers, Architect of

the Capitol; and James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress, and John M. O'Keefe, Executive Director, Open World Leadership Center, both of the Library of Congress.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Army Active and Reserve force mix in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Raymond T. Odierno, USA, Chief of Staff of the Army, General Frank J. Grass, ARNG, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Lieutenant General Jeffrey W. Talley, USAR, Chief of the Army Reserve and Commanding General of the United States Army Reserve Command, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Brian P. McKeon, of New York, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, and 131 nominations in the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded a hearing to examine the role of the Department of Defense science and technology enterprise for innovation and affordability in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Alan R. Shaffer, Acting Assistant Secretary for Research and Engineering, Arati Prabhakar, Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Mary J. Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Technology, Mary E. Lacey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, and Kevin Gooder, Chief, Program Integration Division, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Science, Technology, and Engineering), all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine tactical aircraft programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Christopher C. Bogdan, USAF, Program Executive Officer, F-35 Lightning II Joint Program Office, Lieutenant General Charles R.

Davis, USAF, Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Vice Admiral Paul A. Grosklags, USN, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Lieutenant General Robert E. Schmidle, Jr., USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation, all of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Warren, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

TAX CODE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine supporting broad-based economic growth and fiscal responsibility through a fairer tax code, after receiving testimony from Jane G. Gravelle, Senior Specialist in Economic Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and John L. Buckley, former Chief Tax Counsel, House Committee on Ways and Means, and Diana Furchtgott-Roth, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, both of Washington, DC.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Vice Admiral Paul F. Zukunft, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, who was introduced by Senator Landrieu, and Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be Chairman, who was introduced by Representative Tierney, and Joseph P. Mohorovic, of Illinois, who was introduced by Senator Udall (NM), both to be a Commissioner, both of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Janet Garvin McCabe, of the District of Columbia, and Ann Elizabeth Dunkin, of California, both to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Manuel H. Ehrlich, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PROTECTING TAXPAYERS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting taxpayers from incompetent and unethical return preparers, after receiving testimony from John A. Koskinen, Commissioner, and Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate, both of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury; James R. McTigue, Jr., Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; William C. Cobb, H&R Block, Kansas City, Missouri; Janis Salisbury, Oregon Board of Tax Practitioners, Oregon City; John A. Barrick, Jr., Brigham Young University Marriott School of Management, Provo, Utah; Chi Chi Wu, National Consumer Law Center,

Boston, Massachusetts; and Dan Alban, Institute for Justice, Arlington, Virginia.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed international affairs budget request for fiscal year 2015 for national security and foreign policy priorities, after receiving testimony from John F. Kerry, Secretary of State.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 4419–4430; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 546–549 were introduced. **Pages H3056–58**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H3058**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Woodall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2993**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:58 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2999**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 546, electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H3001**

Baseline Reform Act: The House passed H.R. 1871, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline, by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 168. **Pages H3014–21**

Rejected the Bustos motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 191 yeas to 221 nays, Roll No. 167. **Pages H3019–21**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H3014–15**

H. Res. 539, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1874), (H.R. 1871), and (H.R. 1872), was agreed to on Friday, April 4th.

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024: The House began consideration of H. Con. Res. 96, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024. Consideration of the concurrent resolution is expected to resume tomorrow, April 9th. **Pages H3001–14, H3021–39**

H. Res. 544, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 222 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 170, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 169. **Pages H3022–23**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on page H3001.

Senate Referral: S. 2195 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page H3054**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3020–21, H3021, H3022, and H3022–23. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing for American Indian and Alaska Native public and outside witnesses. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—NASA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on NASA Request and Oversight of NASA Security. Testimony was heard from Charles F. Bolden Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FIELD AGENCIES FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Agriculture Field Agencies FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Michael Scuse, Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agriculture Services; Juan Garcia, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Phil Karsting, Administrator, Foreign Agriculture Service; Brandon Willis, Administrator, Risk Management Agency; Jason Weller, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service; and Michael Young, Budget Officer, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—UNITED STATES AFRICA COMMAND FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on United States Africa Command FY 2015 Budget. This was a closed hearing.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Energy, Environmental Management FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Dave Huizenga, Acting Assistant Secretary, Environmental Management, Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Education

FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Arne Duncan, Secretary, Department of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS—UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing on United States Agency for International Development FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Rajiv Shah, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—UNITED STATES SPECIAL FORCES COMMAND FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on United States Special Forces Command FY 2015 Budget. This was a closed hearing.

APPROPRIATIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on General Services Administration FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Dan Tangherlini, Administrator, General Services Administration.

RUSSIAN MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS AND STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Russian Military Developments and Strategic Implications”. Testimony was heard from Derek Chollet, Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Vice Admiral Frank Pandolfe, USN, Director for Strategic Plans and Policy, Joint Staff, Department of Defense.

THE FY15 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY AND THE CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM: COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION IN A CHANGING GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled “The FY15 Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the Chemical Biological Defense Program: Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Changing Global Environment”. Testimony was heard from Rebecca K. C. Hersman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, Department of Defense; Kenneth Myers, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency; Carmen Spencer, Joint

Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense, Department of Defense; and Andy Weber, Assistant Secretary for Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Department of Defense.

RUSSIAN MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS AND STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “Russian Military Developments and Strategic Implications”. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Terry Joseph Benedict, U.S. Navy, Director, Strategic Systems Programs; M. Elaine Bunn, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy, Department of Defense; Major General Garrett Harencak, U.S. Air Force, Assistant Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration, U.S. Air Force; Edward Bruce Held, Acting Administrator and Acting Undersecretary for Nuclear Security, National Nuclear Security Administration; David G. Huizenga, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Environmental Management; Admiral John M. Richardson, U.S. Navy, Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program; Andrew C. Weber, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Department of Defense; and Peter S. Winokur, Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4366, the “Strengthening Education through Research Act”; and H.R. 10, the “Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act”. The bills, H.R. 4366 and H.R. 10, were ordered reported, as amended.

TROLLING FOR A SOLUTION: ENDING ABUSIVE PATENT DEMAND LETTERS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Trolling for a Solution: Ending Abusive Patent Demand Letters”. Testimony was heard from William Sorrell, Attorney General, State of Vermont; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Examining the Implementation of the Tobacco Control Act”. Testimony was heard from Marcia Crosse, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power began a markup on H.R. 6, the “Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act”.

WHO’S IN YOUR WALLET: EXAMINING HOW WASHINGTON RED TAPE IMPAIRS ECONOMIC FREEDOM

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Who’s in Your Wallet: Examining How Washington Red Tape Impairs Economic Freedom”. Testimony was heard from Meredith Fuchs, General Counsel, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; Richard J. Osterman, Jr., Acting General Counsel, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Scott G. Alvarez, General Counsel, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Amy S. Friend, Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and a public witness.

LEBANON’S SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. INTERESTS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled “Lebanon’s Security Challenges and U.S. Interests”. Testimony was heard from Lawrence Silverman, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State; and Matthew Spence, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Middle East Policy, Department of Defense.

IS AL-QAEDA WINNING? GRADING THE ADMINISTRATION’S COUNTERTERRORISM POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Is al-Qaeda Winning? Grading the Administration’s Counterterrorism Policy”. Testimony was heard from Joseph Lieberman, former United States Senator; and Jane Harman, former Member of Congress; and public witnesses.

AUTHORIZING CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AND IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled “Authorizing Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement”. Testimony was heard from Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Daniel D. Ragsdale, Acting Director, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

OVERSIGHT OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice”. Testimony was heard from Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General, Department of Justice.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 4315, the “21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act”; H.R. 4316, the “Endangered Species Recovery Transparency Act”; H.R. 4317, the “State, Tribal, and Local Species Transparency and Recovery Act”; and H.R. 4318, the “Endangered Species Litigation Reasonableness Act”. Testimony was heard from Michael Bean, Counselor to the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of Interior; Sam Rauch, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce; Kel Seliger, State Senator, Amarillo, TX; Tom Jankovsky, Commissioner, Garfield County Colorado; and public witnesses.

AMERICAN ENERGY JOBS: OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “American Energy Jobs: Opportunities for Women and Minorities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 187, to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit L06, Topsail, North Carolina; H.R. 277, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Sachuest Point Unit RI-04P, Easton Beach Unit RI-05P, Almy Pond Unit RI-06, and Hazards Beach Unit RI-07 in Rhode Island; H.R. 1810, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit in Florida; H.R. 1811, to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System areas included in Florida System Unit P-16, and for other purposes; H.R. 2057, to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System the areas comprising Bay County Unit P-31P in Florida; H.R. 3226, to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in South Carolina; H.R. 3227, to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain

properties in South Carolina; H.R. 3572, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina; and H.R. 4222, to correct the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System in Gulf County Florida, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Jones; McIntyre; and Rice (SC); and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Ecological Services, Fish and Wildlife Service; Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Former Member of Congress; Daniel Tuman, Mayor, Town of North Topsail Beach; Warren Yeager, Jr., Gulf County Commissioner, Florida; Terrell Arline, County Attorney, Bay County, Florida; and public witnesses.

THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Proposal for the Postal Service”. Testimony was heard from Brian Deese, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget.

REDUCING WASTE IN GOVERNMENT: ADDRESSING GAO’S 2014 REPORT ON DUPLICATIVE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Reducing Waste in Government: Addressing GAO’s 2014 Report on Duplicative Federal Programs”. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE WITH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Panel on Public-Private Partnerships held a hearing entitled “The International Experience with Public-Private Partnerships”. Testimony was heard from Representative Delaney; and public witnesses.

BENEFITS OF PERMANENT TAX POLICY FOR AMERICA’S JOB CREATORS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing on the Benefits of Permanent Tax Policy for America’s Job Creators. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT’S FINAL EMPLOYER MANDATE AND EMPLOYER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGULATIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Treasury Department’s Final Employer Mandate and Employer Reporting Requirements Regulations”. Testimony was

heard from J. Mark Iwry, Senior Advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Retirement and Health Policy, Department of Treasury.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D380)

H.R. 4275, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans. Signed on April 7, 2014. (Public Law 113–97)

S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals. Signed on April 7, 2014. (Public Law 113–98)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:15 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine an assessment on how to keep our railways safe for passengers and communities, 9:45 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine defense health programs, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland, to hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:15 a.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, 10 a.m., SR–222.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine National Nuclear Security Administration management of its National Security Laboratories and the status of the Nuclear Security Enterprise in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine from here to Mars, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 429, to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products, S. 1014, to reduce sports-related concussions in youth, S. 1406, to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, S. 1275, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program, S. 1379, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens, S. 1468, to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation, S. 1793, to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, S. 1925, to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders, S. 2022, to establish scientific standards and protocols across forensic disciplines, S. 2028, to amend the law relating to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, S. 2030, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, S. 2076, to amend the provisions of title 46, United States Code, related to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, S. 2086, to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future, S. 2140, to improve the transition between experimental permits and commercial licenses for commercial reusable launch vehicles, H.R. 2052, to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment, the nomination of David J. Arroyo, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and nominations for promotion in the United States Coast Guard, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, to hold hearings to examine addressing primary care access and workforce challenges, focusing on voices from the field, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian education, focusing on Indian students in public schools, and cultivating the next generation, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the Comcast-Time Warner Cable merger and the impact on consumers, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings to examine election administration, focusing on making voter rolls more complete and more accurate, 10 a.m., SR-301.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 1728, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, S. 1937, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to develop contingency plans to address unexpected emergencies or natural disasters that may threaten to disrupt the administration of an election for Federal office, S. 1947, to rename the Government Printing Office the Government Publishing Office, S. 2197, to repeal certain requirements regarding newspaper advertising of Senate stationery contracts, and the nominations of Thomas Hicks, of Virginia, and Myrna Perez, of Texas, both to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission, 10:30 a.m., SR-301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015 for the Small Business Administration, 11 a.m., SR-428A.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4413, the "Customer Protection and End User Relief Act", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Commerce, FY 2015 Budget, 2 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on Office of Management and Budget FY 2015 Budget, 2 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Bill, FY 2015; and Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2015; and Report on the Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2015, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "National Defense Priorities from Members for the FY 2015 National Defense Authorization Act", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled "Beneficiary and Advocacy Overview of the FY15 President's Budget", 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4320, the "Workforce Democ-

ocracy and Fairness Act"; and H.R. 4321, the "Employee Privacy Protection Act", 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, continued markup on H.R. 6, the "Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, markup on H.R. 4342, the "Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters (DOTCOM) Act of 2014", 4 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Legislative Proposals to Enhance Capital Formation for Small and Emerging Growth Companies", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "U.S. Foreign Assistance in FY 2015: What Are the Priorities, How Effective?", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled "Advancing U.S. Interests in the Western Hemisphere: The FY 2015 Foreign Affairs Budget", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled "U.S. Policy Towards Morocco", 3 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Boston Marathon Bombings, One Year On: A Look Back to Look Forward", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on the following legislation: H.R. 503, the "National Desert Storm and Desert Shield War Memorial Act"; H.R. 836, the "Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum Act of 2013"; H.R. 2208, the "North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act of 2013"; H.R. 2430, the "Hincliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013"; H.R. 3802, to extend the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes; H.R. 4002, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; H.R. 4017, to designate a peak located in Nevada as "Mount Reagan"; H.R. 4120, to amend the National Law Enforcement Museum Act to extend the termination date; H.R. 4253, the "Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Efficiency and Savings Act"; and H.R. 4309, to amend the Sikes Act to make certain improvements to the administration of cooperative agreements for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled "Examining Ways the Social Security Administration Can Improve the Disability Review Process", 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space, markup on H.R. 4412, the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2014", 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “Prizes to Spur Innovation and Technology Breakthroughs”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Biggest Tax Problems for Small Businesses”, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 524, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency does not have the authority to disapprove a permit after it has been issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 404 of such Act; and H.R. 4156, the “Transparent Airfares Act of 2014”, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Continued Assessment of Delays in VA Medical Care and Preventable Veteran Deaths”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on referral to Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General, of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois G. Lerner for possible criminal prosecution for violations of one or more criminal statutes based on evidence the Committee has uncovered in the course of the investigation of IRS abuses, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “Trade Implications of U.S. Energy Policy and the Export of Liquefied Natural Gas”, 1:15 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine Ukraine, focusing on confronting internal challenges and external threats, including Russia’s seizure of Crimea, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 9

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2199, Paycheck Fairness Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 11 a.m.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Continue consideration of H. Con. Res. 96—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bachmann, Michele, Minn., E546
 Barber, Ron, Ariz., E551
 Barr, Andy, Ky., E548, E550
 Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E550
 Black, Diane, Tenn., E543
 Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E543, E544
 Carter, John R., Tex., E549
 Castor, Kathy, Fla., E544
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E552
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E548

Davis, Danny K., Ill., E549
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E545
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E550
 Griffin, Tim, Ark., E551, E552
 Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E545
 Larson, John B., Conn., E549
 Latham, Tom, Iowa, E543, E544, E545, E546, E548,
 E549, E550, E551
 Long, Billy, Mo., E549, E551
 McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E548
 McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E552
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E544

Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E543
 Moran, James P., Va., E546
 Rigell, E. Scott, Va., E551
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E547
 Ross, Dennis A., Fla., E550
 Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E545
 Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E543
 Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E552
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E543
 Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E546



Congressional Record

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.