



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2014

No. 25

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA 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.

WHAT IS MORE DANGEROUS, MARIJUANA OR METHAMPHETAMINES?

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week, during a hearing with the Deputy Director of the Office of Drug Policy, there was a moment of clarity for me. I was struck by the realization that our own office, charged with drug policy, discouraging or eliminating drug use, might well be part of the problem.

The poor witness was unable to answer my simple question, What is more dangerous, marijuana or methamphetamines? I asked, How many marijuana overdose deaths were there last year? No clear answer.

The United States does have a drug problem—make no mistake—and it appears to be getting worse: 100 people per day die of drug overdoses. About 9 of them are from heroin; 60 percent of the deaths are from prescription drugs; pharmaceuticals, over 22,000 in 2010, the most recent year we have available, almost three times higher than in 1999.

Why is the \$25 billion we spend fighting drugs each year so ineffective in stopping, much less reversing, the trend? Are our policies and programs misguided? Could it be that too many of the wrong people are spending far too long in jail, wasting lives and money? The States seem to think so. They are reducing sentences and releasing prisoners. Now even the Federal Government is starting to do that as well.

I think part of the problem is that we aren't honest about the impacts and dangers. Nothing better illustrates that than the continued misclassification of marijuana under Federal law as worse than cocaine and methamphetamines. That's according to Federal law.

Is it possible that this Federal dishonesty means that people don't take drug warnings seriously? No one knows anybody who ever died from a marijuana overdose. The failed marijuana prohibition could actually make the real drug problem worse.

Since all marijuana sales are, by definition, illegal, in the shadows, the money, the income, the profits help finance a drug trade that destroys life, like heroin, cocaine, illegal prescription drugs, and methamphetamines.

How easy is it for the distributor, who has no license to lose, who never

checks ID, to offer his marijuana customer something else, something worse, something more dangerous?

I fear spreading misinformation and wasting resources, arresting two-thirds of a million people for something that most Americans now think should be legal, undermines what could be an effective approach. Think for a moment. Unlike marijuana, tobacco is a highly addictive killer—over four hundred thousand people a year die from it yet tobacco use has declined almost two-thirds in the last half century. How did that happen?

We don't arrest people who smoke. We didn't try tobacco prohibition. What we did was research. We found out the facts. We told the truth. We controlled the product. We taxed it heavily, raising the cost, especially to young people—all the steps exactly the opposite of our failed marijuana approach.

I will be clear. For me, this goes beyond issues of marijuana policy. It is a symbol of a political process that is not thoughtful, not rational on dealing with things from the national debt, to our failing infrastructure, to climate change. Isn't it time for us to face some facts, adjust some policies, and move ahead?

CELEBRATING THE WORLD WAR II WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, we had beautiful skies in Miami. It was a perfect day for flying. I was given the opportunity to visit the Wings Over Miami Air Museum to revel in the history of aviation with veterans, fliers, and the families of World War II Women Airforce Service Pilots celebrating the life of one special WASP, Fran Sargent.

□ 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.

H1721

We came to honor these American heroines, the first women in history to fly America's military aircraft. They flew over 60 million miles in every type of aircraft on every type of mission, except combat missions.

The WASPs served our country without hesitation and no expectations of recognition or praise. Yet, as our 23rd President, Benjamin Harrison, once noted:

The manner by which women are treated is a good criterion to judge the true state of a society.

These courageous women had never received the full recognition they warranted for their wartime military service to America. It was my honor then, as the most senior Republican woman in the House of Representatives, to introduce the bipartisan legislation to honor and award the Women Airforce Service Pilots of World War II with the Congressional Gold Medal. The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest honor that this body, the United States Congress, can bestow. Coincidentally, the bill with me was Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS of California and Senators Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland. I was so honored to be part of this effort to finally grant these women the recognition they deserved.

It was right there at the Wings Over Miami Air Museum in August of 2009 that I was able to present to our local WASP framed, signed copies of the legislation for the Women Airforce Service Pilots' Congressional Gold Medal; and in March of 2010, the presentation ceremony of the Congressional Gold Medal was held in Emancipation Hall, in our Nation's Capital, with over 100 WASPs in attendance.

South Florida is very fortunate to herald several Women Airforce Service Pilots in our midst. Air Force Major Ruth Shafer Fleisher is now retired. Bee Haydu is active and says "hello" to her fellow WASPs. Shirley Chase Kruse was there with us on Saturday and shared her vivid memories, while Jeremy Snapp and family represented his mother, whom we recently lost, Helen Wyatt Snapp. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we gathered for a celebration of life and a memorial for Frances Rohrer Sargent, who was well represented by her daughter, Donna—and Terry and Jim—Timmons, and Fran's son, Kenny Sargent, with many grand- and great-grandchildren honoring their WASP.

My thanks to aviatrix Ursula Davidson and all of the women pilots flying with the Ninety-Nines for honoring these women of aviation and to the Civil Air Patrol and the crew at Wings Over Miami for making the day possible. We know you loved Fran as your director emeritus and as a great teacher of flight.

How special are they, these women pioneers of flight? While 25,000 volunteered, only 1,830 qualified women pilots were accepted, and then only 1,102 women earned the wings of WASP. The

WASP are all true pioneers whose examples paved the way for the armed services to finally lift the ban on women attending military flight training in the 1970s. While flying their P-14s and AT-4s in training in Sweetwater, Texas, the WASP never sought to break the barriers for women, but through their service and their success, more opportunities became available for women in all fields.

Fran became a professor at my alma mater, Miami Dade College, where she took charge of developing the aviation program. One of her students, 73-year-old Judy Portnoy, called Professor Sargent "the most amazing person I know."

Mr. Speaker, today, women in military fly every type of aircraft, from the F-15s to the space shuttle. My daughter-in-law, Lindsay Nelson, a Marine Corps pilot, is part of this lasting legacy of WASP. Lindsay, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, served combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan where she flew F/A-18 fighter jets. I am so proud of Lindsay and of all of our servicewomen, past and present, who continue to inspire young women to achieve what was, heretofore, unimaginable. So, on behalf of Lindsay, my congressional colleagues and a grateful Nation, I offer my sincere thanks and utmost admiration to our WASP.

Climbing high into the Sun, Helen, Ruth, Bee, Shirley, and Fran, thank you all, women pioneers.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, all things are subject to interpretation, but as Nietzsche once said:

Whichever interpretation prevails at a given time is often more a function of power and not truth.

Last week, the Congressional Budget Office came out with a report evaluating the economic impacts of the Affordable Care Act. Since then, there are those who have used the power they have to frame a false narrative. Rather than talking about what the report actually says, they have spent the last week talking about what they would like it to say. Their false interpretation of the ObamaCare act is that it will cost the American economy 2.5 million jobs; but the truth is that the much-misrepresented CBO study didn't say that at all because, as The Wall Street Journal accurately reported, reducing the total number of hours Americans have to work is very different than eliminating jobs.

One of the reasons we passed the Affordable Care Act in the first place was to fix the pitfalls of this country's employer-based health care system. Before the ACA, people with preexisting conditions were often forced to stay in their jobs to avoid losing their health care coverage. Even if they wanted to

leave their jobs to reduce their hours, retire early, change careers, or to spend more time with their families, they couldn't because doing so would risk their ability to provide affordable health insurance for their families.

□ 1015

What the Affordable Care Act did was right this wrong. By broadening access to health insurance, the ACA has increased personal freedom and market choice. Now Americans can choose jobs based on what they want to be doing instead of staying where they are unhappy just to keep their insurance.

The expansion of Medicaid eligibility and the subsidies available in the exchanges will give Americans the flexibility they need to raise their families, not encourage workers to seek less employment, which was one of the most misleading claims made after the report was released.

The idea that hardworking Americans will modify their employment just to be eligible for social safety net programs is both ludicrous and offensive. Nobody wants to live in a situation that makes you eligible for Medicaid or other social safety net programs, but too many hardworking Americans are forced to.

In Illinois, a family of four must exist on less than \$32,500 per year to qualify for these programs. In the Chicago area, the cost of living is high and families struggle to make ends meet.

Measures like Medicaid and SNAP are meant to help people lift themselves from poverty. Claiming that poor people want to be poor to rely more on the government is misguided and just flat out wrong.

I have said from the beginning that the ACA is far from perfect and that we should work together to improve it, but arguing that at-risk and low-income Americans will actively choose to work less, reducing their own incomes and jeopardizing their family's economic future just to "game the system," is not a legitimate issue and speaks volumes about the extreme views that are dividing our government and preventing real reform from occurring.

By focusing on false interpretations, we are forgetting the economic benefits contained in the law. To quote the CBO report:

If some people seek to work less, other applicants will be readily available to fill those positions and the overall effect on employment will be muted.

At a time when long-term employment is at its highest since World War II, there are more than enough workers willing and able to take these jobs. That is why the director of the CBO recently testified about the likelihood of the ACA creating jobs, not eliminating them.

The report also acknowledged that insurance premiums under the law are 15 percent lower than originally forecast, that "the slowdown in Medicare cost growth" is "broad and persistent,"

and that enrollments will increase over time to where they would have been if not for the Web site's issues.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, millions of Americans can now access affordable health insurance. With a focus on personal responsibility, preventive care, consumer protections, and increased choices, the Affordable Care Act has helped empower Americans to lead healthier lives.

Let's put aside the punditry and focus on the facts.

GOOGLE GLASS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story about Patrick Jackson.

Patrick is a firefighter from North Carolina who is using new technologies and his programming skills in his mission to save lives. Patrick is using Google Glass, along with the Android and iPhone apps he has developed, to support firefighters on the job. The apps he has created encourage and increase communication between firefighters and emergency responders to accelerate the process of saving victims and putting out fires as quickly as possible.

Although Google Glass is not yet on the market, except for Google's Explorer's program, it has generated a lot of buzz in the tech community. With Glass, people can send and view messages and emails, videos and pictures, and surf the net without using their hands. They can also ask the device for information or get directions without using their hands.

Patrick's Glass app would help firefighters locate incidents and hydrants, and give them hands-free building layouts and the ability to record video from the first responders on the scene. Some departments that have expressed interest in this technology want to take it a step further, such as linking the app to a thermal imaging camera and oxygen masks to increase a firefighter's ability to see in smoke. Although it is still in its preliminary stage of development, technologies like Patrick's could potentially help firefighters and other emergency response teams do their jobs and save lives.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick's idea is a perfect example of how technology betters our lives and can, ultimately, save lives. Innovation leads to job creation. We need to encourage more innovators like Patrick to keep America on top as the world's leader in innovation.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning, I tweeted out a message to the 30,000 people who follow me on Twitter. The tweet said:

The GOP doesn't determine when the fight for immigration reform ends. We will continue to fight for a bill in 2014 because that is what is right, what is fair, and what is best for the USA.

I sent this because many in the pro-immigration reform community thought they heard Speaker JOHN BOEHNER giving up on immigration reform in 2014. That is not what I heard, but many in the community and in the press heard it that way.

I wanted to make it clear that the immigrant community and the huge movement behind immigration reform—business, clergy, and everyone else—are just not going away. We are not taking "wait," "maybe," and "no" for an answer.

By now, every time Speaker BOEHNER says anything about immigration reform, the press and the pundits go crazy. Even if it isn't clear what exactly the Speaker said, a good percentage of the press runs out and writes obituary number 247 for immigration reform.

What I heard the Speaker say last week was that getting immigration reform passed in the House would be hard.

Tell me about it.

I also heard the Speaker say at his news conference that the House "needs" to get immigration reform done this year, and he is right.

Then I heard the Speaker say that the GOP doesn't trust the President of the United States. Really? Despite 2 million deportations and the lowest rate of illegal immigration in recent decades, the House GOP doesn't believe President Barack Obama will enforce immigration laws.

Well, I have been working on this for a while, and, first of all, you are right. It is hard. For more than a decade, I had to work on my own party to get them behind substantial immigration reform, but the Democrats are ready now—and ready to help you, Mr. Speaker, pass a bill. The movement will help supporters of immigration reform in the House GOP Conference work to convince their members that moving forward to actual legislation is not only the right thing to do from a justice perspective, from a law and order perspective, and from an economic perspective, but the right thing to do from a political perspective.

Mr. Speaker, when you said the House needs to pass a bill, boy, are you right.

Nobody believes the Republican Party can elect anyone for President unless you find some way to neutralize the damage you have done to yourselves with your deportation-only approach to immigration. The immigration issue doesn't just hurt you with Latino voters. It has hurt you with Asian and younger voters, too.

There is simply no math that adds up to 270 electoral votes unless the Republican Party stops getting slaughtered by 30, 40, or 50 points among the largest-, fastest-growing groups of voters

in this country. It gets only worse with each passing day, with another 2,000 Latino citizens turning 18 every day and becoming eligible to vote.

Speaker BOEHNER knows this is the best chance his party has of getting the immigration issue off the table before 2016, and I believe he plans to come back to immigration reform. The cost to the GOP politically is just too high if the GOP-controlled House blocks legislation this year.

You thought the Super Bowl was a blowout last month? Wait until November 2016 if immigration reform is still hanging out there undone. You can tell the babysitter you will be home by 10:30 on election night. The contest will be over early. It will be Democrats in the White House by a landslide.

This notion, Mr. Speaker, that President Obama cannot be trusted to enforce immigration laws just doesn't make any sense to anyone who follows the issue. Every day, day after day, week after week, and year after year, people are being "disappeared" by our immigration enforcement machine. Another 1,100 today—and tomorrow.

Where is the generosity of spirit in that? This lax, liberal, soft-heartedness you seem to imagine, I wish you could tell that to the estimated 5,000 children currently in foster care because their parents are in detention or have already been deported. Tell them how soft Obama is.

I am going out to suburban Washington this evening to talk with immigrants and advocates at Casa de Maryland. I don't expect I will hear very much praise for President Obama's enlightened approach to deportation and detention tonight.

They are not waiting patiently for Speaker BOEHNER or anyone in the Republican Conference to make up their minds about whether or when to start legislating on this matter. I know they are not taking "maybe" or "not now" or "no" for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, you are not going to be spared. Kids will keep showing up to interrupt your breakfast as long as their parents are facing deportation and their communities are being ripped apart.

Mr. Speaker, you can't deport your way out of this. You can't ignore your way out of this. You can't blame Obama for your way out of this. You must act for the good of the country.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the House floor today to share with my colleagues several recent headlines from our national papers.

From The Washington Post on January 30:

After billions in U.S. investment, Afghanistan roads are falling apart.

This article goes on to describe the Afghan road network, built with U.S. tax dollars, as a “\$4 billion project that was once a symbol of promise in post-Taliban Afghanistan but is now falling apart.”

Another headline from January 30 from *The New York Times*:

U.S. aid to Afghanistan flows on despite warnings of misuse.

This report informs us that two global firms hired by the United States 3 years ago have found that none of the 16 Afghan ministries can be counted on to keep American aid from being stolen or wasted.

Most recently, this week Reuters published an article titled, “U.S. aid plan seeks to shield Afghanistan from end to war economy,” which details a new initiative from the U.S. Agency for International Development that would spend almost \$300 million to prop up the Afghan economy.

Mr. Speaker, the common factor in these articles is that each describes in alarming detail the absolute waste of American tax dollars overseas. How can we in good conscience tell the American people we are going to continue to send their money to Afghanistan for 10 more years under the Bilateral Strategic Agreement that the United States is currently negotiating with President Karzai?

I hope President Karzai will not sign the agreement. It would be the best thing to happen to the American taxpayer.

Ironically, today or tomorrow we are going to raise the debt ceiling. This is after already raising it by \$230 billion in October of 2013, with \$30 billion reserved for Afghanistan. This is not right or fair to the American people.

We need to stop the insanity in Afghanistan, which could be done if the leaders of the House and Senate would allow Members of both parties to bring bills related to this issue to the floor for a vote.

In addition to the money we are spending, how many more American lives must be lost overseas before Congress decides to act? We cannot continue to waste American money and precious lives in this manner. It is time to end the abuse of the American resources in Afghanistan.

With that, I will ask God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and ask God to please continue to bless America.

EXPRESSING MY APPRECIATION

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in appreciation.

Next week, I am leaving the Congress to pursue the chance to build a career in the private sector. I wanted to take a few minutes this morning to offer appreciation and thanksgiving for a lot of people who have helped make this wonderful experience possible.

I start with, as in all things in my life, my wife, Camille, and my daughters, Jacquelyn and Josie, without whom nothing good would be possible and through whom all good things are.

□ 1030

I look forward to many, many more happy years, God willing, with them and thank them for their support and sacrifice.

I thank my staff. Over all of these years, these men and women are overworked, underpaid, and underappreciated, sometimes by their employer. These are true public servants. They are inspirations, and I assure you that I have learned much more from them than I have taught to them.

I want to single out, in particular, in the present staff, our chief of staff, Fran Tagmire; our general counsel, Amanda Caruso; and our legislative director, J.Z. Golden, for their excellence, and for many, many others over many, many years.

I want to thank my colleagues. I thank Speaker BOEHNER for his friendship and leadership.

I especially thank the first woman Speaker of the House of Representatives—in my view the best Speaker of the House of Representatives—NANCY PELOSI, who has taught me strength and principle and doggedness and focus, and whose inspiration will guide me, my daughters, and others’ sons and daughters for many years to come. I thank her profoundly for her influence and service.

I thank all of my colleagues. I want to come back to that in a minute.

I most especially thank the people of the First Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, who have been the best employer one could possibly have for these last 24 years. And, yes, I would include the people who stop us in the supermarket and complain about a vote that we have cast or wonder why we haven’t solved a problem. There are a few of them.

There are many, many more whose words of encouragement have lifted us up for all these years, and I assure you that we appreciate you, and we are staying in our community and looking forward to new ways that we can serve our friends and our neighbors.

I especially, though, do want to come back to the men and women with whom I have had the privilege of serving for all these years. We have done a lot of things that are good together. Some of us have not always agreed on what is good together, but we passed the Affordable Care Act, which I believe will withstand the test of time and will stand together with Medicare and Social Security as pillars of middle class prosperity and American opportunity.

We have opened the door for college students with the direct student loan program that has helped many, many millions of students get an education.

We have improved our environment. In our district at home, there are con-

struction workers building transportation projects today because of our work. There are police and firefighters and teachers on the job because of our cooperation.

There are two veterans health clinics. We can simply not say thank you with our words to our veterans, but by our deeds. And I must say this morning that I especially remember young men and women on duty around the world serving our country, and I express my deepest appreciation to them.

But to my colleagues, I would say this, that I have had 150,000 constituents over the years come to our office with various issues and problems, and they are certainly an inspiration. But so, too, ladies and gentlemen, are you, my colleagues.

The House is a rambunctious and energetic place. I suspect we will see some of that rambunctiousness even later today. We have seen a little bit this morning. People should not confuse debate with division. Healthy, passionate debate is the elixir of American democracy. It is the fuel that makes the country better. And for those who look at the House and say, well, all they ever do is argue with each other, I would certainly hope so. I would certainly hope we would bring to this Chamber deeply held beliefs, deeply held convictions, and express them in the course of debate.

Of course, there is time for compromise, and there is always a season to get the job done; but may this place never lose the strong convictions of people, right and left, Republican and Democrat, north, south, east, and west, because that is what makes democracy go.

I would also say this, that we, in this Chamber, should never confuse a difference of opinion with a difference of intention. I have served here for nearly 24 years, and I can safely say I have never met a fellow Member who does not love this country, who was not here for the purpose of improving this country as he or she sees that improvement. I have certainly disagreed with the definition of “improvement,” but I have never questioned the motivation or motive of any of the men and women with whom I have had the privilege of serving.

So my admonition would be: Keep the energy flowing. Those who misunderstand debate, let them misunderstand it. Keep the passionate beliefs that occupy this place going. And when we do, I believe with great confidence that the institution will continue to lead the way to a country that is more prosperous, more safe, more free, and more generous than any nation in the history of the face of the Earth.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve. I thank each of you who has given me this privilege.

RUSSIAN OCCUPATION OF THE COUNTRY OF GEORGIA

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as ROB departs the Chamber, let me thank him for his service and for his family's service. As, obviously, the first Republican Member to be able to respond to your comments, let me say what most of us always know, that although many of us disagree on public policy, no one has ever questioned your commitment, your sacrifice, your focus, and your tenacity, and I think I value that more than almost anything we do.

Your words are very important for us and for the American people to understand that spirited debate is not bad. It is a part of this process. As a former high school teacher in government history, we would relish this in our classrooms, to have this type of exchange between our students. So thank you for that, and I am just fortunate to be here when you made your comments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus and turn my comments to Sochi, Russia. As the world focuses on that area of the world, let me talk about what is going on on the southern side of the Caucasus mountain range.

In the country of Georgia, a small country, people have to understand that the Russian Federation occupies two provinces of the country of Georgia, actually, with military troops: one for a long time, South Ossetia, one relatively recently in Abkhazia.

That kind of changes the understanding of this great show that the Russian Federation is putting on with the treatment of their neighbors in occupying provinces. That would be like a country occupying one or two of our States and occupying one or two of the provinces in Georgia.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important to just remind the public of this, especially when the world's focus is there. And I want to specifically talk about what has happened with the Olympics and the Abkhazia region, using Olympic security as an excuse.

Russia has actively created a so-called buffer zone between Abkhazia and Georgia, pushing the cease-fire line established in 2008 7 miles further into Georgia territory. So here we have an international peace agreement that kind of sets a line allowing the occupation in Georgian territory of Russian forces, and then the Russian Federation decides, based upon the Olympics, to push that line further into the country of Georgia 7 more miles.

It is a very troubling extension of Russia's earlier efforts to enclose South Ossetia, this other province, in a barbed wire enclave. And this new incursion of Georgian territory is a violation of Georgia's sovereignty as it stands in stark contrast to Russia's many commitments under international law.

According to the cease-fire signed on August 12, 2008, Russian military forces

were to return to their pre-war positions, yet they have now established militarized security perimeters on the Georgian side of the administrative border with both South Ossetia and Abkhazia. This is a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights, to which Russia is a signatory, and a violation of customary international law.

Russian President Putin claims that he must close borders within the internationally recognized territory of Georgia to prevent security threats in Sochi. This move is nothing more than a power grab. I will continue to support Georgia's sovereignty and urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON DURING BLACK HISTORY MONTH 2014

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue my commitment to honoring influential African Americans from Alabama during this Black History Month. This week, we honor the heroines of the movement for civil rights and voting rights. These courageous women had tremendous roles in our Nation's fight for justice and equality, and I am honored to share their stories.

Today I honor the tremendous life and legacy of Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson. Amelia was a key figure in the voting rights movement in Selma, Alabama, and she is often remembered for her historic role in Bloody Sunday, on that solemn day on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. At 102 years old, she is an American treasure whose story is a testament to her commitment to serving as a conduit of change.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was born August 18, 1911, in Savannah, Georgia. Her mother was an activist during the women's suffrage movement. After the passage of the 19th Amendment, she and her mother would distribute voter registration information to women from the family's horse and buggy in the 1920s.

Her mother's tireless efforts to secure the right to vote for women would have a lasting impact on Amelia. It also paved the way for the young activist to claim her own place in history. Fueled by the same passion, Amelia began her own service to mankind when she and her husband, Samuel Boynton, fought for voting rights and property ownership for Blacks in the poorest rural counties of Alabama.

She was later named the only female lieutenant to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the civil rights movement. In this role, Amelia would travel alongside Dr. King and often appear in his stead for various events and gatherings during the movement.

Amelia is best known for being on the front lines during Bloody Sunday in Selma, Alabama. During the protest,

she was gassed, beaten, and left for dead at the foot of the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Despite the violent attacks, this heroine was committed to staying the course. Her direct involvement in the movement led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Amelia was such a valued part of this process that some of the contents of the bill were drafted at her kitchen table in Selma.

On May 5, 1964, Amelia Boynton Robinson broke yet another barrier when she became the first woman in the State of Alabama to run for Congress. She garnered 10.7 percent of the vote during a time when very few Blacks were registered voters. Her historic run further solidified her impact on the movement for human rights, civil rights, and voting rights in Alabama.

When this extraordinary woman wasn't contributing her time to the causes of her generation, she worked as an educator, a home agent with the Department of Agriculture, an insurance agent, an income tax preparer, as well as a real estate agent.

She attended Georgia State Industrial School, which is now known as Savannah State University, and Tuskegee Normal, which is also known as Tuskegee University.

I am certain that I would not stand before you today as Alabama's first Black Congresswoman without the tremendous contributions of this amazing woman. It is indeed humbling to experience and pay honor and tribute to the first African American woman to pursue this office in my great State.

Her compelling story is one that reminds us of the undeniable power of courage. She refused to be silent and even risked her life to blaze trails for future generations. And at 102 years old, Amelia is still alive and still with us today, and she is still dispensing her wisdom.

As we celebrate Black History Month and the notable contributions of African Americans to this country, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson, an Alabama gem and an American treasure.

□ 1045

TRIBUTE TO PENN STATE LUNAR LION SPACE TEAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Penn State University's Lunar Lion Team will make history as the first-ever university-led space mission to the Moon.

This group of talented young minds is competing in the Google Lunar XPRIZE competition to land a robotic spacecraft on the Moon in December of 2015. The mission, which the team began preparing in January of 2013, includes a launch onboard a commercial

space vehicle, a cruise through space for 5 days, landing, and a relaunch for a second landing on the Moon. The mission will then be used to send high resolution images, videos, and other information back to Penn State's mission control center.

To put this in perspective, only the U.S., Russia, India, Japan, and China have ever landed a craft on the Moon. Penn State looks to join this elite club next year.

The Lunar Lion Team includes Penn State science and engineering researchers as well as 80 undergraduate and graduate students in science, technology, engineering, and math programs, commonly known as STEM, as well as communications, business, logistics, computer science, and information technology, just to name a few majors.

The team will have the opportunity to gain hands-on experience in spacecraft design, construction, and operation. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the team is learning skills necessary for public-private partnerships through collaboration with NASA and commercial space companies.

Like so many of the university's education research initiatives, it will also be used to support new innovations and research in the private sector, real world outcomes that will benefit not just students, but America's competitiveness.

Penn State's bold mission sets the stage for a resurgence of interests in space exploration among America's youth and demonstrates an exciting practical application of STEM education. The team is making great progress towards the mission. Prototype development is underway, and last month, the team commenced rocket testing.

As a Penn State alumnus and a lifelong resident of Centre County, I take great pride in the university and its long list of scholastic and volunteer achievements. The Lunar Lion Team adds another stellar achievement to that list.

The work at the university that has led to the formation and development of this program is another example of innovation and creative leadership on the part of the Penn State community.

As one of the only nonprofit groups working towards the Lunar XPRIZE, and the only university, those working on this Lunar Lion project in State College are truly doing something special.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my very best to the Penn State Lunar Lion Team as they continue this important work. Their community and the Nation are very proud.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, before presenting the topic on which I plan to

speak about this morning, I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about the career of the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman ROB ANDREWS, who leaves this House on February 18 after a remarkable career.

We will be losing an amazing talent, a great intellect, and a fine leader. It has been a great privilege to serve with him and to watch him do his work so ably. We will miss you, ROB.

I now rise, Mr. Speaker, to speak for the 29th time on this House floor about rape in the military. I rise today to speak on a scathing report on military sexual assault by the Associated Press. Sexual assault scandals exposed by the press are the new norm for the military, but this damning report offers us a window into the gross mishandling of sexual assaults at the hands of the chain of command on a massive scale.

This weekend, a deluge of sex crime reports in Japan have been revealed, thanks not to the military disclosing them, but to the Associated Press through FOIA requests. The data reveal how broken the military scales of justice truly are and offers a rare glimpse into how reports of sexual assaults are handled.

Many of these stories involved commanders that undermined investigations, refused to bring a case to court-martial, or overturned a case after a jury had found the perpetrator guilty and sentenced them to jail. Of the 1,000 reports, punishments were wildly inconsistent, and of the suspects determined to be guilty, two-thirds of them spent no time in jail at all. In more than 30 cases, a letter of reprimand was the only punishment. What is truly unacceptable is that we have to rely on FOIA requests at all.

These cases and their outcomes must face the light of day and the scrutiny of the taxpayers that pay for our military in the first place, and I intend to work to make sure that this happens.

What is clear from these cases is that commanders are part of the problem, not the solution. Commanders often decided to not move forward with court-martial, but when they did—even with DNA evidence and tape-recorded confessions of rape—the predators were typically given mild punishments after pleading to lesser offenses. It is the culture of the military that the rules simply don't apply. Commanders also lessened numerous punishments unilaterally and, in two cases, threw out guilty verdicts and punishments completely.

Among the most disturbing stories in the AP analysis was about a doctor at a health clinic at a Naval Air Facility near Tokyo. Airman Tina Wilson went to the clinic in 2008 to have a dressing changed following surgery on her tailbone. But the doctor, Lieutenant Commander Anthony L. Valasquez, decided it was perfectly okay to slip his hand down the front of her panties and then have the nerve to give her a smile and a wink as she walked out the door.

Wilson complained, an investigation was started, and three other women

also reported the doctor had touched them inappropriately, but after 10 months, the investigation was closed with no action taken, according to an NCIS document on the investigation obtained by the AP.

The story gets even more disgusting. Two years later, the Navy finally filed charges against the doctor after more than 25 women reported he touched them, too. But guess what? Most of the charges were dropped under a plea deal, and the doctor served just a week in the brig. He was dismissed and thankfully stripped of his license, but Valasquez could have been stopped years before. Instead, he was allowed to carry on his lewd behavior and scar so many more victims.

Airman Tina Wilson left the Navy, distraught over how the case was handled, according to the AP analysis. This is another of the thousands of tragedies of how sexual assault victims are treated in the military justice system. They often leave or are forced out after making their reports and enduring a grueling, unjust process. Survivors often face retaliation and punishment while their predators get letters of reprimand.

The retaliation is brutal. Survivors are debased, humiliated, and then discharged by the military they so proudly served because another servicemember raped them or sexually assaulted them.

As we know, there are an estimated 26,000 sexual assaults a year in the military, but reporting is low. Court-martial are rare, and the conviction rate is less than 1 percent. This is the result of a legal system beholden to the chain of command that some are hell-bent on protecting.

It is time to pass the STOP Act and bring back justice for all servicemembers, especially victims. When will we stop protecting the predators?

FINAL FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in, again, calling attention to our continued war on poverty, and I thank my colleague and neighbor in California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for leading this effort.

This war is, however, but the latest chapter in a larger struggle that goes all the way back to the founding of our country. When we declared our independence in 1776, Thomas Jefferson helped define the purpose and the mission of this new country with his timeless words in that Declaration of Independence. He wrote:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

They endeavored on what was called at the time a freedom experiment. It

was this perfect idea that no longer should this British nobility system prevail where your destiny was often charted for you before you were even born based on where you were born or to whom you were born to. It was the idea that you should be able to decide your own independence, chart your own destiny.

It was a perfect idea carried out by imperfect men. It wasn't extended to African Americans. It wasn't extended to women. Certain religious sects were left out. So we fought a civil war, ended slavery. We went through the suffragist movement, and women were given the right to vote. Eventually, entire classes of people—Catholics, the poor, and others who had been shut out—were now brought into American opportunity.

Today, when I think about what are some of the final frontiers of freedom that have not yet been expanded, I think back to President Johnson. We are very grateful for President Johnson's declaration of the war on poverty. Fifty years ago, he stated that we are in a war on poverty, and we must fight for civil rights, and he signed legislation that marked the beginning of the end of the Jim Crow era. He also recognized it was time to give the poor a real chance to pursue their happiness.

He hearkened back, just as I did, to our Nation's beginnings. President Johnson said that our Founders made a covenant with this new land and that it was conceived in justice. In his words, this "justice was the promise that all who made the journey would share in the fruits of the land."

So began a renewed effort in America to fight poverty, a renewed effort to give those who are poor the freedom to dream that they could be anything they want. We recognized that kids needed to be better prepared before they go to school, so we created the Head Start program. We recognized the critical importance of health and wellness, and so we created Medicare and Medicaid.

But this freedom to dream has not yet been expanded across America. In fact, I see every day that there are still millions of children living in poverty, and just like every politician, when I see one of these young children in a schoolhouse, I ask them, What do you want to be when you grow up? After doing this a number of times, I realized, I should really ask them, Are you hungry? Are you cold? Are you safe? Because the opportunities around them—the crumbling buildings they are trying to learn in, the parents who are working at a minimum wage that is not a living wage—do not provide them with the tools that these children need to realize their opportunity. This leaves them no different than a child born in the 1700s under the British nobility system.

The freedom to dream is no different, and they are no more able to dream beyond where they were born or whom

they were born to. So our goal must be to continue to fight this war on poverty, to give every child across every schoolhouse in this country the freedom to dream. This means we must raise the minimum wage. We must extend unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed so that they can find a job and make sure they can reinforce the skills at home that their children are learning in the classroom.

We will not rest on this issue until I can ask and every Member of this Congress can ask a child, What do you want to be when you grow up? And that child will be able to say, My country has given me the tools to be anything I want.

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 57 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:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As You make available to Your people the grace and knowledge to meet the needs of the day, we pray that Your spirit will be upon the Members of this people's House, giving them the richness of Your wisdom.

Bless the Members of the minority party as they prepare to gather the end of this week. May they, with those who accompany them, travel safely and meet in peace.

Bless also the majority party, as they will be returning to their constituencies. Give them hearts and ears to listen well to all those whom they represent.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the good work required for service to our Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote

on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HUFFMAN 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.

HONORING MATT COWDREY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Matt Cowdrey on being named Australia's 2013 Multi-Class Swimmer of the Year.

Matt is serving as a fellow in my office as part of the UNI-Capitol Washington Internship Program, which is ably led by Director Eric Federing. Matt is no stranger to success. He is the most decorated Paralympic athlete of all time in Australia, having won 13 gold medals, and 23 overall in Athens, Beijing, and London.

Even though Matt was born Down Under, he exemplifies the American spirit and is a testimony to the power of hard work and determination.

Matt, it has been wonderful having you be part of our congressional team. I look forward to hearing all about your future successes, including from the pool in Rio in 2016, and likely someday in the Australian Parliament.

Congratulations, Matt, once again, on all of your amazing accomplishments. It has been great having you on our team.

COLGAN FLIGHT 3407

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, 5 years ago tomorrow, Continental

Flight 3407 crashed in western New York. This was a tragedy that took so many people far too soon and changed a community forever.

The cause of the crash was found to be pilot and crew error, with fatigue being a contributing factor. In an inspiring act of love, the families of those lost formed as impressive an advocacy effort as I have ever seen. Drawing strength and purpose from their loss, they successfully convinced Congress and the FAA to enact landmark aviation safety reforms.

Their call for “one level of safety” has become a rallying cry for all of those who want to make sure that this kind of preventable tragedy is not visited upon other families and other communities.

Madam Speaker, I and all of western New York stand united with the families of Flight 3407. We feel their loss and express our sympathy to them. We also stand in awe of their commitment and tireless effort to work on behalf of travelers everywhere. The entire American traveling public owes a debt of gratitude to these families who turned tragedy into purpose.

CBO REPORT MAKES REFORMS EVEN MORE URGENT

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, recent CBO estimates predict that regulatory changes created by ObamaCare will remove 2.3 million Americans from the full-time workforce. The President has gone to great lengths to spin this as a positive development, saying job losses will come as a result of people voluntarily choosing to pursue interests other than full-time work.

It is true that, all else being equal, individuals and families being able to make ends meet while working less is a cause for celebration. The problem is that all else is not equal. We have a social safety net that depends on robust economic growth and is already forecast to run perpetual deficits for decades to come. No one disputes that 2.2 million lost jobs will diminish economic growth.

For as long as I have been in Congress, Republicans have been working to enact structural reforms to put our budget back in balance. Last week’s CBO report makes those reforms even more urgent.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

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

Mrs. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, in the aftermath of the Great Recession, Congress established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau for a very clear reason: to ensure that financial markets and services work for all Americans, not just the big banks and best connected.

Today, the CFPB makes sure that consumers get the information they need to make smart financial decisions on everything from mortgages to credit cards to student loans.

Today, the House majority will introduce a purely partisan measure called the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act. That is a mouthful, if nothing else, but rather than improve the CFPB, it would do precisely the opposite by undermining its independence and eliminating its rulemaking authority.

Consumer protections could be scrapped. We must not repeat the same costly mistakes that put our economy in the free fall of the Great Recession.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MARRIAGE WEEK

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Marriage Week.

Every year, in the lead-up to Valentine’s Day, we recognize the importance of the institution of marriage and the stability it brings to the American household. Married couples lead longer lives, have greater financial and emotional stability, and are healthier and generally happier than their unmarried counterparts. However, only 52 percent of adults in America are married today—a steep decline from 80 percent in 1970.

Children who grow up in a two-parent household generally perform better in school, stay out of trouble, and are on track to live a healthier and happier life. Yet today, over 40 percent of babies are born out of marriage, compared to only 5 percent in 1960.

I have been married to my wife, Rebecca, for 32 years. We have enjoyed raising our four wonderful children together, the oldest of whom is now married himself.

I believe promoting the positive benefits of marriage is important for the happiness, stability, and well-being of the next generation. I am proud to recognize National Marriage Week, and I am honored to be married to Rebecca and be the father of Patrick, Kathleen, Laura, and Colin.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I left the House Judiciary Committee, where they were discussing, “Asylum Fraud: Abusing America’s Compassion,” a hearing that was called by the Republican majority.

Madam Speaker, I adhere to following the law, but I do believe as we approach the 50th year of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, we will see more and more voices being raised for the indignity

and lack of human rights in not passing comprehensive immigration reform.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Refugee Act was signed by President Reagan in 1980. It reflects America’s values and this country’s deep-seated commitment to liberty and human dignity, as well as to pledge, under the Refugee Convention protocols, to save those who have been abused, sexually or otherwise, and children or families who have been subject to violence.

Let’s get on with the values of this Nation. Let’s pass comprehensive immigration reform. Let’s restore the values of this country and provide laws that secure all of our borders. Yet we continue to have these hearings suggesting that those of us who cry out for immigration reform do not understand the law. Coming from a border State, let me be very clear, Madam Speaker, that I understand the law.

Let’s pass comprehensive immigration reform.

HONORING ILLINOIS VETERAN OF THE MONTH JOHN CARR

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army veteran John Carr, who was recognized as Illinois’ January Veteran of the Month.

Enlisting in 1969 during the Vietnam war, John was wounded in action and was medically retired in 1972. For his service, John received the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Medal, and a Purple Heart, among others.

John didn’t know what was in store upon leaving the service, but when he saw an ad to transport other veterans to the hospital, he signed up. He then joined the Kane County Veteran’s Assistance Commission as a hospital caseworker and was elected as superintendent only 3 years later. He retired last February, after nearly four decades of service to his fellow veterans.

My staff is proud to have worked alongside John to help Illinois veterans navigate the Federal benefits system. Constituents regularly told us how John helped anxious veterans or spouses receive their well-deserved benefits.

Thank you, John, for your service to our country and to the men and women like you who have made sacrifices to defend it.

JOBS AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

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

Mr. SIREs. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of joblessness in America.

A simple way to enhance opportunities for all Americans is continued investments in career technical education or vocational schools. Not every

child's career path takes them through a 4-year college. It is necessary to provide opportunities for them to learn skills to apply for a job either right after graduation or through further certification.

Career technical education teaches general employment skills and teaches skills required in specific occupations or careers. It can provide young people with confidence to focus on a career path.

Many occupations taught at vocational schools are in high demand, such as nursing, business administration, culinary arts, automotive maintenance, software programming, and engineering technology.

Our labor market is evolving and placing greater emphasis on high-tech skills. To ensure vocational training keeps pace with these changes, we should encourage private industries to partner with vocational schools to identify emerging job markets and have students trained to fill these jobs.

By investing in career technical education we can ensure that more Americans have secure career opportunities after graduation.

END THE TAX ON U.S. OLYMPIC CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, there is almost nothing Uncle Sam won't tax. You get hit at the grocery store, the gas pump, and your paycheck. You even get taxed when you die.

Now, as the eyes of the world are on Sochi, Uncle Sam's eyes are on yet another way to collect: U.S. Olympians.

Believe it or not, our men and women who bring home the gold, silver, or bronze are taxed on the value of the medals they earn and their minimal winnings while representing our country on the world stage. That is not okay.

Competing on the U.S. Olympic team is an achievement that should be celebrated, not taxed. That is why I have cosponsored the Tax Exemptions for American Medalists Act. It prevents Olympic athletes from paying taxes on their winnings. Our Federal Government shouldn't penalize them for performing at their best.

We need broad-based tax reform. In the meantime, I encourage my colleagues to support the TEAM Act and end this undue tax on our Olympians.

□ 1215

THE END OF SNOW

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, there was a deeply troubling story this Sunday in *The New York Times*, entitled, "The End of Snow."

Like all of you, I have been cheering on our Olympians in Sochi, particu-

larly in the snow-related events. But as this article notes, climate change is threatening the very concept of Winter Olympics and snow sports in general.

Current models project a 7-degree rise in global temperatures by the year 2100, leaving winters drier and our mountains bare of snow. Of the 19 cities that have hosted Winter Olympics, only 10 might still be cold enough by 2050 to host them again.

Warmer winters and less snow will be disastrous to the United States' \$66 billion ski industry. Until this weekend, California had just 12 percent of its average snowpack. Thankfully, it snowed in the Sierras, bringing some needed relief.

But one snowstorm in California and another on the east coast does not solve our bigger, long-term climate crisis. Climate change will impact our lives in every way. Let's get to work. Let's reduce greenhouse gases and prevent the worst impacts of climate change.

THE TRAIN WRECK OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, the train wreck of the President's health care reform just continues.

This week, there have been two developments: the first one, the CBO announcing their study that shows that 2½ million full-time equivalents—that is, jobs—will be eliminated from the economy by ObamaCare; and yesterday, the President finally recognized that ObamaCare, in fact, destroys jobs and will delay the bill's mandate to buy insurance, but only for corporations, not for hardworking American families.

Madam Speaker, you don't get to keep your policy. You don't get to keep your doctor. Now you don't get to keep your job. America deserves better.

TWIN PRIME NUMBERS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about twin prime numbers. Twin primes are two prime numbers separated by a single number, like 11 and 13, or 17 and 19. The question is, Are there an infinite number of twin primes? It was the general consensus of the mathematical community until just recently that that question was beyond the capability of our current mathematical community.

However, there have been some stunning advances on this problem in the last few years. In particular, last May, with the help of an online collaborative project, mathematicians pioneered new methods for addressing this problem with a huge breakthrough from Tom Zhang at the University of New Hamp-

shire. We now know that there are an infinite number of prime number pairs separated by amounts smaller than 270.

While the twin prime problem itself is still unsolved, mathematicians are hopeful that this year they can reduce the separation from 270 to less than 100.

SUPPORT FOR THE A-10 AND CLOSE AIR SUPPORT

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the A-10 and close air support for our warfighters.

Hundreds of brave Americans are alive today because of the performance of the A-10 in Iraq and Afghanistan. I agree with Army Chief of Staff General Raymond Odierno, who said in an SASC hearing, "The A-10 is the best close air support platform we have today." Even Air Force Chief of Staff General Mark Welsh has said the A-10 "is the best airplane in the world at what it does."

The Air Force should not retire the A-10 before its replacement reaches full operational capability. Otherwise, it will result in a close air support gap that will put our ground troops at increased risk.

There is no greater responsibility than ensuring our men and women in uniform have the support they need to accomplish their missions and return home safely. Premature divestment of the A-10 by the Air Force would create a dangerous close air support capability gap that could unnecessarily endanger American servicemembers in future conflicts.

FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of raising the minimum wage and passing H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, which would give approximately 28 million Americans an overdue pay raise, promote economic growth, and strengthen the middle class.

In America, if you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to provide for your family and provide them with a decent quality of life. But for about 4.6 million Americans living in poverty, this is not the case.

It has been 5 years since those working for the minimum wage have seen an increase in the minimum wage and, according to one study, the minimum wage today is worth \$2 less than in 1968. This is shameful, and we have the responsibility to address growing income inequality by increasing the minimum wage immediately.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose this commonsense legislation, arguing that it will hurt jobs. But as

The New York Times noted this past weekend, this position is contrary to decades of economic research that shows increases in the minimum wage have lifted pay without hurting employment.

Americans deserve a raise, and raising the minimum wage will help to protect U.S. workers, grow our economy, and build ladders of opportunity into the middle class.

THE DAY WE FIGHT BACK

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

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, each day Americans use new and more common technology to communicate with each other, to read online, share photographs, shop and purchase goods, do their banking, and countless other everyday tasks.

In this new tech age, Americans live their lives online, yet the Federal Government acts as if these communications are not subject to Fourth Amendment protections. In fact, the IRS has claimed that Americans “do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy” when it comes to their emails being read by the Federal Government.

Thousands of Americans are joining together today in an effort to bring awareness to some of the unconstitutional and intrusive surveillance practices of our United States Government.

February 11 is “The Day We Fight Back.” It is a reminder that law-abiding Americans have certain expectations of privacy and rights guaranteed in our Constitution that our government cannot unreasonably search and seize our personal property, including electronic property, without just cause. That is why I am a lead sponsor of the Email Privacy Act, which will apply the same Fourth Amendment protections to our electronic communication as the paper documents in your home file cabinet.

Madam Speaker, let’s pass this bipartisan bill. Let’s draw clear lines to ensure our government protects the constitutional rights of every American.

CONGRESS MUST ALSO MAKE 2014 A YEAR OF ACTION

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, President Obama stood in this Chamber and addressed the Nation, declaring 2014 as the “Year of Action”: a year of action to put more Americans back to work and continue to make sure that middle class families across the country are secure in their jobs and their homes; a year of action to continue fighting for equal pay, for equal work, in order to strengthen the American family and ensure fairness in the workplace for women; a year of action to understand that, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Just today, I witnessed in the 100 years of the Federal Reserve to have a female Chair, Janet Yellen, come before us.

A year of action to make sure that American students can have dreams and that they can have an affordable education.

We must understand that we must work together. Democrats, Madam Speaker, are doing their part. We invite our Republican colleagues to understand we need a year of action.

NATIONAL COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING WEEK

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

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor National Court Reporting and Captioning Week, taking place from February 16 to February 22, a week that serves to recognize the value and importance that court reporters and captioners have made in American society.

As a lawyer who has spent over 25 years as a litigator, I have a profound respect and appreciation for those who preserve the official record.

Court reporters, broadcast captioners, and Communication Access Realtime Translation, or CART, captioners serve an integral role in my home State of Florida and throughout the United States. In fact, Florida has a particularly vibrant court reporting economy. My cousin, Les Renfro, has been one for over 35 years. They have over 400 small business owners in Florida, 1,300 court reporters and captioners, and three court reporting programs which will help fulfill the needs of an industry, an industry that the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts will grow by 2022.

That is why I am happy to join the National Court Reporters Association in commemorating the week from February 16 to February 22 as National Court Reporting and Captioning Week.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, every February we have the opportunity to celebrate Black History Month by honoring the great achievements and contributions of African American leaders who have courageously pushed boundaries and moved our country forward in the name of justice and equality. It is an honor for me today to mention some of the great leaders from Los Angeles who have made Black history:

Tom Bradley, from Los Angeles, the first African American to be mayor of Los Angeles; great leaders like Merv Dymally, the first African American Lieutenant Governor of California; Congresswoman Juanita Millender-

McDonald, the first African American woman to chair the House Administration Committee; Aja Brown, the first African American female mayor of Compton; and my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, the first Black woman to be speaker of any State legislature in U.S. history.

This year is the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act, but this milestone should be a reminder of the work that still needs to be done. We can’t forget that, for many Americans, the promise of civil rights and equality remains unfulfilled. So, today and every day, let us reaffirm our commitment.

PASS A BIPARTISAN FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the House Speaker and the Republican leadership to take up the bipartisan flood insurance bill as soon as possible.

Hardworking families all across America, and plenty of small businesses as well, are facing exorbitant increases in their flood insurance rates. This is very harmful to their economic security and is really putting a damper on the economic recovery in communities all across the country. We need the Congress to fix this.

After the reform bill was passed last session, no one imagined these exorbitant increases in flood insurance rates. The best course of action right now is to take up the bipartisan Senate-passed flood insurance bill that passed on January 30.

We can work on this together, but we need action now.

WHAT DO WOMEN WANT FOR VALENTINE’S DAY?

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, February 14 is Valentine’s Day, a great commercial event. But what is it that women really want for Valentine’s?

It may differ for each of us, but I believe we can all agree on one thing: we want equality.

Women want equal pay for equal work.

Women want equal access to health care, not paying more for our health care premiums, not having pregnancy defined as a preexisting condition, and not having decisions as to our body made for us by the denial of contraceptive services.

Women want to be treated as political equals, recognized for the work we do, what we have contributed, not looked upon as second-class citizens, not deemed less, somehow, because our right to vote is less than 100 years old and our great country will be celebrating its 238th birthday.

We want what we have earned: equality.

BRING AN END TO DEPORTATION

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, today, unfortunately, we commemorate the 2 millionth deportation under President Obama. President Obama continues to tear families apart by deporting non-criminal immigrants to our country who want nothing more than to make our country stronger, grow our economy, and raise their American families.

But the President can bring an end to deportation. Even if this body doesn't act, the President can stop deporting noncriminal detainees. If somebody has violated our criminal laws, they should suffer the consequences of their crimes.

If their only crime was trying to make a better life for themselves in our great country, just as our own forebears did, just as my great-grandparents did, we should welcome them to help make our country stronger, create jobs for Americans, and grow our economy.

Madam Speaker, it is time for this body to act. Absent this body acting on comprehensive immigration reform, I encourage the President to stop deporting noncriminal aliens.

□ 1230

THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. In 1788, over 225 years ago, James Madison wrote these words:

It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood. If they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes, that no man who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow.

Oh, how relevant these remarks are today. Off-the-cuff changes and delays to the Affordable Care Act without proper legislative authority confuse and confound American individuals and businesses alike.

We are formed as a Nation of laws, laws crafted by Representatives of the people. America achieved great things by adhering to the principles of our legal framework. The fundamental genius of the American Republic came from the simple, yet absolute, affirmation that we, as a Nation, operate by the rule of law, law crafted by the many, not the one.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) laid before the House the fol-

lowing communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 11, 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 February 11, 2014 at 11:05 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1954.

Appointments:

Washington's Farewell Address.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3193, CONSUMER FINANCIAL FREEDOM AND WASHINGTON ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 475 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 475

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-36 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question

in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from February 13, 2014, through February 24, 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. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of February 12, 2014, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure relating to the public debt limit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Boulder, Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my colleague and my friend, 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. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 475 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3193. This rule makes in order every amendment that complied with House rules, giving House Members of the majority and the minority ample opportunity to participate in today's debate.

The legislation before us today takes important steps to restore transparency, accountability, and effective oversight in our Federal regulatory process. Established in 2010 under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, known as CFPB, is granted the authority to regulate the financial services industry in an effort to limit bad actors and protect consumers from fraud and abuse.

Unfortunately, by design—no mistake—the CFPB has virtually zero congressional oversight, limited judicial review, and the unilateral ability to promulgate any rule or regulation it deems appropriate. In essence, it is wholly unaccountable to the American people and to the United States Congress, the men and women who, by the Constitution of the United States, have the authority and the responsibility to represent the American people through elected office.

This is not how our government was meant to operate, but this is what former Speaker NANCY PELOSI and House Democrats desperately wanted, control of the financial services industry by one person, one person who answers solely to the President of the United States.

I have heard from numerous community bankers in Texas. Madam Speaker, I am from Dallas, Texas, and am proud to say that Dallas, Texas, is home to community bankers who understand that they are on the front lines of a new regulatory regime, and that is not just community bankers, but all bankers and those covered under financial services regulations. Their accounts of the impacts stemming from the new CFPB rules are startling. Specifically, they have told me that the CFPB's new regulations regarding "qualified mortgages" will significantly increase borrowing costs and considerably reduce the number of available mortgages.

Sounds familiar, doesn't it? Sounds like something that the Democrats concocted to make sure that health care was in trouble so they could show up with the answer of the Affordable Care Act, which is nothing that is implied in its name.

They are doing exactly to financial services what the Democrats did to health care in this country, and bankers and the financial services industry understand this.

In a time when Americans are looking to the Federal Government simply to promote increased private sector investment in our economy and to allow the free enterprise system to flourish, up to and including offering more jobs, stable opportunities for meaningful capital, instead, we see one person at the head of the organization who can make all these decisions handing down new rules and regulations which, I believe, do the exact opposite of making it easier, safer, and better to grow jobs and to have Americans be competitive in the marketplace.

The bill before us today is not about deregulation. It is about appropriate balanced regulation with ideas that come from not just the Committee on Financial Services, led by our great young Chairman JEB HENSARLING, but perhaps, more importantly, ideas that coincide with other government agencies, where it is a bipartisan effort, not by a particular head of one organization.

While the American people do need protection from bad actors in the fi-

ancial services industry, they also need protection, I believe, from an activist government that unilaterally dispenses burdensome and needless regulations which negatively impact not only our economy but the industry that helps provide needed capital, jobs, and enrichment of the American financial services industry, which is a part of the free enterprise system.

Madam Speaker, I am sure you are familiar with ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board, known as IPAB. Yes, it is the one body of unelected bureaucrats which rations health care and makes decisions, once again, without judicial or congressional oversight on America's seniors.

Just as IPAB restricts choices in the health care sector, so too do unelected bureaucrats at the CFPB. They restrict choices in the financial sector. They are trying to choke off the free enterprise system as a result of rules and regulations that become burdensome, and so people quit offering their services.

By regulating the types of credit cards, mortgages, or loans that Americans can get, the CFPB makes unilateral decisions regarding what types of financial tools Americans can use. The American people, I believe, deserve something better from Washington, as opposed to this which they are getting, which is a one-size-fits-all approach from Washington, D.C.

That is why I support H.R. 3193. It brings much-needed balance to the CFPB by replacing the lone director with a five-member commission to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, similar to other financial regulators, so that no one person can unilaterally determine regulations which impact millions of Americans and has little oversight by our courts or by Congress.

Additionally, as an independent agency housed in the Federal Reserve today, the CFPB is not subject to appropriation. They are a mandatory spending item as a result of what President Obama and House and Senate Democrats have done.

By restoring this important check and balance, Congress needs to make sure that we appropriate the money that they should use. It will ensure that the CFPB acts as intended and does not continue to impose economically devastating regulations on the American economy.

To have no oversight and no authority for the money that they spend I believe is a misuse of the way we would want a government agency to work. Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, we should be for understanding they should serve at the pleasure of the American people, not the reverse therein.

Finally, this legislation takes important steps. It protects Americans' personal nonpublic information. Yesterday, up in the Rules Committee, we heard testimony from Chairman JEB HENSARLING of Dallas, Texas, that the

CFPB currently maintains over 900 million credit card records. That is right: the NSA of financial services, that is exactly what the CFPB is, and such an immense amount of private data held by the Federal Government presents ample opportunity for misuse.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe that they should have this information, and I believe they should immediately recuse themselves of gaining this information.

H.R. 3193 will ensure that Americans are protected by requiring express written consent from the CFPB before they can obtain, access, collect, use, or disclose any personal nonpublic information.

□ 1245

I think it is dangerous to have a government agency with this type of power, information, and, as we have seen from the IRS, a misuse of personal information and data that has become an abuse of power. This bill will require that the CFPB assert in writing how that information will be used and to request it.

Madam Speaker, the American people are tired of the Obama administration's blatant disregard for the laws which govern our great Nation. Just yesterday, we witnessed, once again, President Obama's willingness to do whatever he wants when he unilaterally delayed the employer mandate of the health care bill by 1 year. Instead of giving all Americans relief from the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, the administration is single-handedly picking winners and losers—by the way, on behalf of business as opposed to individuals. Just as the President has done with health care, there is nothing to prevent the CFPB from following suit and unilaterally deciding who will be subject to crushing regulation and who will not. That is why H.R. 3193 is so important.

Madam Speaker, we are on the floor today because we are talking about what literally is a Big Government action that was done several years ago by the President of the United States, by the former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and by Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID. Republicans understand that Big Government not only is costly and expensive but that some people want them to control our lives. Freedom, in fact, Madam Speaker, is worth fighting for, and so Republicans are here today on the floor to balance that tilt in favor of freedom, opportunity, and for the right of their own person, an individual in this Nation, to know if your government is collecting your financial records.

And you have a right to know that. That is another reason why Republicans are pleased to say today we are talking about very, very important issues to every single American. It is more than freedom. It is rule of law.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3193. This package of bills was brought under a restrictive process that prevented efforts by Members on both sides of the aisle to improve the legislation.

H.R. 3193 would gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Now, a lot has been said by the gentleman from Texas that I believe has mischaracterized what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau actually does. It in no way restricts our freedoms, Madam Speaker. In fact, banks aren't the only entities that have freedom. American consumers have freedom, too. American consumers want to be protected from predatory practices, Madam Speaker.

How many of us have signed a credit card agreement with a font size that is too small to even read? We want to make sure that people aren't giving away their home and their livelihood when they enter into a credit card agreement, a simple loan, or other financial transactions. The American people want that certainty.

When we are talking about making sure that markets operate well, that competition exists in the consumer financial marketplace, that people have different financial options that empower themselves, there needs to be a referee on the field. This bill effectively blindfolds and handcuffs that referee, takes her off the field, and let's the banks have their day with the American people.

That is why I oppose this bill. This bill will not advance a constructive economic agenda. This bill will not address our broken immigration system. It won't secure our borders that hundreds of people enter our country illegally every day, and it won't reunite shattered families.

Earlier today, I spoke of how, under President Obama's administration, over 2 million people have now been deported from this country. This bill will not end that. Instead of moving forward, it blindfolds the referee and ensures that predatory financial institutions can take advantage of the American people without a watchdog.

This bill has serious flaws. It would add additional bureaucracy to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau by replacing its Director with a commission. The gentleman from Texas said somehow this bill meant that there wasn't Big Government. This bill establishes more Big Government, more commissions, rather than having—guess how most private companies are run, Madam Speaker? There is usually a CEO in charge. They don't have some directorate or commission. I mean, that sounds more like the Soviet Union than the United States of America what the Republicans are proposing in this bill.

This bill would also prevent the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from offering salaries and benefits to employees that are competitive with other financial regulators. Guess what, Madam Speaker? The financial industry pays well. The big banks pay well. That is wonderful. That is the beauty of the capitalist system. If they are creating value working for a big bank and they are earning hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in our market economy, that is wonderful. Well, guess what? If you want somebody who understands that business to be able to work on behalf of the American people as a watchdog, you need to pay a competitive salary to make sure that they are able to then use their expertise that they have developed in the private sector to protect their fellow Americans from predatory or scrupulous activities.

This bill would impede the ability to attract and retain qualified and experienced people that have to handle very complex regulatory issues. It would also eliminate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's independence and parity with other regulators by subjecting it to the appropriations process.

Sadly, last night during the rules debate, one of my colleagues on the Rules Committee equated the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with the gestapo. That is insulting to our civil servants who work for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, consumers that it serves, and it is extremely offensive to the true victims of Nazi Germany. It is inappropriate to even compare the intentions of the U.S. Government, whether it is led by Democrats or Republicans, to those of Adolph Hitler and Nazi Germany.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has played a crucial role in helping millions of Americans become more informed and empower them to make financial choices that benefit them and their families. For instance, at a time that we know that higher education and college are more important than ever, the cost of higher education continues to skyrocket. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has developed a Web site that helps students understand their borrowing options before they take on substantial debt and make sure they are aware of the lowest interest rates that they can use to finance their education. Their user-friendly tools allow families to compare financial aid and college costs, choose a loan with a low interest rate, and select repayment terms that are most favorable to them. As the largest student loan lender, the Federal Government should help make sure that students have the information they need to help take control of their financial destinies.

I was honored to work with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on my Know Before You Owe Act, which would provide students and families with information about their eligi-

bility for Federal loans before they take out more costly, higher interest rate, private loans. While I hope that Congress would pass this bill, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau also hopes to advance this important cause even without legislation. This bill on the floor today would hamper their ability to prevent students from paying more than they need to for their college education.

Now, Democrats are open to improving the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau through bipartisan proposals. Unfortunately, the House majority has shunned bipartisanship in favor of these bills. We can do better, Madam Speaker. The American people want to make sure there is a referee and that there is a watchdog. We want to make sure that our banking industry and financial services industry can continue to grow and flourish in this country. One of the most important factors in the success of that industry is the confidence that the American people have in the financial services industry to be fair and honest.

The establishment of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau helps ensure that the American people are confident in the financial products that are being marketed by banks across the country and will lead to continued job growth in the financial services industry, which America is a leader in, both here and abroad.

Let's talk for a moment about what we are not discussing under this rule, Madam Speaker. We are not taking one step, 1 inch, towards fixing our broken immigration system—a huge drag on our economic growth. Many residents of our country that are living here illegally in the shadows of the underground economy simply want to work. They want to pay taxes. They want to raise their American kids here. They want to raise a family. They want to participate in the same American Dream that welcomed my great-grandparents when they came to this country.

The House Republicans' principles on immigration reform were an important step forward. I applaud them. They were promising. There was nothing in those principles that was mutually inconsistent with a Democratic desire to secure our borders, create a law enforcement environment where we know who is here, and make sure that we can have a compassionate approach to uniting families.

Nearly a year ago, the New Democrat Coalition Immigration Task Force released detailed principles, as well, on comprehensive immigration reform. I am proud to say that, last October, Democrats and Republicans joined together to introduce a bipartisan bill, H.R. 15, on comprehensive immigration reform. The bill creates jobs, reduces our deficit, secures our borders, and reflects our values as Americans. Yet, to date, the only immigration vote in this Congress that the House has had was a vote to defund the deferred action, or

DACA, program, which allows DREAMers to finally get to work and pay taxes to make our country stronger, and instead subjected DREAMers to deportation at taxpayer expense.

We can and we must do better, Madam Speaker, and this rule and this bill simply don't do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Weston, Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), a member of the Financial Services and Budget Committees. He is not just the author of the bill; he is an awesome and outstanding new Member of Congress.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

Madam Speaker, just to be clear, the bill that is before the House today is not a repeal bill of the CFPB. It is a modification, a reform package to the CFPB. So when my colleagues and friends across the aisle talk about how there will be no consumer protection, that is absolutely false. We just want to make sure the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau works better and is more responsive to the American people.

So I want to talk about a few of the things that this bill does. The first thing is it moves the Director of the CFPB over to a bipartisan commission of five. Now, I know my friends across the aisle have taken issue with this. However, when, under Dodd-Frank, the CFPB was originally envisioned by House Democrats and the former chairman Barney Frank, they didn't have a single director; they actually had a commission. When ELIZABETH WARREN, now Senator WARREN, envisioned this package, it wasn't a director; it was a commission. So now that my friends across the aisle take issue with the reform package that has a commission and not a director, it was their original idea. So let's not play partisan politics. Let's join together on points of agreement, and this is one of them.

Another concern, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is not responsive to Congress because it doesn't get its funding from Congress. It doesn't go through the appropriations process, which gives us great oversight here in the House. Their funding comes from the Federal Reserve. We think it is appropriate, when you have an agency that is so powerful and so unaccountable, that we give the elected Members of the American people power to say how much money they should have and how they should use it. We don't have that ability right now. And who on God's green Earth says that we should take power away from Congress and let them set their own budgets?

Going to the point of unaccountability, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau sets their own pay. Where in the free-market system does any employee tell the employer, This is what you are going to pay me; I am setting my own pay? That is what they do at the Consumer Financial

Protection Bureau. And all we say is we, the Congress, the elected representatives of the American people, we should set the pay of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

These are commonsense reforms that actually work for the American people, and, frankly, it will work for the CFPB to make them far more accountable.

□ 1300

The way this bill is set up, not the bill, the law, the way the law is set up, big banks on Wall Street, the very big banks that caused the financial crisis, they are actually able to go and have consumer financial protection rules reviewed by FSOC, and if FSOC thinks that the rule as petitioned by big banks can create systemic risk, the rule can be overturned. So big banks on Wall Street, they get a voice. They get to go: This is bad for us; overturn the rule.

If you come from rural Wisconsin, where we only have small community banks and credit unions, and you see one of our small financial institutions going to FSOC and saying, Hey, this rule is bad for us, the small banks and credit unions, please overturn the CFPB rule, they are going to laugh them out of FSOC. They don't have a voice. Small financial institutions, credit unions, and small banks don't have a choice to go to FSOC and have a ruled overturned by the CFPB.

The way the law was written and the way it has been implemented, they have given a big, loud voice to Wall Street banks but have shut out the small community banks and credit unions that are all over America, the very banks and institutions that lend money to our families, the very institutions that our small businesses on Main Street America, they go to and ask, Will you give me a loan so I can expand my business, maybe create an extra job or two in America? Those are the ones that have been shut out in the review process by the CFPB.

That doesn't work for consumers. That doesn't hurt consumers. That actually helps consumers, and that helps small town America.

I think one of the most important portions of this reform bill—and again, it is a reform bill; it is not a repeal bill—is what we do in regard to data. America has recently learned that the NSA is collecting phone data and information on them and keeping it. Now Americans have said, Listen, I am okay with AT&T or Verizon, whoever my phone company is, that they have my records. But the American people have never given the American government permission to take their phone records, and when they heard about it, they were outraged. They were outraged.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle are supportive of this expansive NSA, they are supportive of a big government taking information on Americans, but most Americans say, no, we don't want that kind of relationship between the American citi-

zenry and our government. Just like the NSA, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is collecting financial data on the American citizenry. They are collecting information on almost 1 billion credit cards. I will say that again. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is collecting data and information on almost 1 billion credit cards, and I would ask, Do you think they have asked permission of the American people to take their financial data? Absolutely not.

All we ask for in this reform bill is, if you want to take America's financial information and you say that you are here to protect the American citizenry, why don't you ask them? Ask if you can take it because I guarantee I know what they are going to say. They are going to say: No way. I am okay with my bank having this information, my credit union having this information, but I will be darned if I want some agency that says they are here to protect me to collect my financial information and my financial records.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 4 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, collecting information from the American people and their phone records is one thing, knowing who you call and when you call them. It is something far different, Mr. Speaker, when you see how they spend, where they spend, when they spend. If you want to know about America, take their financial records.

So all we say in this reform package is give them a choice. If you are here to protect them, ask them and say, We want to take your financial data information; are you okay with that?

If you are here to protect the consumer, why wouldn't you ask them? We mandate, we require the CFPB to make that ask, and there is an important reason behind it, because, as many folks in this body understand, in politics, you can get a good representation of the whole by sampling data, taking a small, small segment of the whole and getting a representation of the whole body.

That is what the CFPB could do if they wanted good market data on how things are working because I do think they need data, they need information, but that is not what they are doing. They are not sampling; they are taking almost a billion credit cards and information from those.

Mr. Speaker, they don't keep that information for a month, they don't want to keep it for a year; they want to keep your financial data for over 10 years. They want to keep your financial data for over 10 years. This is unacceptable, and for my colleagues across the aisle to say that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is only protecting consumers and there is no need for reform is a misstatement. There is plenty of room for reform in a very powerful, very unaccountable agency that is

accessing financial information from Americans in a way that they would find unacceptable.

So as we debate this rule, I hope that my friends across the aisle will see the pure-hearted, spirited effort that has been made to actually make the CFPB more effective and more accountable to the consumer.

Mr. POLIS. Before I further yield, I want to clarify: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is already prohibited from collecting personally identifiable information in the course of its market-monitoring responsibilities to make sure that American consumers are not taken advantage of.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, how quickly some forget. When Congress created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, we did so on behalf of every constituent unfairly defrauded during the financial crisis.

As a Cook County commissioner in 2007, I remember the financial crisis and the damage it did to Chicago's community. I remember when your credit card rate was about how well you could read fine print, not how regularly you paid your bill. I remember when auto loan financing could be based on a whim, not on your credit history, and when home buyers were pushed into loans no one could ever expect them to repay. I remember when it was open season on our veterans, when a whole industry was made out of defrauding our returning sons and daughters.

I also remember how many of my colleagues characterized the creation of the CFPB, calling it a bureaucratic behemoth that would devastate credit markets and make lending impossible. Yet here we are today, with a growing economy and a vibrant credit market. Only now, we do it with fair practices, protecting American consumers and treating them with dignity.

So I reject this attempt today to undermine the CFPB and the progress we have made. We simply cannot afford to return to the free-for-all that existed pre-crisis. H.R. 3193 is either a bad case of congressional amnesia or an attack on the most important financial reform of a generation. Either way, it is ill-sighted, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this effort.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3193. Congress created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau in response to a regulatory system that couldn't keep pace with the needs and the entities that it oversaw. The system was neither agile enough nor properly equipped for protecting consumers. The financial crisis exposed subprime lending practices that preyed on the most vulnerable consumers. It

uncovered obscene credit card contracts that put working families underwater. It found student loans that left our next generation more worried about their interest rates than about changing the world.

The list goes on.

The CFPB was our answer to these and prospective concerns. It is the only independent agency that is tasked with protecting consumers, our constituents. Free from the political melee, this watchdog focuses on making sure that markets are fair and players follow the rules.

The CFPB may not be perfect. Undoubtedly, missteps may occur. That is why the agency is subject to regular audits and why the government maintains ways of addressing flawed rules.

I am willing and eager to work with my colleagues to improve the CFPB to ensure that the American people are properly protected, but that is not what this bill does. This bill scraps the intention of the agency and re-exposes our families and our students to the same unfair and undue risks which necessitated the agency's creation in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to use this agency to help protect their constituents and to address their concerns. Remember your constituents when you vote today. I ask my colleagues to join in opposition to this measure and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

I am hearing the arguments from across the aisle about how the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is protecting consumers and protecting America from unfair practices and risks in the financial sector, but I would challenge my friends on the other side of the aisle to tell me how is that mission of protecting consumers diluted if we go from a single payer to a commission, which was originally their idea. How is this diluted if we go to a pay scale set by Congress and not by themselves? That doesn't impact their ability to work on consumer protection issues.

Why are consumer protection issues impacted if we give a similar and same voice to small community banks and credit unions, the same that they have given in this bill to big Wall Street banks? You are still protecting consumers. There is nothing in here that prohibits the CFPB's ability to do their job.

Finally, how are we hurting consumers by making sure that the CFPB asks them first before they get their information?

I guess I haven't heard those comments being made. I am hearing a lot of platitudes, a lot of comments at 30,000 feet that have nothing to do with the reform package that is here in the House today. I would enjoy hearing my

friends across the aisle talk about what is actually in the bill. It is not immigration; it is protecting consumers from the CFPB, and they are bringing up issues that aren't relevant.

One other issue I want to clarify, which is in regard to personally identifiable information. Two points: information has been very clearly made to us that, one, the CFPB is not following the directive of the statute; and, number two, the amount of information that the CFPB has, the quantity, the amount, it is easily reverse engineered, simply re-engineered to find out who the individual is. So if I have your ZIP Code plus four, your date of birth, your age, all this information, I might not have your name, but in an instant I can get your name because I have all the data I need to do just that. That is not protecting consumers.

If you want to have a debate about protecting consumers and having an agency that is accountable to Congress, I would love to have that debate, but when we bring up issues that aren't in the bill, it is pretty hard to have an honest and fair conversation about that.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. DUFFY is correct that immigration reform is not in the bill or the rule. It should be, but it is not. We have another motion for something that should be in the bill, but is not.

Mr. Speaker, last week we provided the House two opportunities to consider flood insurance reform, a bipartisan measure that now has almost 200 cosponsors, but unfortunately, it was denied. Not only does this bill not have immigration reform, it also does not have flood insurance reform.

Today, we are offering Members another chance to put aside party politics and do something that is important for the American people. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bill that would delay flood insurance premium hikes and provide relief to thousands of American families.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding me the time. I rise to encourage all of our colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, "no" on the previous question, and "no" on the underlying bill.

□ 1315

It has been 2 weeks since the Senate passed a bipartisan fix to the exorbitant rise in flood insurance rates across the country, but it has been particularly dismaying that in the past 2 weeks the GOP-controlled House has not taken up the Senate-passed bill or the House version to provide some relief for hardworking families across the country. Because there has been no action, we are asking today that all Members come together to vote "no" on the previous question so we can take up the flood insurance fix bill.

Many of us have been working in a bipartisan way for much longer than 2 weeks. For many months, we have had bipartisan proposals here in the House, but for some reason the GOP leadership has been resistant to bringing up this bipartisan solution.

I have offered an amendment on every piece of legislation passing through the Rules Committee since November for a flood insurance fix, but, again, the Republicans refused to make it in order. So, without any scheduling of a bill yet, we have to resort to going to the previous question.

If you take a step back, flood insurance reform was very well-intentioned. The reform bill was passed in 2012, intended to make the flood insurance trust fund solvent. Especially after Superstorm Sandy, the flood insurance trust fund that is the backstop to economic security for many families was insolvent, so we came together and passed a reform bill. The problem is it hasn't been implemented in the right way.

FEMA has actually implemented it in an irrational way. It is not affordable, and they have problems with mapping. What this does is it creates a very troublesome path to eventual solvency of the trust fund. People are not going to be able to pay into the trust fund like they should.

So what is happening? Families are facing exorbitant, unconscionable increases, depressed home values, an inability to buy or sell a home.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Here is another concern. You remember how difficult it was for the GOP House to actually provide emergency aid when Superstorm Sandy hit? 179 Republicans voted against the emergency aid. So that makes it even more important that we fix the flood insurance trust fund so that it is there for families who need it.

Last week, I pointed out that many are very skeptical that the Republicans in Congress will act in support of the middle class, in support of small businesses across America. Well, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to prove them wrong. Let's come together. Vote "no" on the previous question, and let's move the flood insurance fix.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to follow up on my good friend and colleague from Florida's comments on behalf of homeowners in south Florida and around the Nation who are trying to maintain affordable flood insurance coverage, and I urge the House leadership to bring the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act to a vote today.

Through the National Flood Insurance Program, millions of homeowners benefit from the ability to purchase affordable coverage, including thousands of south Florida families.

While I understand the need to keep the national flood program financially stable, we must do so while ensuring that these families can afford the coverage on their homes or they won't have coverage. Surging premiums destabilize our recovering housing market and they cause uncertainty for homeowners. The system cannot withstand these increases, and we must act to fix it.

I want to thank my colleagues in the Senate who, in a bipartisan way, passed this legislation, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who make up the 207 bipartisan cosponsors here in the House of Representatives who want to pass this bill into law. This is essential. We can't allow this to go on.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's homeowners can't afford to wait any longer. We need to defeat the previous question and vote on this bipartisan agreement today.

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

I thank the gentlewomen from Florida who bring up this issue again. We spoke about this issue last week, how it is actually a \$24 billion problem to the taxpayer. It is also equally a very difficult lift financially on the problems that it is creating to homeowners who live in flood areas.

As was noted last week, FEMA did not complete their job. We have known about this. This is not a new issue. The numerous Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, are trying very diligently to work on this and have been.

I want to acknowledge the work that has been put in by both these Members and others—including the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS—who sit on the Rules Committee, including the gentlemen and gentlewoman that sit on the Rules Committee from Florida. There are a total of 4 people out of 13 on the Rules Committee that live in Florida.

This is a nationwide problem wherever those people live, predominantly along coastal areas. We are working on it. But it is a \$24 billion problem that was not addressed by the Senate—not addressed. What we are trying to do is to work with the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, as well as the ranking member and the committee on getting an answer.

As I have stated to people numerous times, I do appreciate not only them keeping this issue in the forefront, but it is something that we must address in the Rules Committee. We intend to do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. I thank my colleagues from Florida for being on the floor, and I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that instead we can call up a bipartisan bill to alleviate the anxiety of millions of homeowners in flood-prone areas that their flood insurance premiums won't become simply unaffordable.

Should we do any less? Twice already we have had the votes in this House to bring up this bill, a companion of which passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote of 68–32 on January 30. There is no reason why this bill wouldn't pass overwhelmingly.

Once again, partisan politics has wedged itself into Congress' best intentions and the potential for achieving results. It is surprising that Republican Members from flood-prone districts have twice voted to block this bill from coming to the floor and to deprive their constituents of the assistance they need and the reassurance they deserve.

Sometimes party asks too much. Sometimes party asks for votes which will hurt your constituents. Rise above party and vote for your people. We should not repeat the overwhelming delay that occurred in supplying assistance in response to Superstorm Sandy. After that storm, the Republican leadership blocked Congress from taking action on emergency disaster funding for more than 90 days.

The continued obstruction of this bipartisan flood insurance bill is an unfortunate continuation of that same trend of letting partisanship get in the way of doing what is right. I know there are many of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle that want to do what is right for their constituents. Do not let party regularity dissuade you from doing the right thing.

I appeal to them, Mr. Speaker, to support their constituents, not their party, by setting partisanship aside, working with us to defeat the previous question, and allowing the House to vote on the Grimm-Waters legislation, a bipartisan piece of legislation that will make sure homeowners don't find themselves under water in more ways than one.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the previous question, what does that mean? Our constituents, Mr. Speaker, must be watching. What is Mr. HOYER talking about the previous question? What is all this talk about the previous question?

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

It is simply a vote by which it says that, if the previous question is not approved, we can offer the bipartisan legislation to give the relief that is so desperately needed now, not 90 days from now—now. So defeat this previous question.

And my Republican colleagues, if you care about your flood-ravaged and flood-risk constituents, vote “no” on the previous question.

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

I do appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Maryland coming down. Once again, I would tend to not just acknowledge what the gentleman is asking for, but I will speak to it.

The problem is that we have to worry about the solvency of the program. The program is some \$24 billion in the red right now. Not addressing its solvency just to give some new program life rather than fixing it correctly is where we politely disagree.

We believe that the ability we have in this Congress with this issue is to do it right where it is in the best interest of the people back home that I care about, that every Member of this body cares about, but also the financial integrity to the taxpayer. The national debt is a tremendous national embarrassment, and we are not going to just waive a \$24 billion that will become a \$50 billion problem. That is why we are trying to address it the way we are.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

I share my friend’s view that we need to be worried about the solvency of our Nation. We haven’t done such a good job at that. We are, by the way, going to have a bill on the floor pretty soon which won’t do much for that either, somewhat irresponsibly, in my view.

But the solvency that I am worried about right now is the guy who lives in a \$190,000 home with his family and has got a \$25,000 premium facing him yearly, annual premium. It is going to make him move out of his home. But the problem he is going to have is nobody is going to buy his home. We need to act.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding.

I want to recognize precisely what the gentleman from Maryland was talking about.

I would like to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so we can get to this important issue.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas’ understanding of this. But I want to talk about the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which is a bipartisan bill that would delay crippling premium increases that are affecting people throughout south Florida and throughout the country, and I want to talk about specific people.

Mr. Speaker, because of rising flood insurance rates, people are literally

walking away from their homes. I recently spoke to Derek and Robin Menard. They had an increase because the property owner of where they rent put it on their bill, and so they could not afford to remain in south Florida because it just got too expensive. After 9 years of calling south Florida home, they were forced to move away. They were forced to find jobs where they had moved to in Pennsylvania. They had to pull their little daughter, Millie, out of school, and she had to change friends and neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, this is not right. While I recognize the gentleman from Texas wants to solve this, we have a bipartisan bill that was passed out of the Senate. We can pass this out now and then get to working on this problem before we hurt more people, before we force more people to move away from their community, their friends, their loved ones, due to these exorbitant insurance rates.

So, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can pass a bipartisan bill that makes common sense and provides a solution and much-needed relief to policyholders.

□ 1330

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I don’t consider common sense or the right thing to do a \$24 billion irresponsibility, which is, once again, what the Democrat Party is pushing today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I have to acknowledge that I am a little disheartened that my friends across the aisle are encouraging the defeat of a rule that would bring a vote to protect consumers from having the CFPB collect financial data on them. I know my friends want to talk about flood insurance, and we are, no doubt, going to have that day to have that conversation, and it is important; but the bottom line today—the conversation today—is that we protect consumers from having their information collected on them just like the NSA is collecting phone records on Americans.

Let’s stand together. Let’s protect the middle class. Let’s protect small community banks and financial institutions. That is the vote today. Stand with us. Let’s move the ball forward for hardworking middle class families who want to keep their information and their data to themselves, and let’s move forward at a date soon to be acknowledged on flood insurance.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this great country of ours has weathered hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and fires. Now our families in Florida and across the Nation are confronting a man-made crisis, created unintentionally by past acts of this Congress.

An economic storm is brewing. Just ask my constituents, the Woodlaws, who live in a modest home in Lauderdale-By-The-Sea. They have paid off their mortgage and pay \$2,400 a year in flood insurance. Because of Congress’ past actions, they now face a \$12,000 bill for the same coverage that they cannot afford and are one flood away from financial disaster. Our constituents like the Woodlaws are facing skyrocketing jumps in flood insurance premiums unless we act now and take up the bipartisan Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, a storm is brewing.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first say and credit the chairman of the Rules Committee for having addressed this problem. He has spoken about it to me and to others. The same holds for my cochair of the Florida delegation, VERN BUCHANAN. All of us on the Florida delegation, minus one person, are supportive of this particular measure.

Here is an opportunity then for us to defeat the previous question and bring this matter up now. Enough already of continuing to discuss it. We have had ample time to deal with this problem. Don’t forget: Florida, among other States, is a donor-state in this business.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, what we can do is really do our work and pass comprehensive immigration reform to deal with the pain of so many in this country.

I do believe that we should defeat the previous question so that my constituents in Texas, along the coastline, can stop paying \$8,000 in flood insurance. It is absolutely absurd. A bill has passed. We are ready to go.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we discuss H.R. 3193, which wants to undo the corrections that we made to save America’s jobs, homes, life savings, and pensions when we reformed Wall Street. We believe in the capitalistic system. We just don’t believe in the abuse of the capitalistic system. The Consumer Protection Agency that has been put in place to help consumers with credit, credit cards, and other matters dealing with their financial needs is now being imploded by this legislation.

What do we have to say to speak for the people of the United States? This bill effectively defunds the CFPB.

What we want to do is to continue the consumer protection board, continue the leverage that it has given to protect consumers. I have actually heard from consumers who have said, Thank you; we now have a board that will hear our voices and that will express our concerns with what kind of treatment we are getting from financial agencies.

Let's move on behalf of the American people now, not on behalf of special interests.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been clear—and we actually have some bipartisan agreement here—about what this bill lacks. This bill does not do anything about hundreds of people sneaking across our southern border every day. It does nothing to reunite American families. It does nothing to end over 2 million deportations that have occurred during the Obama administration. It also does nothing to address the imminent hikes in flood insurance that many Americans face, including Americans in my home State of Colorado, if Congress fails to act.

So what does this bill do that has preempted Congress instead of dealing with illegal immigration? instead of dealing with flood insurance?

It creates additional Federal Government bureaucracy. It takes one person's job and turns it into a commission of five people who will endlessly debate things rather than decide things.

What if one is sick and what if there are four at work and it is deadlocked 2-2, and then the other one comes in and one is missing because the appointment is held up? Do we really need to have more government regulators in charge of this Federal agency, Mr. Speaker?

That is exactly what this bill does. One person can do the job.

How many companies in this country are run by a panel of five co-CEOs? I don't know of a single one. Why would we want to run a Federal agency like that?

The gamesmanship that we are doing in this House, while there are important issues like illegal immigration and flood insurance, is at a serious cost to the American people. The Senate passed a bipartisan immigration reform bill last June. The House hasn't dedicated a single minute of legislative floor time to an immigration reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with the 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can deal with one of these pressing issues that my

colleagues from Florida and other States have made a compelling case for here on the floor of the House today in order to address flood insurance. I also urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues from the Democratic Party for coming and for, once again, offering their ideas about flood insurance. That is not part of the bill. I would simply reply to them, as I have previously, that the Senate-offered compromise or the Senate-offered language spends \$900 million more but does not take care of the \$24 billion problem, which is red ink that the taxpayer would pick up, which harms the solvency of the program.

Why have a government program that runs in the red \$24 billion and then goes to \$50 billion?

That is not what we are going to do. We are going to come up with an answer in the House of Representatives, and I expect it to be done quickly.

Today, we are talking about the CFPB, and Americans have witnessed firsthand the negative effects of the CFPB. We have looked at how this administration and one agency cannot only gather records but literally control a marketplace. I believe that what you have heard today lends us to understand that a balance of the CFPB is what is important. We have brought five distinctly different bills to bear here, one of them saying that we should not have employees of the CFPB who are paid well outside of normal government standards, where even an intern who serves for this CFPB makes over \$51,000.

Mr. Speaker, what Republicans are trying to do is to balance the piece of legislation that passed this House with President Obama, with Speaker PELOSI, with Senator REID. We are trying to offer a balance to that on behalf of the consumer, on behalf of a legislative process where Members of Congress and the Financial Services Committee have an opportunity to work with any administration, not just with the Democrats, on what the policy of the CFPB would be. Secondly, we think it is wrong that 900 million financial records are taken without notice given to a consumer. We think that is not just an overreach; we think that is an abuse of power. When the government unilaterally has 900 million records, I would have to ask why.

So I support the rule. "Yes" on the rule. "Yes" on the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 475 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 5 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. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, 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 Financial Services. 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3370.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1400

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 25) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 25

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

Paragraph (6)(B) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control

Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) is amended by striking "and for fiscal year 2023" and by inserting " , for fiscal year 2023, and for fiscal year 2024".

SEC. 2. INAPPLICABILITY OF REDUCED ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER THE AGE OF 62 UNDER THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 WHO FIRST BECAME MEMBERS PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1401a(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 403(a) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67) and amended by section 10001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) MEMBERS COVERED.—This paragraph applies to a member or former member of an armed force who first became a member of a uniformed service on or after January 1, 2014."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on December 1, 2015, immediately after the coming into effect of section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and the amendments made by that section.

SEC. 3. TRANSITIONAL FUND FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE (SGR) REFORM.

Section 1898 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading to read as follows: "TRANSITIONAL FUND FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE (SGR) REFORM";

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish under this title a Transitional Fund for Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) Reform (in this section referred to as the 'Fund') which shall be available to the Secretary to provide funds to pay for physicians' services under part B to supplement the conversion factor under section 1848(d) for 2017 if the conversion factor for 2017 is less than conversion factor for 2013."

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "during—" and all that follows and inserting "during or after 2017, \$2,300,000,000."; and

(4) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "from the Federal" and all that follows and inserting "from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Washington once said:

The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive veterans of earlier wars were appreciated by our Nation.

There is no doubt that we appreciate the service and sacrifice of each generation of veterans, from our original veterans, patriots, to those who landed at Normandy during World War II, to present. We as Americans and as lawmakers are forever in debt to the dedication of our military men and women who bore the pain of battle, physically and emotionally.

While we stand here in this Chamber each day and pledge our allegiance to the American flag that they defend, while we are able to act as a democratic body freely elected by the people thanks to their sacrifices, sometimes simple appreciation isn't enough. We have a chance today to treat our veterans with the honor they deserve by ensuring that they are fully compensated for their service during retirement, while also addressing other concerns facing our Nation.

Today we will take up the legislation under consideration to ensure that all servicemen and -women who are enlisted prior to January 1 of this year will receive the full cost of living adjustments in retirement before and after the age of 62. Furthermore, this bill also ensures our seniors will have access to the health care services they depend on through Medicare.

For too long, the relationship between doctor and patient has been strained by the confusion and instability of a well-intentioned but unaddressed problem with the Medicare program itself, known as the sustainable growth rate or SGR. A component of this legislation works to ensure that seniors are able to receive the care they depend on from the physicians who know them, while also guaranteeing that those physicians are fairly compensated by Medicare through a fund until long-term reform of the SGR is achieved this spring. In doing so, this legislation provides much-needed stability for the medical community by ensuring that physicians have the predictability in billing they need to further their practice and to focus on their patients.

By taking up and passing this legislation in bipartisan fashion, we can address areas of critical concern, while working together to make sure we are also being fiscally responsible. This legislation provides a necessary offset that is in the same vein of the bipartisan budget agreement this Chamber passed just over a month ago.

The American people expect us to make the tough decisions that help them in their daily lives, be it a military veteran looking to secure his retirement after a lifetime of duty and commitment, to the senior making sure their next doctor's visit is free from any undue stress, or ensuring that physicians can further their passion of serving their community.

This legislation provides a path forward for our Nation and this body in addressing their concerns. I urge full bipartisan support of this legislation

and encourage the whole House to consider the important needs that the bill addresses.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are a number of problems with this piece of legislation. One of the biggest ones is just the process of it. This has been dropped on us at the absolute last minute. In fact, on a bill that has profound impacts on the budget in a number of different areas, we just, moments ago, received a broad outline of a score of how it is going to impact that budget—moments ago. We did not have time to consider this legislation adequately to figure out what impact it was going to have on the budget, but there are a couple of things we do know about it that creates a major problem.

Yes, in the short-term, this pleases two constituency groups. It pleases veterans, and it pleases doctors by giving them the money that they want. But what was not mentioned in the speech talking about this bill in favor of it is how it is paid for. It is paid for by adding another year to sequestration.

Now, there are a couple of interesting things about this. First of all, that is 8 years from now. We have heard nothing but, from the other side of the aisle, about how government is spending too much money, about how the deficit and the debt are out of control, and yet here we have up-front money being spent on the promise that 8 years from now we will cover those costs. And what is worse, 8 years from now, the way we are going to cover those costs is through sequestration, across-the-board cuts that will cut other entitlement, other mandatory spending programs. So we are really simply robbing one group of deserving people to pay another group of deserving people. That is hardly responsible and hardly helpful.

There are a couple of other specific aspects of this that I want to mention from the Department of Defense standpoint, focusing now just on the portion that addresses the cost of living reduction.

I want to make sure we understand what exactly that cost of living reduction was. In the military, if you serve 20 years, you can retire at that point with your full pension, which is basically half of your pay at that point. This bill took, for those people between the ages of 42 and 62, working age, and reduced their COLA by 1 percent. It didn't reduce the pension. It reduced how much that pension would be increased by each year by 1 percent.

Now, I don't deny that that is a hit and a cost, but what is it offsetting?

The Pentagon has to pay this cost, or at least a portion of this cost. They have to pay—the old bill, and again, I am just getting the new score. But in the old bill, it was roughly \$700 million a year that DOD had to take out of

their operating budget and put in to paying for this pension. So, by doing this, we are taking roughly \$700 million a year out of the Pentagon budget.

What does that mean? What it means is a further blow to readiness. Now, Republican and Democratic members of the Armed Services Committee have rightly screamed that we are cutting readiness to the point where we are not training our forces to prepare to fight the fight that we ask them to fight.

Now, the gentleman made an excellent point that, basically, what is going to make people want to sign up for the military? And he mentioned making sure that we take care of our veterans. I certainly think that is an issue. And I will tell you, for the last 10 years we have increased the GI Bill. We have increased pay every single year. We have made dramatic increases in combat pay. I applaud this Chamber for the bipartisan way in which they have taken care of our military veterans. But one other major issue that is going to determine whether or not people want to join the military and stay in it is whether or not we train them and prepare them for the fight we are going to ask them to do. And what the consequences of this are going to be is it is another blow to that.

If you are a pilot, you will not have enough fuel or enough fixed equipment to train as often as you need to. If you are an infantryman, you will not have the bullets to practice as much as you need to. Doing this creates the one thing that everyone has said we don't want, and that is a hollow force, a force that exists but is not trained to fight the fight that we ask them to do.

In fact, there is a great and compelling story told by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in an argument for why readiness is important, and that was the Korean war, and those were the troops that we sent over in the initial effort to stop the North Koreans. Those troops were not trained, and men died because they were not trained and they were not prepared for a battle that we sent them into.

So we are robbing one portion of the Pentagon budget to pay another, and I think we are robbing precisely the portion that we can least afford to rob. And I don't think there is anything noble about standing up and taking money away from the readiness that is going to train our troops to fight fights that we, as politicians, send them to fight.

Now, I will say, on the SGR fix and the doc fix, that is a short-term problem, and we need to deal with it. Step aside. I would be very, very happy to pay for that, and I support that very strongly.

I do not like the pay-for. Personally, I would be more than willing to raise taxes or cut spending in other places other than to, once again, go back to the sequester option and also to kick it out 8 years from now.

This is an irresponsible bill that approaches very, very real problems. But

make no mistake about it. You can stand up and talk about what you are paying for, whom you are giving the money to, but I do hope people will address whom you are taking the money from. You are taking the money from other recipients of mandatory spending by doing sequester again. And as importantly, you are taking the money away from the readiness accounts that will train our troops so that they are able to fight, so that we will hopefully not do the one thing that I think would be utterly unconscionable, and that is to send troops to a battle that we have not prepared them for.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), though she is in support of the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the manager of this legislation.

I thank our chairman, our ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, for his consistent diligence on acting on behalf of the men and women in the United States military, and certainly those who have already served.

I, for one, will associate myself with the disappointment of the offset that has been offered in this legislation. No one likes sequester.

I will add an additional point of contention is that this Nation is not broke. Economists have said over and over again that we are not broke. We can fully fund and should fund our military as it relates to preparedness. That is part of protecting the homeland, which I serve on the Homeland Security Committee.

□ 1415

Then of course we all have tried to deliberate on what we can do best for our doctors under what we call the SGR, or the doctor fix. Let me just say this as I rise to support this legislation, because I do come from Texas, and I do interact with veterans across the Nation and others.

As painful as the extending out of the sequester to 2024 was, I just want to offer this thought. First of all, as I have argued—and I hope maybe the light will come on that we are not broke, that we will rid ourselves of the sequester and begin to budget fully to provide investment in our people.

So, the reason for advocating is, as I go home every weekend, and throughout the week when I am in the district I will run into military personnel and/or veterans, to speak about the impact that this would have on them, their families. Certainly I believe that this was one that needs to be corrected, and I would like to see us working fairly across the board, that we find a way to respond to the high numbers that this costs, and as well to work with those with optional ideas. I hope before 2024

we have no sequester. As my good friend has indicated, it is a poor way of managing our budget.

Let me also say, because of the many low-income areas and the physicians that I have interacted with, who indicate how difficult it is to serve my low-income patients or my patients that are elderly, that the doctor fix is crucial for the 18th Congressional District in providing health care for those who are in need, particularly those who are elderly.

So, as we look askance at how this has been formulated—and I know that it is one that has come to us—but I would hope that we would do this fix this time, Mr. Speaker, and then work to undo the offset so that we can help seniors and doctors.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so if the gentleman has no further speakers I will close.

I yield myself the balance of my time just really to drive home one point on the Armed Services' side of the equation, and that is the impact that personnel costs are having on the Department of Defense. They are an increasing, growing part of our defense budget in large part because we have been very, very generous with people who serve in the military in terms of pay, benefits, and retirement, but as everyone who serves on the Armed Services Committee knows, increasing personnel costs squeezes out other portions of the budget.

I have talked a lot about readiness. I think that is incredibly important, but also procurement, making sure that the men and women who serve in the military have the equipment that they need to fight the fight. We can have a great military where everyone is very well paid, the benefits go on forever, but they don't have the equipment or the training necessary to fight.

I will tell you, every single expert, right, left, middle, wherever, who studies this question, we just had four prominent think-tanks spanning that spectrum come out with a study on the future of the Department of Defense budget. Every single one of those experts has said that if we do nothing to rein in personnel costs, that is precisely the force that we will have; it will be hollow. It will not have the equipment, and it will not have the training to do what it is that we ask them to do.

Now, we may not think that the 1 percent cut that was done here in the COLA is the best way to go. I can entertain that argument. I certainly understand veterans who were promised this, who expect to receive it. If it is not that, what is it? What is on the table? All we have done in this Chamber is said no, no, no to every effort the Department of Defense has put out there to try to rein in this spending, to try to rein in this spending, as I said,

so that we can have a military that lives up to what we want it to live up to. This is a very, very real issue.

Once again, we are punting it and completely ignoring it, completely unaddressed by supporters of this bill. They are just addressing this narrow area, making the broader problem worse.

As I said in the beginning, also, once again, adding sequester back in the lexicon for another year. This is not a solution to any problem, other than a series of political ones. We have just too many difficult choices to make to simply rely on politics with every bill that we bring up here. We have got to make some hard choices. This bill doesn't do it. It punts once again in every conceivable way. It simply makes the problems worse.

I know it is not going to happen, but I would nonetheless urge this body to oppose this bill and make some responsible choices, actually make choices as to what to do with the budget instead of continually punting on every difficult decision that comes before us. I assure you, this will not be the last one by any stretch of the imagination.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is always responsible to keep promises made to our Nation's veterans. What is before the House today is an extension of current policy that was passed in overwhelming bipartisan fashion right here in this Chamber less than 2 months ago.

In addition, it does protect the promises that the Nation has made to our veterans. So, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill, to care for those who have borne the battle, and to send that message to all who can hear it.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, due to heavy snow in Oregon, and the associated cancellation of flights out of the State, I am unable to be present for the vote on S. 25. I plan to vote in favor of S. 25. I voted against the Murray-Ryan Budget that put in place the unacceptable cuts to military retirement cost of living adjustments (COLAs). These cuts would have reduced annual COLA for military retirees by 1 percent every year until the service member turns 62. This could be as much as an \$83,000 cut over the lifetime of a typical enlisted member who retires after 20 years of service. It is unconscionable that Congress would try to balance the budget on the backs of our military retirees, and I am glad that S. 25 prevents COLA cuts from going into place for all current military retirees and future retirees who are currently serving.

I am also pleased that S. 25 sets aside some funding for preventing Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) cuts to Medicare and TRICARE reimbursements for doctors. I voted against the creation of the faulty SGR formula in 1997 and have fought to fix it ever since. Unfortunately, instead of fixing the SGR Congress has delayed it year after year. This

means that if Congress fails to act by March of this year, doctors would face a cut of approximately 20% in their Medicare and TRICARE reimbursements. This is not acceptable. I am hopeful that Congress will use the funds set aside by S. 25 to help pay for a permanent fix to the SGR rather than another delay.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, while I support the effort to fix the cut to veterans' pensions included in S. 25, I am staunchly opposed to extending sequestration cuts to Medicare. Given that the cut to veterans' pensions is due to occur many years before the sequestration extension, I am supporting this bill, with the hope that Congress will undo this additional extension of sequestration cuts to Medicare. Again, let me state clearly: I oppose extending sequestration cuts to Medicare, and I will be working to convince the Senate to find an alternative way to fund the fix to veterans' pensions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 25, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 475;

Adopting House Resolution 475, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing S. 25.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3193, CONSUMER FINANCIAL FREEDOM AND WASHINGTON ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for consideration of the bill (3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by

the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from February 13, 2014, through February 24, 2014; and for other purposes, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt	Gosar	Pastor (AZ)
Amodei	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Campbell	Israel	Rush
Cárdenas	Latham	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lewis	

□ 1453

Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. GALLEGO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 58, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 193, answered “present” 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—223

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

NOES—193

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

Capuano Honda
 Carney Horsford
 Carson (IN) Hoyer
 Cartwright Huelskamp
 Castor (FL) Huffman
 Castro (TX) Jackson Lee
 Chu Jeffries
 Cicilline Johnson (GA)
 Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke (NY) Jones
 Clay Kaptur
 Cleaver Keating
 Clyburn Kelly (IL)
 Cohen Kennedy
 Connolly Kildee
 Conyers Kilmier
 Cooper Kind
 Costa Kirkpatrick
 Courtney Kuster
 Crowley Langevin
 Cuellar Larsen (WA)
 Cummings Larson (CT)
 Davis (CA) Lee (CA)
 Davis, Danny Levin
 DeGette Lipinski
 Delaney Loeb sack
 DeLauro Lofgren
 DelBene Lowenthal
 Deutch Lowey
 Dingell Lujan Grisham
 Doggett (NM)
 Doyle Luján, Ben Ray
 Duckworth (NM)
 Edwards Lynch
 Ellison Maffei
 Engel Maloney,
 Enyart Carolyn
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean
 Esty Matheson
 Farr Matsui
 Fattah McCarthy (NY)
 Foster McCollum
 Frankel (FL) McDermott
 Fudge McGovern
 Gabbard McIntyre
 Gallego McNerney
 Garamendi Meeks
 Garcia Meng
 Grayson Michaud
 Green, Al Miller, George
 Green, Gene Moore
 Grijalva Moran
 Gutiérrez Murphy (FL)
 Hahn Nadler
 Hanabusa Napolitano
 Hastings (FL) Neal
 Heck (WA) Negrete McLeod
 Higgins Nolan
 Himes O'Rourke
 Holt Owens

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Brooks (AL)

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt Gosar Pastor (AZ)
 Amodei Hinojosa Pingree (ME)
 Campbell Israel Rush
 Cárdenas Latham Scott, David
 DeFazio Lewis

□ 1501

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 59, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

EXTENSION OF DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 25) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Elec-

tric Service District, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—326

Amash Diaz-Balart Kildee
 Andrews Dingell Kilmier
 Bachmann Doggett Kind
 Bachus Duckworth King (IA)
 Barber Duffy King (NY)
 Barletta Duncan (SC) Kingston
 Barr Duncan (TN) Kirkpatrick
 Barrow (GA) Ellmers Kline
 Beatty Enyart Kuster
 Benishek Eshoo Labrador
 Bentivolio Esty LaMalfa
 Bera (CA) Farenthold Lamborn
 Bilirakis Farr Lance
 Bishop (GA) Fincher Langevin
 Bishop (NY) Fitzpatrick Lankford
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann Latta
 Black Fleming Lipinski
 Blackburn Flores LoBiondo
 Bonamici Forbes Loeb sack
 Boustany Fortenberry Lofgren
 Brady (TX) Foster Long
 Braley (IA) Foxx Lowenthal
 Bridenstine Franks (AZ) Lucas
 Brooks (AL) Gabbard Luetkemeyer
 Brooks (IN) Gallego Lujan Grisham
 Broun (GA) Garamendi (NM)
 Brown (FL) Garcia Lummis
 Brownley (CA) Gardner Lynch
 Buchanan Garrett Maffei
 Buchson Gerlach Maffei
 Burgess Gibbs Maloney,
 Bustos Gibson Carolyn
 Butterfield Gingrey (GA) Maloney, Sean
 Byrne Gohmert Marchant
 Calvert Goodlatte Marino
 Camp Gowdy Massie
 Cantor Granger Matheson
 Capito Graves (GA) McAllister
 Capps Graves (MO) McCarthy (CA)
 Capuano Green, Al McCarthy (NY)
 Carney Green, Gene McCaul
 Carson (IN) Griffin (AR) McClintock
 Carter Griffith (VA) McHenry
 Cassidy Grimm McIntyre
 Castor (FL) Guthrie McKeon
 Castro (TX) Gutiérrez McKinley
 Chabot Hall McKinnley
 Chaffetz Hanna McMorris
 Chu Harper Rodgers
 Cicilline Harris Meadows
 Clark (MA) Hartzler Messer
 Cleaver Hastings (FL) Mica
 Coble Hastings (WA) Michaud
 Coffman Heck (WA) Miller (FL)
 Cohen Hensarling Miller (MI)
 Cole Herrera Beutler Miller, Gary
 Collins (NY) Moore
 Conaway Higgins Mullin
 Connolly Himes Murphy (FL)
 Cook Holding Murphy (PA)
 Cooper Horsford Neal
 Costa Hudson Neugebauer
 Cotton Huizenga (MI) Noem
 Courtney Hultgren Nunes
 Cramer Hunter Nunnelee
 Crawford Hurt O'Rourke
 Crenshaw Issa Olson
 Cuellar Jackson Lee Owens
 Culberson Jenkins Palazzo
 Daines Johnson (GA) Pascarell
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH) Paulsen
 Delaney Johnson, Sam Pearce
 DelBene Jordan Perlmutter
 Denham Joyce Perry
 Dent Keating Peters (CA)
 DeSantis Kelly (PA) Peters (MI)
 Deutch Kennedy Peterson

Petri Ryan (OH) Tipton
 Pittenger Salmon Titus
 Pitts Sarbanes Tsongas
 Poe (TX) Scalise Turner
 Polis Schiff Upton
 Pompeo Schneider Valadao
 Posey Scott (VA) Van Hollen
 Price (GA) Scott, Austin Vargas
 Price (NC) Sensenbrenner Veasey
 Quigley Sessions Vela
 Rahall Sewell (AL) Wagner
 Rangel Shea-Porter Walberg
 Reed Sherman Walden
 Reichert Shuster Walorski
 Renacci Simpson Walz
 Rice (SC) Sinema Wasserman
 Richmond Sires Schultz
 Rigell Smith (MO) Weber (TX)
 Roby Smith (NE) Webster (FL)
 Roe (TN) Smith (NJ) Welch
 Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Weststrup
 Rogers (KY) Southerland Westmoreland
 Rogers (MI) Stewart Whitfield
 Rohrabacher Stivers Williams
 Rooney Stockman Wilson (SC)
 Ros-Lehtinen Swalwell (CA) Wittman
 Roskam Takano Womack
 Ross Terry Woodall
 Rothfus Thompson (MS) Yarmuth
 Royce Thompson (PA) Yoder
 Ruiz Thornberry Yoho
 Runyan Tiberi Young (AK)
 Ruppertsberger Tierney Young (IN)

NAYS—90

Barton Honda Pallone
 Bass Hoyer Payne
 Becerra Huelskamp Pelosi
 Blumenauer Huffman Pocan
 Brady (PA) Jeffries Ribble
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Rokita
 Clarke (NY) Jones Roybal-Allard
 Clay Kaptur Ryan (WI)
 Clyburn Kelly (IL) Sánchez, Linda
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger (IL) T.
 Conyers Larsen (WA) Sanford
 Crowley Larson (CT) Schakowsky
 Cummings Lee (CA) Schock
 Davis (CA) Levin Schrader
 Davis, Danny Luján, Ben Ray Schwartz
 DeGette (NM) Schweikert
 DeLauro Matsui Serrano
 DesJarlais McCollum Shimkus
 Doyle McDermott Slaughter
 Edwards McGovern Smith (WA)
 Ellison McNerney Smith (WA)
 Engel Meehan Speier
 Fattah Meeks Stutzman
 Frankel (FL) Meng Thompson (CA)
 Fudge Miller, George Tonko
 Grayson Moran Velázquez
 Grijalva Mulvaney Visclosky
 Hahn Nadler Waters
 Hanabusa Napolitano Waxman
 Heck (NV) Negrete McLeod Wilson (FL)
 Holt Nugent Wolf

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Pastor (AZ)
 Amodei Gosar Pingree (ME)
 Campbell Israel Rush
 Cárdenas Latham Scott, David
 DeFazio Lewis

□ 1509

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2014.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, Due to my recent appointment to the House Judiciary Committee, I hereby resign from the House Committee on the Budget.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. CICILLINE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATION RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR AIRMEN AND
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS RE-
LATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3578) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3578

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

**SECTION 1. MEDICAL CERTIFICATION RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR AIRMEN AND AIR TRAF-
FIC CONTROLLERS RELATING TO
SLEEP DISORDERS.**

[(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may implement or enforce a requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment (including consideration of all possible treatment alternatives) of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder only if the requirement is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding.

[(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a requirement that was in force before November 1, 2013.

[(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

[(1) AIRMAN.—The term “airman” has the meaning given that term in section 40102(a) of title 49, United States Code.

[(2) AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER.—The term “air traffic controller” means a civilian employee of the Department of Transportation described in section 2109 of title 5, United States Code.

[(3) SLEEP DISORDER.—The term “sleep disorder” includes obstructive sleep apnea.]

**SECTION 1. MEDICAL CERTIFICATION RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR AIRMEN AND AIR TRAF-
FIC CONTROLLERS RELATING TO
SLEEP DISORDERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may, consistent with accepted medical standards and practices, implement or enforce a requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment (including consideration of all possible treatment alternatives) of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder—

(1) in the case of an airman, only if the requirement is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding; and

(2) in the case of an air traffic controller, only if the Federal Aviation Administration meets its obligations pursuant to chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a requirement that was in force before November 1, 2013.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) AIRMAN.—The term “airman” has the meaning given that term in section 40102(a) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER.—The term “air traffic controller” means a civilian employee of the Department of Transportation described in section 2109 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) SLEEP DISORDER.—The term “sleep disorder” includes obstructive sleep apnea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3578.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3578.

Let me begin by thanking some of my colleagues—first and foremost, Congressman LARSEN, also Congressmen BUCHSHON, LIPINSKI, and GRAVES—for their help and support in introducing this very important bill.

Before I explain the bill, I would like to enter into the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 3578.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3578 addresses the medical certification process for pilots and air traffic controllers as it relates only to sleep disorders.

Currently, pilots and controllers are required to be medically certificated by the FAA at varying intervals. The duration, as well as the type of medical certification, depends on the type of activity they are seeking to perform—airline pilot, private pilot, et cetera—and all other factors, such as age. Regardless, pilots and controllers undergo a thorough medical review process, and the FAA ultimately decides whether or not to issue them a medical certification. Further, there are no certain medical conditions that the FAA automatically deems as disqualifying. Currently, pilots with one or more of those conditions, including sleep apnea, are required to seek a special certificate, which is issued at the sole discretion of the FAA and only if the applicants can prove they will not endanger public safety. Neither process is perfect, but it is a process that works.

In November of 2013, the FAA announced a proposal to significantly and arbitrarily modify the medical require-

ments for airmen who might be at risk of having a sleep disorder, such as sleep apnea, even in the absence of any clinical evidence. The FAA’s proposal would effectively assume overweight pilots have a sleep disorder based solely on their body mass index and would require them to prove otherwise at their own expense. It is a scenario of being guilty before proven innocent. The potential cost to these pilots could be thousands of dollars.

The FAA proposal, announced without any input from the stakeholders, is neither reasonable nor effective. However, health issues can arise unexpectedly, which is why I have always supported reasonable, effective, and proactive efforts to improve aviation safety; but the FAA’s action related to sleep disorders was carried out behind closed doors, with no input from stakeholders, and based upon controversial assumptions. While I applaud the FAA for seeking stakeholder input recently, it is too little, too late.

Safety is my top priority as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee. That is why the legislation we are considering today, H.R. 3578, does not prohibit the FAA from implementing new medical certification requirements for sleep disorders, but it does require the FAA, in the case of pilots, to conduct an open rulemaking process and, in the case of air traffic controllers, to use a process established under current Federal employment law.

Finally, it is important to note that H.R. 3578 does not change the FAA’s medical certification process or otherwise prevent the agency from responding to new medical issues in a timely manner. This legislation applies only to proposed changes to the medical certification process for sleep disorders. In addition, the rulemaking process required by this legislation does not apply to the enforcement of requirements providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of pilots and controllers for sleep disorders in force prior to November 1, 2013.

H.R. 3578 is a bipartisan bill that is supported by a wide range of stakeholders, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

H.R. 3578

Industry Supporters:

Air Line Pilots Association

Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association

Airlines for America

Allied Pilots Association

Coalition of Airline Pilots Association

Experimental Aircraft Association

Federal Aviation Administration Managers Association

General Aviation Manufacturers Association

Helicopter Association International

National Agricultural Aviation Association

National Air Traffic Controllers Association

National Air Transportation Association

National Business Aviation Association

NetJets Association of Shared Aircraft Pilots

Recreational Aviation Foundation
Southwest Airlines Pilots Association

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3578.

I want to thank Chairman LOBIONDO for bringing this issue to the attention of the committee and for working hard to bring it to the floor so quickly.

This bill would require the Federal Aviation Administration to go through a rulemaking process if it chooses to propose and implement new pilot medical certification requirements for sleep apnea.

Under current law, in order for a pilot to be certificated, every pilot is screened by an aviation medical examiner to ensure he is safe and capable of piloting an aircraft. If a pilot is diagnosed with obstructive sleep apnea or with any other disqualifying medical condition, that pilot must obtain a "special issuance" medical certificate from the FAA to keep flying.

Last November, the FAA abruptly announced changes to the medical certification process as it pertains only to sleep apnea. The new policy would require all airmen with a body mass index, or BMI, of 40 or more to undergo new testing and evaluation requirements for obstructive sleep apnea in order to maintain their medical certificates.

General aviation groups and pilot unions have raised concerns that the FAA's proposed policy changes could impose significant undue costs on thousands of airmen without an adequate opportunity for the public to comment on the relative safety merits of these new requirements.

H.R. 3578 would ensure transparency and would require the FAA to initiate a rulemaking if it chooses to implement a new pilot medical certification requirement for sleep apnea. This bill would not prohibit the FAA from implementing new medical certification requirements, but the rulemaking process will provide the opportunity for all interested parties to comment on any proposed changes. So I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3578.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), who has been a big help on this issue.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a general aviation pilot myself, I was shocked when the FAA Air Surgeon, Dr. Fred Tilton, announced a forthcoming guidance to require additional testing for pilots, as was mentioned, with the arbitrary numbers of a BMI of 40 and a neck size of 17 inches. Not only did he indicate in December that the FAA would move forward with this new guidance on sleep apnea, but that it would challenge Congress by saying:

If Congress passes a law to force industry consultation, we will be compliant; but until they do so, we will move forward with our guidance.

Today, Congress is acting against the FAA's egregious assumption that these pilots pose a safety risk if untreated. When it comes to the general aviation community's safety record, there is simply no data or evidence to suggest that sleep apnea—or any other medical issue for that matter—is the cause behind general aviation accidents. In fact, most of these accidents happen as a result of weather. GA pilots know that, every time they get into a plane, they are taking their own lives into their hands as well as the lives of others. So, naturally, pilots are not going to knowingly put themselves into an unsafe situation.

What is so absurd about this process is just the medical certification in general. The FAA requires GA pilots—or any pilot for that matter—to go through certification every 2 years for a third-class medical and certification every year for a first- or a second-class medical, but there is nothing in that process that guarantees a pilot's fitness to fly within that time period. It is up to the pilot to determine his fitness to fly himself or herself, and he or she knows best.

General aviation supports 1.2 million jobs, and it contributes \$150 billion annually to the GDP. There are 223,000 general aviation aircraft out there serving 19,000 small and regional airports. It accounts for 27 million flight-hours, and it serves 166 million passengers every year. It is more important than most people realize, and adding burdensome regulations like the FAA is proposing on sleep apnea do nothing but discourage further participation, at least in general aviation.

This rule would also have some dramatic effects on commercial aviation, which is also facing a pilot shortage in and of itself. Based on these arbitrary benchmarks, a pilot is going to be required, as was pointed out, to get further examinations and sleep tests, which is going to slow the process down that much more.

The outcry from the pilot community, both in general aviation and in commercial, has led to the introduction of this bill, H.R. 3578. It requires the FAA to go through the normal rulemaking process, which allows for public comment and requires them to analyze the impact of the regulation. The FAA should follow the rules, plain and simple. That is all we are asking. They should listen to pilots and take their viewpoints into account.

I want to thank Chairman LOBIONDO and all of the others for sponsoring this piece of legislation and for joining me to make sure the FAA goes through the proper channels in issuing this regulation.

Similar legislation addressing sleep apnea for truckers was passed by both the House and Senate last fall, and it was signed by the President. I hope my House colleagues will join me in supporting this similarly commonsense piece of legislation.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3578, which would require the FAA to conduct a formal rulemaking process for sleep apnea certifications for pilots and air traffic controllers.

As a member of both the Small Business Committee and the Transportation Committee and as a pilot, I am deeply concerned that complex Federal regulations and bureaucracy are hurting America's aviation industry.

When deemed absolutely necessary, new FAA rules should follow a transparent and open process that includes strong oversight and input from all stakeholders. The proposed sleep apnea regulation was a broad administration guidance with no oversight or input. Furthermore, this is yet another example of the administration's regulating in search of a problem.

According to the Civil Aviation Medical Association, there is no scientific evidence that sleep apnea has compromised aviation safety. According to yesterday's Washington Post, the number of small planes flying across this country has fallen by nearly 200,000 since 1980. The production of single-engine airplanes has fallen twentyfold to below 700 per year.

We need to ensure that any regulations help, not hinder, the aviation industry in growing and prospering. Across the Nation, nearly 1.2 million workers depend on the general aviation industry. This is especially true in rural upstate New York. I encourage the FAA to ensure that we promote safety in a way that is consistent with growing our vital aviation industry and so that it makes sense in the real world.

H.R. 3578 would require the FAA to follow a proven and transparent process when issuing rules, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON). I thank him for his help on this issue.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill.

Less than 6 months ago, the House passed my bill, which requires the Department of Transportation to address the issue of sleep apnea for truck drivers through a rule and not guidance, potentially saving the industry \$1 billion. Unfortunately, our Nation's pilots and air traffic controllers are facing a similar arbitrary guidance issued by

the FAA, and we have brought a bill to the floor to protect them.

As a doctor, I know firsthand that sleeping disorders are incredibly serious and can be very dangerous. However, I also know that you can't diagnose any patient by a set of arbitrary guidelines and stereotypes. Like any major disease, it can only be diagnosed through proper testing and conversation with a doctor. Issuing guidance based on nonmedical factors on this issue for pilots and air traffic controllers will cause doctors to order unnecessary tests, driving up the costs of health care and potentially affecting our Nation's airline travelers.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more speakers, and I am prepared to close when Mr. LARSEN is finished.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to again ask my colleagues to support this legislation. It is bipartisan. We have worked hard to get it here quickly, and we appreciate people supporting this.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again thank my colleague Mr. LARSEN and colleagues who were interested in this issue.

I would like to reiterate that this bill is about transparency and about working with stakeholders, two areas in which the Federal Government desperately needs to improve. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3578, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1530

SMALL CAP LIQUIDITY REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3448) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for an op-

tional pilot program allowing certain emerging growth companies to increase the tick sizes of their stocks, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3448

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 "Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k-1(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

"(A) QUOTING INCREMENT.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of a covered emerging growth company shall be quoted using—

"(i) a minimum increment of \$0.05; or

"(ii) if, not later than 60 days after such date of enactment, the company so elects in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

"(I) a minimum increment of \$0.10; or

"(II) the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(B) TRADING INCREMENT.—In the case of a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph, the Commission shall determine the increment at which the securities of such company are traded.

"(C) FUTURE RIGHT TO OPT OUT OR CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—At any time beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph may elect in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

"(I) for the securities of such company to be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph; or

"(II) to change the minimum increment at which the securities of such company are quoted from \$0.05 to \$0.10 or from \$0.10 to \$0.05.

"(ii) WHEN ELECTION EFFECTIVE.—An election under this subparagraph shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after such election is made.

"(iii) SINGLE ELECTION TO CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—A covered emerging growth company may not make more than one election under clause (i)(II).

"(D) MANNER OF ELECTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—An election is made in the manner described in this subparagraph by informing the Commission of such election.

"(ii) NOTIFICATION OF EXCHANGES AND OTHER TRADING VENUES.—Upon being informed of an election under clause (i), the Commission shall notify each exchange or other trading venue where the securities of the covered emerging growth company are quoted or traded.

"(E) ISSUERS CEASING TO BE COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—If an issuer the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment

of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph ceases to be a covered emerging growth company, the securities of such issuer shall be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may by regulation, as the Commission considers appropriate, specify any circumstances under which an issuer shall continue to be considered a covered emerging growth company for purposes of this paragraph after the issuer ceases to meet the requirements of subparagraph (L)(i).

"(F) SECURITIES TRADING BELOW \$1.—

"(i) INITIAL PRICE.—

"(I) AT EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company is below \$1 at the close of the last trading day before the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(II) AT IPO.—If a covered emerging growth company makes an initial public offering after the day described in subclause (I) and the first share of the securities of such company is offered to the public at a price below \$1, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(ii) AVERAGE TRADING PRICE.—If the average trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company falls below \$1 for any 90-day period beginning on or after the day before the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall, after the end of such period, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(G) FRAUD OR MANIPULATION.—If the Commission determines that a covered emerging growth company has violated any provision of the securities laws prohibiting fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive acts or practices, the securities of such company shall, after the date of the determination, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(H) INELIGIBILITY FOR INCREASED MINIMUM INCREMENT PERMANENT.—The securities of an issuer may not be quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph at any time after—

"(i) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II);

"(ii) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (C)(i)(I), except during the period before such election takes effect; or

"(iii) the securities of such issuer are required by this paragraph to be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

"(I) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND DISCLOSURES.—The Commission shall require a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph to make such reports and disclosures as the Commission considers necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"(J) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—An issuer (or any officer, director, manager, or other agent of such issuer) shall not be liable to

any person (other than such issuer) under any law or regulation of the United States, any constitution, law, or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any contract or other legally enforceable agreement (including any arbitration agreement) for any losses caused solely by the quoting of the securities of such issuer at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10, by the trading of such securities at the increment determined by the Commission under subparagraph (B), or by both such quoting and trading, as provided in this paragraph.

“(K) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission, in coordination with each exchange on which the securities of covered emerging growth companies are quoted or traded, shall submit to Congress a report on the quoting and trading of securities in increments permitted by this paragraph and the extent to which such quoting and trading are increasing liquidity and active trading by incentivizing capital commitment, research coverage, and brokerage support, together with any legislative recommendations the Commission may have.

“(L) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term ‘covered emerging growth company’ means an emerging growth company, as defined in the first paragraph (80) of section 3(a), except that—

“(I) such paragraph shall be applied by substituting ‘\$750,000,000’ for ‘\$1,000,000,000’ each place it appears; and

“(II) subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of such paragraph do not apply.

“(ii) SECURITY.—The term ‘security’ means an equity security.

“(M) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Commission may—

“(i) make such adjustments to the pilot program specified in this paragraph as the Commission considers necessary or appropriate to ensure that such program can provide statistically meaningful or reliable results, including adjustments to eliminate selection bias among participants, expand the number of participants eligible to participate in such program, and change the duration of such program for one or more participants; and

“(ii) conduct any other study or pilot program, in conjunction with or separate from the pilot program specified in this paragraph (as such program may be adjusted pursuant to clause (i)), to evaluate quoting or trading in various minimum increments.”

(b) SUNSET.—Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k-1(c)(6)) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3448, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3448, the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2013. This bill, approved by a vote of 57–0 in the Financial Services Committee last year, represents yet again another bipartisan and commonsense effort by the House to promote small business capital formation.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) for all of his hard work and leadership in bringing this very important piece of legislation to the floor. I also would like to thank Mr. CARNEY from Delaware for all of his hard work and support for this legislation as well.

What are we talking about here?

Today, many small, publicly traded companies are finding it more and more difficult to attract investor demand and trading liquidity for their stocks. As a result, these companies may have trouble obtaining the investor capital they need for their companies to grow and create jobs.

H.R. 3448 would begin to address this liquidity crunch by testing, through a pilot program, whether increasing the minimum trading increment, also called the “tick” size, for certain emerging growth company stocks, or EGCs, from a penny to 5 cents or 10 cents would promote liquidity by incentivizing market makers and others investors to trade these stocks, and by concentrating this trading interest around fewer price points.

All of this may sound like a lot of Wall Street and stock market jargon, but at its core this bill is a simple bill aimed at helping small American companies obtain the capital that they need from investors so that they can grow their businesses.

What the bill does is leave most of the details of designing and administering the tick size pilot program to the experts at the SEC. As a result, the SEC should have the discretion it needs to devise a pilot program that reflects the views of all market participants and interested parties, and that generates the maximum amount of deep and useful data on how different tick sizes impact trading liquidity in small-cap stocks.

By first establishing a temporary pilot program, this bill will ensure that any potential and permanent changes to tick sizes that may be done sometime in the future will be done only in a thoughtful, incremental, and data-driven manner.

The data generated from this pilot program may also be useful into how other aspects of the stock market work, but on this point, let me be clear. This bill is focused on improving small business capital formation. This is not a bill to reform the fundamental structure of U.S. equity markets, nor is it intended to be a substitute for a more detailed, holistic review by the SEC of how these markets work.

Ultimately, there are no guarantees that a tick size pilot program will

achieve the desired results and that the benefits of any future action on tick sizes will outweigh the cost, but we should all be agreed that this commonsense approach will help small businesses grow. It is worth trying, and we need many more like it.

Again, I will conclude by saying that this bill was approved by the Financial Services Committee 57–0. In addition, many market participants, as well as SEC Chair White; at least two of her colleagues, Commissioners Gallagher and Piwowar; and the SEC’s Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies, have all vocally supported the concept of a tick size pilot program.

So I hope that this legislation will serve as a final push forward getting this tick size program forward and moving off the ground. I urge my colleagues to, again, promote small business capital formation by passing H.R. 3448, and I urge my friends over in the Senate to take up this bill immediately as well.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3448. I would like to thank Mr. GARRETT, chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee. Particularly, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) for his good work on this piece of legislation. I certainly enjoyed working with him on it.

I particularly want to applaud Mr. DUFFY for his willingness to address concerns raised by stakeholders, members of the committee, and those we heard from during the hearing on this bill. I appreciate his commitment to working in a bipartisan way in developing good and workable policy in this legislation.

As has been already said, the purpose of our bill is really pretty simple. We know that small businesses are the engine of job creation in this country. We want to encourage investors to take a closer look at small businesses and invest in them so that they can continue to grow and create jobs once they have gone public.

In my home State of Delaware, as a corporate center, we have a lot of people who spend a lot of time paying attention to corporate formation and corporate governance. In a former life as the State secretary of finance and as Lieutenant Governor, I worked with a lot of these people. They have been following the trends over the past 10 years, and they have seen and observed the decline in IPOs and the changes in the growth of emerging growth companies after going public.

That is why last year I worked with my colleague, Mr. FINCHER from Tennessee, on a provision in the JOBS Act that created an onramp for companies to go public. The bill has already been credited with helping fuel the recent uptick we have seen in the initial public offerings, which is very good for job

growth in this economy. H.R. 3448 builds on that work by helping companies grow after their IPO.

Our hope, as has been described, is that increasing the increments that stocks trade in will draw more attention to these small emerging growth companies. We hope that brokers will spend more time and resources researching these companies and, ultimately, encourage greater investment in them. This increased coverage from brokers and analysts will help small companies grow and create jobs.

We have heard concerns about some unintended consequences that increased tick size could have, which is why this bill instructs the SEC to conduct a pilot program to better examine the effects and effectiveness of larger spreads. Additionally, this bill gives the SEC the flexibility to implement a pilot program in a way that will produce the best information on how to proceed afterwards.

Thanks to members and staff on both sides of the aisle working closely together, we were able to come up with a bill that makes sense and that addresses the concerns that we heard from other members, from stakeholders, and from the Financial Services Committee hearing that we had.

The four amendments accepted in the committee were all consistent with our original objective. Each improved the bill based on input that we received from members and stakeholders.

This bill is truly a bipartisan effort. As Mr. GARRETT pointed out, it passed out of the committee on a 57-0 vote. As with any piece of legislation, once we got into the weeds, it turned out to be a little bit more complicated than we initially thought, but the end result is a good product that Members on both sides of the aisle can support.

I want to close by again thanking Mr. DUFFY and his staff for their hard work and for working together with us and involving us in the discussions about the particulars of this bill.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3448, the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2013.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the prime sponsor of this legislation and the gentleman who has been the driving force behind this idea.

Mr. DUFFY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding time.

As both you and the gentleman from Delaware mentioned, it is pretty remarkable that on the Financial Services Committee, a committee which comes together and doesn't always agree on the particulars of every debate that we have, that this bill came out with a vote of 57-0, moving it forward, which I think underscores the fact that there was a lot of work put in on the front end, making sure we were working out the kinks and the concerns.

I am very appreciative of Mr. CARNEY from Delaware and all the effort and

help he put in, and for Mr. GARRETT's help in making sure that we could put a package together that we can get a lot of folks to buy into.

We all realize that job creation, especially in a slower moving economy, is incredibly important. Job creation at the higher levels comes from our small businesses, our emerging growth companies. As Mr. CARNEY earlier referenced, that is why Financial Services came together and passed a bill out of the House, along with the Senate moving it, and the President signing, the JOBS Act, which helped emerging growth companies actually get on the onramp and go public, accessing more and better capital.

What we have seen, though, are a few concerns from those small emerging growth companies that are going public that they are not as easily accessing capital as I thought they may. That is why we have come together to start a pilot program to see if we can enhance the interest and the capital and liquidity of these emerging growth companies.

It really is not very complicated, as Mr. GARRETT indicated. This is a 5-year pilot program. So if things don't go as expected, the program will end. If it goes as well as we think it may, we can continue this on permanently.

We are truly looking at small emerging growth companies—those that have revenue of less than \$750 million a year. Again, the small, fast-growing companies. It is a small space of the market. It is only 2 percent of trading on and off exchanges.

There has been a lot of debate as we have done this about what is an appropriate model to use when we increase the tick size. Do we do a trade-at, a quote-at, midpoint matches? A lot of people came to us with a lot of different ideas. All of us realized there is a larger debate going on right now that involves our "dark pools" and our exchanges.

To be very clear, no one here who worked on this legislation wants to impact that debate in this field. The intent of this bill is not to influence that debate at all. It is really very specifically and narrowly tailored to help small businesses as they look for additional capital to grow and create more jobs.

That is why we have given the SEC the ability to set up different baskets or different segments. One can be a trade-at, one can have price improvement of a different variation, but allowing us to get good quality data that will help us make decisions as we move forward.

One other thing: companies that may not want to participate will have the option to opt out if they don't feel like this kind of a program would work for them.

I just want to say I very much appreciate the gentleman from Delaware and the chairman from New Jersey for all the effort they have put into this bill. I hope that our colleagues, after seeing

the great support that we had in the committee, will support this bill today.

□ 1545

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Delaware has already yielded back. So, at this point, I would just like to again thank the gentleman from Delaware for his work, the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue.

And, also on his page, I saw written in a large number was the magic number 57-0. I hope that does send a resounding message over to the other body, to the Senate, to do as they have not been doing for the last 14 months, which is to take up some of these good job-creation bills, a bill that helps promote jobs and small businesses in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3448, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 540, PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-351) on the resolution (H. Res. 478) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 540) to designate the Air Route Traffic Control Center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center", and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 540, PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 478 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 478

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 540), to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark

Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center". All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of sections 1 through 3 of Rules Committee Print 113-37 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 475 is amended in section 2 by striking "February 13, 2014" and inserting "February 12, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 478 provides a closed rule for the consideration of S. 540.

Now, if you heard the Clerk read S. 540, you might not have understood why we were here today. He read it exactly as it is drafted in the title, but we are here today to move a clean debt ceiling.

Now, I won't tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am excited about being down here today. I am excited to be carrying the rule, because I believe this is the way that regular order ought to operate. But I came here, as you did, Mr. Speaker, and as so many of my colleagues did on the other side of the aisle, to try to move the needle, to try to move the needle on Federal spending, to try to move the needle on the borrowing that is going on from our children and our grandchildren.

We talk so often back home, Mr. Speaker, about raising taxes. In fact, so many folks in this Chamber have signed a pledge to say I will never raise taxes on the American people, and I admire that sentiment. But, Mr. Speaker, when we have a vote to raise the debt ceiling, debt that has to be paid, we are, in effect, raising taxes on the American taxpayer.

Now, it is not a surprise to anyone in this Chamber. I sit on the Budget Committee. Anyone who has looked at the budget understands that we don't have enough revenue to pay our bills.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of being on the Republican Study Committee as chair of their

Budget and Spending Task Force. I had an opportunity last year to offer the most conservative budget offered in this Chamber—the most conservative budget offered in this Chamber—and we had to continue borrowing money as far as the eye can see.

When RAND PAUL was elected to the United States Senate among much fanfare—lots of conservatives across the country looking to RAND PAUL for guidance, and rightfully so—he dropped a budget in the United States Senate, the most conservative budget introduced at that time in Washington, D.C., balanced the budget in 3 years by abolishing agency after agency after agency, sentiments that I happen to agree with wholeheartedly but know that we don't have the votes to achieve, and even that budget required borrowing money from our children and our grandchildren for the next 3 years.

So it is not a happy day that we are here, Mr. Speaker. The happy day, I would argue, was back in August of 2011. I was a young freshman Member, Mr. Speaker. I remember it because it was the kind of vote that you ran for Congress to take. We were here, and the news commentators were back and forth; is it the right deal? Is it the wrong deal? JOHN BOEHNER and President Barack Obama engaged in debate at the White House night after night after night, and suddenly, a deal was reached.

Now, as has been my experience in my 3 years in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, the term "a deal has been reached" 100 percent of the time means what ROB WOODALL wanted didn't happen. It is funny how that works out. I get one voice out of 435, and so when I have to send my Speaker down to the White House and negotiate with not just one President but 100 more Senators, I don't get what I wanted.

But what I did get in August of 2011, Mr. Speaker, was an agreement that, if we raised the debt ceiling, if we agreed to further encumber our children and our grandchildren, as everyone in this Chamber knows that the current laws of the books require us to do, we would take a step, a \$2 trillion step to try to make sure that we didn't have to raise the debt ceiling again.

It didn't contain what anybody thought was the 100 percent right plan, Mr. Speaker, but it was a proposal that we could come together around—not just we Republicans; not we, the House of Representatives; not we, Capitol Hill, with the Senate; but we, the elected representatives of the American people, from the White House to the U.S. House to the United States Senate.

We have come 2½ years, Mr. Speaker, and we have done some amazing things. I created No Budget, No Pay last year, for example, Mr. Speaker, which attached an increase in the debt ceiling to the requirement that we pass a budget out of this House and that they pass a budget out of the Senate, allow-

ing us to come together to produce the first budget this institution has seen since I have been elected to the Congress, the first one. Not the first House-passed budget—we do that every year; it is our responsibility; of course we do—but the first one with which we found agreement with the Senate and received a Presidential signature.

Mr. Speaker, the debt limit is a constant reminder of the imbalance of America's taxing and spending. We have a spending problem in this Nation. Everyone in this Chamber knows it. And the debt ceiling is an opportunity for us to come together and find solutions.

And try as hard as he might, Mr. Speaker, when the Speaker of this United States House dug deep to try to find those answers, he could find none. Not that there were no answers out there—of course there are—but there were not answers out there that could receive the approval of this body, the approval of the Senate, and the signature of the President.

I have to ask why, because there is not a man or woman who is going to come into this Chamber today who does not know that we need to take steps to address the problem. And dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in this Chamber who doesn't know we have the ability to do it, because we have done it before—not 100 years ago, not 50 years ago, but just 3 years ago, with largely the same folks that are here today.

That is not what this rule is bringing to the Floor today, but what it is bringing to the Floor is a clean debt ceiling resolution. This should be a day on which we are coming together around solutions to that longer-term spending problem, but we find ourselves here today simply trying to bring America back from an economic brink the likes of which not a single Member of this Chamber wants America to see.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago it appeared as though the crises that had come to define this Congress maybe were coming to an end. In a rare show of bipartisanship, Democrats in the Senate and Republicans in the House passed a budget compromise that set the spending levels for the next 2 years. As was clear at the time of its passage, the bipartisan budget agreement authorized spending well beyond the current debt limit. Despite that fact, 166 members of the majority voted to authorize the spending and to increase the Nation's debt. At that time, a member of the majority declared that passing the legislation would be the responsible thing to do, and, indeed, it was.

Now, today, we are going to find out whether that moment of responsibility

was an aberration or a sign of things to come. The majority has a simple choice today. We understand they don't have the votes to pass this. And the Democrats, as they have been on so many other things we have tried to get to the floor, are more than willing to do our part for our country because that, Mr. Speaker, is why we were elected to come here.

The majority has a choice today: act responsibly and pay the country's bills which they voted for, some of them, or trigger another economic panic by threatening default.

For decades, up till about 2011, which was just held up as a landmark here, no matter which party was in charge, Congress always raised the debt ceiling without hesitation or pause. In the years that I have been here, there was never any notion of having to pay a ransom to get the side that you were not on to do what its duty called for. But in recent years, the majority doubts the seriousness of this responsibility and dared the global financial system to punish them for their malfeasance.

Although we need no reminder, in 2011, the majority of this Chamber demanded ransom in exchange for an increase in the debt ceiling. The self-inflicted wound that followed sparked the most volatile week for the financial markets since 2008, when we had the financial crisis, and resulted in the credit rating agency Standard & Poor's downgrading our Nation's credit rating for the first time in history. And for what? Some notion that they didn't have to meet their responsibility.

In the years since, the majority has continued to play this dangerous game of political hostage taking that hurts our economy, and even caused a 16-day government shutdown. And that shutdown, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the people of America, took \$24 billion out of our economy for absolutely nothing.

Even when it has been clear that there is only one way out of a self-inflicted crisis such as the government shutdown, the majority pursued an approach that can be summarized as "only when we have tied ourselves in legislative knots, only when we have thrown the economy into turmoil, only after we have frightened employers from hiring and given global investors pause, we will do the right thing," as we are doing today.

□ 1600

This irresponsible approach has particularly drawn the ire of the American people and dragged the approval ratings of the House of Representatives to historic lows. Today I urge the majority to follow the lead of the Democrat leadership, my colleagues, and me and do the right things first instead of last.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on today's rule—and that, by itself, is wonderful for me to do; it feels good—and the underlying legislation so that we can honor the commitments this Congress has made and protect the full

faith and credit of the United States. We are charged to do no less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would mention to my friend from New York that if she has no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

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

As I have said, the question before us today is a simple one: Are we going to pay the country's bills or will the United States become a deadbeat nation? This is not a question of increasing our Nation's spending. That question was answered when 166 Members of the majority voted to spend beyond the Nation's debt ceiling by passing the bipartisan budget agreement just a few weeks ago.

Today is simply a matter of paying our bills when they come due, as real Americans do, and we should follow suit. So when this is coming due, we hope after today, we will be able to pay ours.

For our part, my Democratic colleagues and I are ready to do the right thing—and have been for some time—by increasing our Nation's debt ceiling and protecting the full faith and credit of the United States of America. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on today's rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I am one of those Members the gentlelady from New York referenced, one of those Members who voted in favor of an appropriations bill that funds the government for this year. In fact, I have voted for the House-passed budget and the Republican Study Committee budget in each and every year that I have been in this institution. What is unique about those votes, Mr. Speaker, is they absolutely understand that we are going to have to spend money that we don't have, but they take steps to make the problem better instead of worse.

I want to take issue with what my friend from New York said about a raising of the debt ceiling with absolutely no strings attached as being the responsible thing to do. It is absolutely not. It is the worst-case scenario.

Now, I am going to have colleagues on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, who are petrified of what happens if we don't do this today. They are petrified that even though we know we can come together and find a solution forward, find a solution that makes the problem better instead of worse, they are petrified that they do not have a willing partner in the President or with the Senate. So unless they vote to pass this bill today, America faces default, and that is an awful box, an awful box that my friends have painted.

I want to read a few quotes, Mr. Speaker. I think words matter. This is from 2006, as a young Senator Barack Obama faced a debt limit increase in the United States Senate, and he said this—and I just want to point out, be-

cause my friend from New York talked about the obviousness of this vote, how clearly this is the right thing to do, just to raise the debt ceiling to whatever amount folks would like.

Here is what Senator Barack Obama said in 2006. He said: The fact that we are even here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burdens of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren.

Then-Senator Barack Obama goes on, Mr. Speaker. He said: America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America deserves better. Therefore, I intend to oppose this effort to increase America's debt limit.

I don't have to say it very often, Mr. Speaker, but when the President is right, he is right. This was an opportunity to come together and one that we searched for, searched for.

There is not a man or woman in this town who wants to find a path forward more than our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, does. There is no one who has sweated to find that opportunity more than our Speaker has. Yet without a willing partner in the White House or the Senate, it can't happen.

The same here, Mr. Speaker, 2006. Then-Senator JOE BIDEN says this: The President's budget plans will bring our debt to \$11.8 trillion at the end of the next 5 years. This is a record of utter disregard for our Nation's financial future.

Mr. Speaker, \$11.8 trillion is what JOE BIDEN was concerned about. That number reached \$16 trillion within that same time period.

He goes on: It is a record of indifference to the price our children and grandchildren will pay to redeem our debt when it comes due. History will not judge this record kindly. My vote against the debt limit increase cannot change the fact that we have incurred this debt already and will, no doubt, incur more. It is a statement that I refuse to be associated with, the policies that brought us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, 2010, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen said this: Our national debt is our biggest national security threat. Not terrorism, not al Qaeda, not a rogue nation, but our debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to deal with our debt. If it was easy, we wouldn't have the debt to begin with. It is hard, but I have seen us come together to fix it before. A \$2 trillion worth of difference we came together to make 3 years ago, not even. Yet today, we find ourselves unable to find that path.

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of my friend from New York—I would very much appreciate it—I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank both my friend on the majority side and my friend on the minority side for allowing me this unusual procedure.

I do rise in support of the rule. I am going to vote for the rule. But, Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the underlying bill on the debt ceiling.

I have brought some materials that have been prepared by the Congressional Research Service with materials that were provided by the Office of Management and Budget that show in the fiscal year that we are now engaged, mandatory spending is 62 percent of the total budget, and interest on the debt is over 6 percent. Those two combined are two-thirds of all total spending, mandatory spending and interest on the debt.

It is not going to get any easier, Mr. Speaker, to solve this problem by pass-

ing so-called clean debt ceilings that don't address the underlying problem. I understand the problems governing on the majority side, and I understand the issues with the Presidency and the Senate being controlled by the Democrats. I understand that.

But I couldn't walk into a bank in Ennis, Texas, today and say, I owe you \$300,000 right now, but I want to borrow another \$200,000. They would want to know what plan I had to repay the money I had already borrowed, and they would want to know how giving me another \$200,000 would actually be the appropriate thing to do.

What we are doing on the underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, with this so-called

clean debt ceiling is simply saying, we want to borrow—I am not sure how much it is—probably 600 or \$700 billion, where we already owe \$17 trillion. We have no plan to repay the money we have already borrowed and certainly have no plan to repay the money we are going to borrow.

So my comment today is, this Congress should be addressing this problem in a bipartisan fashion today. We will be back here in March of next year. We will have the same debate. So I will be voting “no” later this evening.

I do thank my good friend from Georgia and my good friend from New York for allowing me to speak.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OUTLAYS SINCE FY1984, VARIOUS MEASURES

[Data from FY2014 OMB Public Budget Database]

	fy1984	fy1985	fy1986	fy1987	fy1988	fy1989	fy1990	fy1991	fy1992	fy1993	fy1994	fy1995	fy1996	fy1997				
Gross Domestic Product (\$billions)	3844.4	4146.3	4403.9	4651.4	5008.5	5399.5	5734.5	5930.5	6242	6587.3	6976.6	7341.1	7718.3	8211.7				
GDP Price Index	0.5986	0.618	0.6323	0.6492	0.67	0.696	0.7216	0.749	0.7685	0.7854	0.802	0.819	0.8348	0.8502				
Population	2.36E+08	2.38E+08	2.40E+08	2.42E+08	2.45E+08	2.47E+08	2.50E+08	2.52E+08	2.55E+08	2.58E+08	2.60E+08	2.63E+08	2.65E+08	2.68E+08				
Outlays, in \$Billions:																		
Discretionary Outlays	379.5	415.8	438.5	444.2	464.4	488.9	500.6	533.3	533.8	539.7	541.4	544.8	532.8	547.1				
Defense (function 050)	228.1	253.1	273.8	282.6	290.9	304.1	300.2	319.7	302.6	292.4	282.3	273.6	266.0	271.7				
Non-Defense (all other)	151.4	162.7	164.7	161.6	173.5	184.8	200.4	213.6	231.2	247.3	259.1	271.2	266.8	275.4				
Mandatory	361.3	401.0	415.8	421.3	448.2	485.9	568.1	596.5	648.4	670.9	717.4	738.9	786.8	810.1				
Net interest	111.1	129.5	136.0	138.6	151.8	168.9	184.4	194.4	199.3	198.7	203.0	232.2	241.0	244.0				
Total	852	946	990	1,004	1,064	1,144	1,253	1,324	1,382	1,409	1,462	1,516	1,561	1,601				
Constant FY2013 dollars (billions, using CDP price index, FY2014 OMB projections):																		
Discretionary Outlays	750	796	820	809	820	831	821	842	822	813	799	787	755	761				
Defense (function 050)	451	485	512	515	514	517	492	505	466	440	416	395	377	378				
Non-Defense (all other)	299	311	308	295	306	314	329	337	356	373	382	392	378	383				
Mandatory	714	768	778	768	791	826	931	942	998	1,011	1,058	1,067	1,115	1,127				
Net Interest	220	248	255	253	268	287	302	307	307	299	299	335	342	340				
As % of GDP:																		
Discretionary Outlays	9.9%	10.0%	10.0%	9.5%	9.3%	9.1%	8.7%	9.0%	8.6%	8.2%	7.8%	7.4%	6.9%	6.7%				
Defense (function 050)	5.9%	6.1%	6.2%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	5.2%	5.4%	4.8%	4.4%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.3%				
Non-Defense (all other)	3.9%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%	3.6%	3.7%	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%				
International (fcn 150)	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%				
Mandatory	9.4%	9.7%	9.4%	9.1%	8.9%	9.0%	9.9%	10.1%	10.4%	10.2%	10.3%	10.1%	10.2%	9.9%				
Net Interest	2.9%	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%	3.3%	3.2%	3.0%	2.9%	3.2%	3.1%	3.0%				
As Share of Total Outlays:																		
Discretionary Outlays	44.5%	43.9%	44.3%	44.2%	43.6%	42.7%	40.0%	40.3%	38.6%	38.3%	37.0%	35.9%	34.1%	34.2%				
Defense (function 050)	26.8%	26.7%	27.6%	28.1%	27.3%	26.6%	24.0%	24.1%	21.9%	20.7%	19.3%	18.0%	17.0%	17.0%				
Non-Defense (all other)	17.8%	17.2%	16.6%	16.1%	16.3%	16.2%	16.0%	16.1%	16.7%	17.5%	17.7%	17.9%	17.1%	17.2%				
Mandatory	42.4%	42.4%	42.0%	42.0%	42.1%	42.5%	45.3%	45.0%	46.9%	47.6%	49.1%	48.7%	50.4%	50.6%				
Net Interest	13.0%	13.7%	13.7%	13.8%	14.3%	14.8%	14.7%	14.7%	14.4%	14.1%	13.9%	15.3%	15.4%	15.2%				
	fy1998	fy1999	fy2000	fy2001	fy2002	fy2003	fy2004	fy2005	fy2006	fy2007	fy2008	fy2009	fy2010	fy2011	fy2012	fy2013	fy2014	fy2015
Gross Domestic Product (\$billions)	8663	9208.4	9821	10225.3	10543.9	10980.2	11676	12428.6	13206.5	13861.4	14334.4	13960.7	14348.8	14929.4	15547.4	16202.7	17011.4	17936.1
GDP Price Index	0.861	0.8724	0.8897	0.9106	0.9257	0.9446	0.9685	1	1.034	1.0646	1.0893	1.1033	1.1145	1.1379	1.1588	1.183	1.2054	1.2283
Population	2.70E+08	2.73E+08	2.82E+08	2.85E+08	2.88E+08	2.90E+08	2.93E+08	2.96E+08	2.98E+08	3.01E+08	3.04E+08	3.07E+08	3.09E+08	3.12E+08	3.14E+08	3.16E+08	3.19E+08	3.21E+08
Outlays, in \$Billions:																		
Discretionary Outlays	552.0	572.1	614.6	649.0	733.9	824.3	895.0	968.5	1,016.7	1,041.6	1,134.9	1,237.5	1,347.2	1,347.1	1,286.1	1,257.9	1,241.9	1,232.0
Defense (function 050)	270.2	275.5	294.9	306.0	348.9	405.0	454.0	493.6	520.0	547.8	612.5	656.7	688.9	699.4	670.5	651.5	618.3	603.6
Non-Defense (all other)	281.7	296.7	319.7	343.0	385.0	419.4	441.0	474.9	496.7	493.7	522.4	580.8	658.3	647.7	615.6	606.5	623.7	628.4
Mandatory	859.3	900.0	951.4	1,007.7	1,106.0	1,182.5	1,237.5	1,319.4	1,411.8	1,449.9	1,594.9	2,093.2	1,913.7	2,025.9	2,030.6	2,204.3	2,312.9	2,422.6
Net Interest	241.2	229.8	222.9	206.2	170.9	153.0	160.3	183.9	226.6	237.1	252.7	186.9	196.2	230.0	220.4	222.7	223.0	253.6
Total	1,652	1,702	1,789	1,963	2,011	2,160	2,293	2,472	2,655	2,729	2,983	3,518	3,457	3,603	3,537	3,685	3,778	3,908
Constant FY2013 dollars (billions, using GDP price index, FY2014 OMB projections):																		
Discretionary Outlays	758	776	817	843	938	1,032	1,093	1,146	1,163	1,157	1,233	1,327	1,430	1,400	1,313	1,258	1,219	1,187
Defense (function 050)	371	374	392	398	446	507	555	584	595	609	665	704	731	727	684	651	607	581
Non-Defense (all other)	387	402	425	446	492	525	539	562	568	549	567	623	699	673	628	606	612	605
Mandatory	1,181	1,220	1,265	1,309	1,413	1,481	1,512	1,561	1,615	1,611	1,732	2,244	2,031	2,106	2,073	2,204	2,270	2,333
Net Interest	331	312	296	268	218	192	196	218	259	264	274	200	208	239	225	223	219	244
As % of GDP:																		
Discretionary Outlays	6.4%	6.2%	6.3%	6.3%	7.0%	7.5%	7.7%	7.8%	7.7%	7.5%	7.9%	8.9%	9.4%	9.0%	8.3%	7.8%	7.3%	6.9%
Defense (function 050)	3.1%	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3%	3.7%	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%	4.0%	4.3%	4.7%	4.8%	4.7%	4.3%	4.0%	3.6%	3.4%
Non-Defense (all other)	3.3%	3.2%	3.3%	3.4%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.6%	3.6%	4.2%	4.6%	4.3%	4.0%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%
International (fcn 150)	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
Mandatory	9.9%	9.8%	9.7%	9.9%	10.5%	10.8%	10.6%	10.6%	10.7	10.5%	11.1%	15.0%	13.3%	13.6%	13.1%	13.6%	13.6%	13.5%
Net Interest	2.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.0%	1.6%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.8%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.4%

	fy1998	fy1999	fy2000	fy2001	fy2002	fy2003	fy2004	fy2005	fy2006	fy2007	fy2008	fy2009	fy2010	fy2011	fy2012	fy2013	fy2014	fy2015
As Share of Total Outlays:																		
Discretionary Outlays	33.4%	33.6%	34.4%	34.8%	36.5%	38.2%	39.0%	39.2%	38.3%	38.2%	38.1%	35.2%	39.0%	37.4%	36.4%	34.1%	32.9%	31.5%
Defense (function 050)	16.4%	16.2%	16.5%	16.4%	17.4%	18.7%	19.8%	20.0%	19.6%	20.1%	20.5%	18.7%	19.9%	19.4%	19.0%	17.7%	16.4%	15.4%
Non-Defense (all other)	17.1%	17.4%	17.9%	18.4%	19.1%	19.4%	19.2%	19.2%	18.7%	18.1%	17.5%	16.5%	19.0%	18.0%	17.4%	16.5%	16.5%	16.1%
Mandatory	52.0%	52.9%	53.2%	54.1%	55.0%	54.7%	54.0%	53.4%	53.2%	53.1%	53.5%	59.5%	55.4%	56.2%	57.4%	59.8%	61.2%	62.0%
Net Interest	14.6%	13.5%	12.5%	11.1%	8.5%	7.1%	7.0%	7.4%	8.5%	8.7%	8.5%	5.3%	5.7%	6.4%	6.2%	6.0%	5.9%	6.5%

Source: CRS calculations based on FY2014 budget submission data from OMB.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman. And again, I thank the gentleman from New York as well.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have these opportunities very often. I would posit to my colleagues that if really the right answer is to pass clean debt ceilings whenever the debt needs to be increased, I would wonder why it is we don't just repeal the debt ceiling altogether. If this isn't a moment for us to come together, if this isn't a moment for us to do those things that have to be done, if this isn't a moment that focuses like a laser the American people on what the consequences are of the decisions we make today, I don't know what would be. This is our best opportunity.

I could not be more grateful to my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, for coming together to make some of those things possible. In fact, that great day in August of 2011 that I talk about, that wasn't possible with Republican votes. Turning the dial on spending to the tune of \$2 trillion, that wasn't possible with just Republican votes. That was a bipartisan effort. That was a collaborative effort that makes a difference for our children and our grandchildren, and it is one of which I hope we are both proud.

The men and women who are going to come to the floor of the House today to cast their vote are all going to be men and women who are deeply concerned about the future of this country. Now, some of those men and women are going to look into their hearts, and they are going to look at what default would mean to the Nation. They are going to believe earnestly that because we cannot find a partner in the Senate or in the White House to negotiate on solving the problem, that the only step left to take is either to default or not, and with a heavy heart, they are going to vote to raise the debt ceiling.

There are other men and women in this body, Mr. Speaker, who are going to come to the floor today for this vote, and they are going to say, Default is a terrible, terrible, terrible even threat to make, but if we do not find a way to curb the growth of Federal spending, default is not a question of if; it is a question of when. It is a question of when.

There is not a budget in Washington, D.C., that stops the borrowing next year or 2 years from now or even 10 years from now. There is not one, and the most conservative budgets we have don't have enough votes to pass. If not today, when?

Now, I think the votes have been counted. The decisions have been made,

Mr. Speaker. Folks have been grappling with this issue in their hearts and with their constituents. Mr. Speaker, I plead with you to play that role in this debate so that when this decision confronts us again—not if, but when—we take advantage of that to do the hard things that must be done.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle—and I know I speak for a large plurality of our Members on this side of the aisle—challenge me to do those things that are hard. Give me that vote to take that so enrages the right flank that I get sent home in the next primary, but I had a chance to do something that mattered while I was here.

Folks didn't leave their families to come and just cast a ballot to keep things going on the way they are going on, Mr. Speaker. They came from both sides of the aisle to make a difference. The path that we are on with spending and revenue is a path that is unsustainable to the tune of \$17.3 trillion today and a path that is unsustainable to the tune of hundreds of trillions of dollars tomorrow.

The economic demise of this country on that path is not if, but when, but we have the ability right here in this Chamber to make that difference. We have the ability right here in this Chamber to look our children and our grandchildren in the eye and say, When I had that voting card for that brief time, I did everything I did to make a difference.

We have been on a streak here, Mr. Speaker, of coming together in surprising ways to achieve things that I thought could not be done. I hope we make deficit reduction in this next budget cycle that same bipartisan priority. I believe we can surprise even ourselves with the amount that can be accomplished.

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

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

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 478, I call up the bill

(S. 540) to designate the Air Route Traffic Control Center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of sections 1 through 3 of Rules Committee Print 113-37 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 540

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 "Temporary Debt Limit Extension Act".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on March 15, 2015.

(b) *SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.*—Effective March 16, 2015, the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased to the extent that—

(1) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on March 16, 2015, exceeds

(2) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. RESTORING CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONAL DEBT.

(a) *EXTENSION LIMITED TO NECESSARY OBLIGATIONS.*—An obligation shall not be taken into account under section 2(b)(1) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred pursuant to law by the Federal Government that required payment before March 16, 2015.

(b) *PROHIBITION ON CREATION OF CASH RESERVE DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.*—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not issue obligations during the period specified in section 2(a) for the purpose of increasing the cash balance above normal operating balances in anticipation of the expiration of such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 540.

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

There was no objection.

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

The last time I stood on the floor to talk about a “clean” debt limit increase, I did so to prove that we could do better. It was an effort to implore my Democrat colleagues in the House and the Senate to heed the warnings of the President’s own fiscal commission, also known as the Simpson-Bowles Commission, which clearly noted how our economy and hardworking taxpayers would suffer under the mountain of debt Washington was racking up.

My position is unchanged. I remain as committed as ever to grappling with our debt; to making the tough decisions to reform, improve, strengthen, and protect our entitlement programs; and, most importantly, to getting this economy back on track so hardworking taxpayers start seeing their pay go up and those in need of a job can find one. In fact, that work is underway at the Ways and Means Committee where we posted for public comment bipartisan proposals to reform Medicare and Social Security so that they are viable for seniors and taxpayers, not only today but well into the future.

Regrettably, over the last 3 years, Democrats have hardened their position. The President, Senate Democrats, and House Democrats will not even entertain a discussion—let alone a negotiation—over what reforms we can make along with a debt limit increase. They have become unyielding. Democrats are totally adamant: extend the debt limit or default. That is the position of today’s Democrat Party: don’t negotiate, don’t reach out across the aisle, ignore the past, which clearly shows the debt limit typically passes with other reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I remember serving when Bill Clinton was President. Those were different times. Despite our different opinions, we were able to find common solutions for the American people. We balanced the budget, reformed our Nation’s welfare laws, and helped break the cycle of dependency by placing an emphasis on work. Today, Democrats openly cheer that their health care law will lead to less work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed the Democrats have walked away from the table, and I am disappointed we are not engaged in a more serious debate today. But as disappointed as I am, I cannot, in good conscience, let the Democrats’ refusal to engage lead to a default. For that reason, and that reason alone, I will vote “yes” today.

But today’s legislation is hardly a solution to our looming debt crisis. That is why the Ways and Means Committee will continue to carefully review and advance policies that not only reform our entitlement programs, providing greater protection for seniors and

greater savings for hardworking taxpayers, but also policies that will create a stronger economy with more jobs and higher wages for workers. It is only through a combination of such policies that we can truly solve this problem.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for his responsible commitment to vote for this bill today. I wish I could say that a majority of his party was going to be responsible and vote for this bill today, but I cannot.

First, I am pleased that the Republican Party seems to be shedding at least part of its extremist Tea Party ideology in the prevailing belief of holding the Nation hostage to meet the whims of a select few.

Now, I would just like to take a moment to explain what the House is and is not voting on today. We are voting today to ensure that our country can pay the bills we have already incurred—not new bills, old bills, so that Social Security checks can continue to be mailed, so that doctors serving Medicare patients will be reimbursed for their services, so that veterans’ pensions and compensation will be paid out, and so income tax refund checks will continue to be processed and paid out.

What we are not voting for—what we are not voting for—we are not voting for a bill to spend money. Our Republican colleagues will argue that this bill allows the Federal Government to continue to borrow and, therefore, spend more money. They say tax revenues come in and even more goes out in spending for government services and programs, services and programs that we all agree benefit our mutual constituents.

So what is the alternative the Republicans would offer instead? My Republican colleagues would offer default, because not supporting this bill would mean you support default and defaulting on our Nation’s debt. Default would mean taxpayer dollars would still come into the government. We would still collect. The IRS would still collect taxes, but no money would go out. There would be no services or programs that benefit our constituents; they would be shut down.

Do you all remember how angry the country was during the Republican shutdown of our government when military death benefits were not paid? That would only be magnified under a default led by the Republican side of the aisle. Not only would there be no death benefits, there would be no veterans’ benefits at all, and no money for VA hospitals, doctors, and nurses. And a default wouldn’t just affect our military and our veterans. There would be no funds for food inspectors, no Pell grants, no air traffic controllers or any

other government service because of the default.

Let’s be clear. If you liked the Republican-engineered shutdown of our government, you will love the default the Republicans who would vote “no” today would perpetuate on the American public.

This is a debt that the Republican caucus helped create. You own a portion of this debt. The American people are watching this vote. They are confounded, once again, that the majority of the majority will vote to default. The overwhelming majority of the minority will vote not to default. I ask the American people, which party is the responsible party? The answer is clear. The Democratic Party will be responsible today. We will vote overwhelmingly for this bill not to default on our Nation’s debt, not to raise interest rates on our constituents, and not to raise the cost of money for the government to borrow, either.

I yield as much time as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) may consume.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. CROWLEY for recognizing me, and I want to pursue the themes that he has offered a moment ago.

I listened to the gentleman from Georgia earlier speaking of debt in the years out. That has nothing to do with the argument that is being applied on this floor. This is about the basic arithmetic of the credit card that arrives at a family’s doorstep for a variety of costs. This is about paying for the war in Iraq, which I was opposed to but I believe we still have an obligation to pay for, including the 1 million new veterans that were created that are currently straining our VA system.

In addition, this is a vote about paying for the tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 that continued right through 2010 based upon the mistaken notion, the theology that was applied, suggesting that, in fact, tax cuts pay for themselves.

This is about a turnaround of a projected surplus of \$5 trillion that instead became ongoing deficits and debt noted for the ill-conceived policies that many of our friends on the other side embraced under the hubris of suggesting that you can have it all.

When else in American history, when else have we embraced the idea enunciated not long ago by the former majority leader of the Republican Party who suggested that it was patriotic in a time of war to cut taxes? Lincoln and Roosevelt certainly didn’t embrace that position. You can’t have it all.

What was desirable by the Republican Party during those years was essentially this: they were going to score political points on the issue of the debt ceiling. They were going to hold the debt ceiling hostage for isolated issues that placated a minority of the majority.

Now, I know most of the Republicans that have come to the floor today, and I want to tell you, my knowledge of

them is they are very responsible when it comes to budgeteering, but they are caught by a minority of their majority who now dictate the outcome of where many of those positions go. So the result of the last standoff we had over the debt ceiling was that our debt was downgraded. America's credit rating in the world was downgraded. Look at the strength of the American dollar today. Why is it in that position? I have never been anywhere where the world doesn't say, We honor the American dollar.

The point that I offered a moment ago is the following: they were prepared to default on that debt for the purpose, again, of isolated, strident political views that are outside of the mainstream. Job creation? It was held hostage. Fewer jobs were created than at any time since the Great Depression. That is not an opinion; that is a fact.

Now, this behavior was unacceptable, and the American people said so. You pay for what you spend. Raising the debt ceiling ensures that we will not be a deadbeat nation in the eyes of the world nor in the eyes of our own citizenry.

Not long ago, we passed an omnibus spending bill.

Incidentally, because of the breakdown in the regular order here, the idea that we used to spend according to the 12 to 13 appropriations bills that guided us every year, it was known as the regular order where Members had a chance to amend spending bills in committee and then on the floor, I must tell you that is a quaint reservoir of thought these days. Now we wrap it all up, and the same people that could say, Well, I am going to pass the omnibus spending bill to take care of favored spending, and then say, Well, I am not going to vote to raise the debt ceiling, the argument is anachronistic.

So I support this measure having voted against the Bush tax cuts, having voted against the war in Iraq, and having voted against most of the policies that got us into this. But this is about the full faith and credit of the United States, and it should be embraced by this entire body.

Mr. CROWLEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, NANCY PELOSI, the leader of the Democratic Caucus in the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership on this important issue to him. To Mr. LEVIN and members of the Ways and Means Committee, thank you for making clear what the stakes are in this vote on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the 14th Amendment of our Constitution declares:

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, shall not be questioned.

That has always been the standard upheld and advocated by House Democrats.

In each of my conversations with Speaker BOEHNER, I have conveyed the

unwavering support of the House Democratic Caucus for a clean bill to lift the debt ceiling. That means no goodies for one side or the other. There is nothing you could add to it that would say, Okay, since it is something I like, then I don't mind if it isn't clean. I said to the Speaker, Even if you added something that I cared about a great deal, that our Caucus cared about a great deal, that does not make it right because the full faith and credit should be unquestioned, and it is not negotiable.

I thank the Speaker for giving us this opportunity. This is really important to bring legislation to the floor that is consistent with the intent of the Constitution and with the best interests of the American people. Well, I tell you this, we have heard from all kinds of leaders of finance, from the boardroom to the kitchen table. The boardroom tells us, the conference table then writes to us and says, We urge you to again take the necessary steps to preserve our Nation's financial standing in the world and help ensure that the American recovery continues in its current path toward restored prosperity by the uncertainty as to whether or not we will incur an historic default in raising the debt ceiling.

□ 1630

I wish to submit the full letter to the RECORD with the signatories who represent the captains of industry and finance in our country.

More important than that, as important as that is, our global standing in the world, more important to each and every person in our country is what Mr. NEAL spelled out: what this means to you. If you are a consumer with a credit card, if we did not take this action today, interest rates could skyrocket, making it harder for families to get loans, and for small businesses to invest, spend and hire. Again, on your kitchen table as you pay the bills each month, you would have higher interest rates for your mortgage, your car payments, your student loans, and your credit card bills. Higher interest rates once again on small business loans that are used to pay employees or expand business. Significant blows would come to 401(k)s as a result of the stock market reaction to our not lifting the debt ceiling. Credit markets could freeze. The value of the dollar would be negatively impacted.

So there is a great deal at stake in this vote today. Again, at the time when we have to lift the debt ceiling, it is appropriate to have a discussion of spending priorities, of budgets that should be a statement of our values; but there should be no question that those debates would be something that would not just be a debate, but be a barrier to lifting the debt ceiling. That is why I am grateful to the Speaker and the Republican leadership for giving this House this opportunity to act in a way that is consistent with the Constitution.

When this measure passes today, Congress will state unequivocally that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is not in doubt. I thank my Democratic colleagues for never wavering from this position and standing firm on behalf of all Americans. I thank once again the Speaker for giving us this opportunity to associate ourselves and support the Constitution and the American people.

JANUARY 30, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, The undersigned associations representing a broad swath of the nation's business community and sectors serving tens of millions customers, businesses and investors, respectfully urge you to raise the federal debt limit without delay.

While we firmly believe that the time is long overdue for the Administration and the Congress to come together and develop long-term solutions to our very real fiscal challenges, defaulting on the nation's debt obligations should not be an option for policymakers to consider. Should the President and Congress fail to work together and raise the debt limit in a timely fashion, the Treasury will be unable to meet government obligations coming due which would trigger a series of events that would inevitably lead to American taxpayers paying more to finance our debt. Even a short-term failure to fulfill our obligations would seriously impair market operations and could have significant consequences to our fragile economic recovery. When Congress last debated this matter in the fall of 2013, markets clearly signaled the potential negative affects through increased interest rates and weakened investor demand for U.S. assets.

We urge you to again take the necessary steps to preserve our nation's financial standing in the world and help ensure that the American economy continues on its current path toward restored prosperity by eliminating the uncertainty as to whether or not we will incur an historic default and raising the debt ceiling.

Thank you for considering our urgent request. We look forward to working with you to advance this and other critical legislation.

Signed,

American Bankers Association, American Insurance Association, U S Chamber of Commerce, Consumer Bankers Association, Financial Services Forum, Financial Services Roundtable, Independent Community Bankers of America, Investment Company Institute, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

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

The Budget Control Act was signed into law on August 2. On August 5, Standard & Poor's downgraded the United States credit rating and did so because:

The downgrade reflects our opinion that the fiscal consolidation plan that Congress and the President recently agreed to falls short of what, in our view, would be necessary to stabilize the government's medium-term debt dynamics.

There have been some speakers who have come to this floor who said we were downgraded because of brinksmanship. We were downgraded because there were those of us who wanted to see some approach to fiscal responsibility in our debt limit negotiations.

Clearly, that is revisionist history, and the facts bear out. Standard &

Poor's own quote was it was because we didn't go far enough, not because we tried to address our medium term and long-term debt.

So this reinforces my point. We can't be satisfied with just increasing the debt limit. I realize that is where we are today, and as I have said, I will vote for this legislation, but as another speaker has said, they have viewed this as nonnegotiable, and what we really need to do is reach across the aisle and work together to find long-term solutions to both our medium term and long-term debt obligations so that these programs, like Medicare and Social Security, these valuable programs that serve many of our citizens, are not only viable and there today, but there well into the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 21 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 25½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we have been adamant about a clear, clean debt ceiling vote, and now it is happening. It should have happened the last time, and because of the Republican position, a high price was paid—jobs were lost, 120,000; the stock market plunged nearly 20 percent; and economic growth was slowed significantly. So this time around, we are going to do the right thing.

The gentleman from Michigan, my colleague, the chairman of the committee talked about working together, and I want to close by suggesting now with this vote in terms of the debt ceiling, we have cleared the deck. Let us now take up the other issues of major importance to the people of this country, and one of them is unemployment insurance.

As we stand here today, isolated maybe by the walls around this Chamber, but I hope not, 1.7 million people have lost every dime of their unemployment insurance, the long-term unemployed. All right, we are clearing the decks. Now let's pay attention to the business of the American people in addition to full faith and credit. We should not be leaving here with 1.7 million Americans out in the cold because too many people in this institution haven't been willing to listen to their stories. Listen and act.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Let me start by saying this issue ought not to be subject to debate. America, the greatest land on the face of the Earth, and one of the most successful economic countries in history, ought to pay its bills. I can't believe there is any American who thinks that America should or would welch on that which it owes. That is not a very sophisticated argument. I can make a more sophisticated argument, but when it comes down to it, that is the issue: will America pay its bills? Will it give confidence to the investor community? Will it give confidence to the business community? Will it give confidence to our own citizens? Indeed, will we give confidence to the world that the world's leader can manage its own affairs responsibly?

I want to join Leader PELOSI in congratulating the Speaker for bringing this bill to the floor. He brings it to the floor because he knows, as I have just said, there is no alternative for America but to pay its bills. He brings it to the floor because he knows that if he doesn't, the business community is going to think that the majority party in this House cannot manage the affairs of the United States of America in a responsible fashion. Lamentably, he brings it to the floor, apparently, with some doubts as to whether or not those who have elected him Speaker will follow him in taking a responsible path.

My presumption is, although I don't know, is that the gentleman who chairs the Ways and Means Committee will vote for this. My presumption is Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader, will vote for this. My presumption is that Speaker BOEHNER will vote for this. My presumption is based upon the fact that they have represented that there is not an alternative that is a responsible one.

I doubt that there are many people on this floor who have urged us to pursue a big deal more than I have. I voted against the last budget agreement, otherwise known as Ryan-Murray, because I thought it was too small and did not move us toward fiscal responsibility and sustainability in the magnitude that it should have.

Having said that, however, there is no alternative to pay the bills that we have incurred, that the House, the Senate, and the President on behalf of the American people have incurred, and because we are a great Nation, we will certainly not welch on our debts.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. So we come to this time with not many people on the floor, although we have demagogued this issue in the past. We, both sides. Let's be clear. On our side, we said that the Republicans cut revenues; therefore, they were responsible for the debt. On their side, they say Democrats spent money and invested money; and, therefore, they are responsible for the debt.

The fact of the matter is we were all responsible for the debt. The fact of the

matter is under the Reagan administration, when I came to Congress, we substantially increased the national debt, and we could only do so with Ronald Reagan's signature. Then under George Bush the first, we substantially increased the debt. We could only do so with George Bush's signature. Under Bill Clinton, we brought the debt down for 4 years running, and we ran surpluses for the next 4. Of course, Republicans were in the House and in charge for 6 years. So it was a team effort, if you will, and we had a budget surplus.

Then in the second Bush administration, we substantially increased the budget deficit. We had two wars, and we paid for none; trillion dollar-plus in additional deficit, many trillions over time.

So, my friends, we come to the floor today to do the only responsible alternative available to us, but that does not mean that anybody who votes for this believes that it is not critically important for us to have America on a fiscally sustainable path.

The Business Roundtable has urged us to pass this bill. As Leader PELOSI quoted, the Chamber of Commerce said not to do so will put our country and our economy at risk. Yet, I fear there are going to be apparently a significant number of people who will come and vote "no," vote "no" on paying America's bills; vote "no" on giving confidence to the international community that America is in fact able to manage its affairs.

There ought to be no debate, as I said, when it comes to making sure that we pay our bills on time, the bills Congress has incurred. As I said, the Business Roundtable was quoted as saying:

Urgent action is required on the part of Congress in order to prevent a default.

In fact, they said if we defaulted, every American, all 315-plus million, would feel the negative effects. Why would anybody vote against such a bill?

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I will conclude because my friend is running out of time. This is not a partisan vote and should not be viewed as such. Republicans and Democrats have voted to protect the American people, provide for the national defense, and provide for the general welfare of our country pursuant to our constitutional responsibilities. Having done so, there is no responsible alternative but to pay our bills. That is what this vote is about. Let's show the courage, the wisdom, the common sense to do just that. Vote "yes."

□ 1645

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

I point out to my friends on the other side that, in recent memory, there have been seven instances where debt limits were part of other major pieces

of legislation. For example, in the first Bush administration, there was a Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Act; in the Clinton administration, there was the Reconciliations Act, as well as the Contract with America Advancement Act; in the Obama administration, there was stimulus, Pay-As-You-Go, Budget Control Act. This has happened seven times in recent history.

What is different? Why can't it happen now? Well, the difference is that you had both parties willing to come together and negotiate major pieces of legislation that would help to address the short-term, medium-term, and long-term drivers of our debt. What we have now is a very open admission that it is absolutely nonnegotiable. There is a straight increase in the debt limit without any legislation, even though this happened seven times in the past.

So I would just say that debt limit increases are often parts of larger pieces of legislation and it would not be unusual. And it is, I think, a sad day when the other side has a take-it-or-leave-it approach and is unwilling to come together with the Republicans to find a way to bring other legislation to the floor that will help address the drivers of our debt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is the House Democrats who are required to take the important action to protect our Nation's well-being. Today, most House Republicans will once again refuse to stand behind the full faith and credit of the United States, threatening an economic catastrophe for all Americans.

When Republicans pushed our Nation to the brink of default last year, refusing to increase the debt limit, businesses, large and small, began to cut back by slowing spending and hiring. Consumer confidence fell faster than at any other time since the financial crisis in 2008. Potential home buyers didn't buy homes. But despite these warnings, House Republicans still want to push us to default, and the consequences would be disastrous.

The value of our 401(k)s and IRAs would plummet, significantly hurting those saving for retirement. For consumers, a default would make credit cards, mortgages, and student and automobile loans all more expensive. Default would lead to a U.S. credit rating downgrade, making it harder for new businesses to hire new employees and our cities and States to finance schools, hospitals, roads, and bridges.

Mr. Speaker, the American people cannot afford another round of Republican recklessness. Everyone from Wall Street CEOs to conservative economists agree: we need to honor our debts.

I and my Democratic colleagues will once again do what is necessary. I urge

the Republicans to put Americans before ideology and support this legislation to raise the debt ceiling.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, today the U.S. Congress is doing its job 5 days after forcing the Treasury to resort to extraordinary measures to finance our government and 3 legislative days before an unprecedented default.

This marks the fourth time in the last 3 years that we have been pushed right to the brink of default. Everyone outside of this Chamber knows we would have and should have lifted the debt ceiling long before we arrived at this point.

I am glad to see that once again we have been able to do our most basic job, but we need to stop playing these political games with our economy, our stability, and our reputation. We should not be forced to wonder, year after year, if we are going to be able to decide to meet our obligations. We should guarantee that the only time we debate spending is during spending debates.

I would ask my colleagues to help me reform this process and install a permanent fix that would end their brinkmanship surrounding the debt limit. That is why I have introduced two bills that allow the debt limit to be raised unless a supermajority of Congress votes to block them. This would permanently shift the rule of Congress to disapproving debt ceiling increases instead of being forced to approve them.

My approach has been introduced in the other Chamber by Senators Schumer, Boxer, and Hirono. It has been endorsed by a growing chorus of economists and outside thought leaders.

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to lift the debt limit with me today. I also ask my colleagues to join me in pursuing permanent, necessary reforms for tomorrow so we can eliminate the futile hostage-taking.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to debate on the floor of the House, I have seen that Members are coming from all regions of the United States, which means that, in fact, this will be impacting all of our constituents. So I would hope Republicans would join the Democrats who will vote by and large, almost near 100 percent, to do what the Federal Reserve former Chairman Ben Bernanke said is to avoid a government shutdown. And perhaps even more so, a failure to raise the debt limit could have very serious consequences for the financial market and for the economy.

More importantly, it will cost student loans much more to our young as-

pirants who are attempting to develop an expertise to contribute to this society. A longer default could increase payments by \$2,000 of 531,327 Texas students who rely on loans to go to college. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to do that.

Higher interest rates for mortgages and auto loans and student loans and credit cards—Mr. Speaker, I don't want to do that.

Families' retirement savings and 401(k)s dropping as the stock market plummets, reminding us of about 4 years ago when we had one of the worst plummets that we have ever experienced during the last administration.

3.4 million veterans not receiving their disability—I know we do not want to do that.

Ten million Americans not receiving their Social Security check on time in just the first week—we cannot do that.

Drug reimbursements under Medicare stopping and doctors and hospitals not getting paid—I know the Members of Congress will not and do not want to do that.

So, a clean debt ceiling is the only direction, but we have some other options. We can do this in a bipartisan manner. We can have the Democrats standing tall as they have advocated for a clean debt ceiling, but we can join with our partners and we can acknowledge the fact that the government is not broke. We can invest in infrastructure.

As my colleague, Congressman LEVIN, has said, we can ensure that we extend the unemployment insurance and provide for education and provide for research and development. We can build this country. It is time now to vote for a clean debt ceiling and do it together so that we can invest in America.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any additional speakers?

Mr. CAMP. I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

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

In closing, I appreciate all of my colleagues coming down to the floor this afternoon to speak in favor of this proposed bill.

I do think it is noteworthy to point out that only the gentleman from Michigan has come down to speak on behalf of the majority today and ably, I should say, he is voting for this bill, and I appreciate his support. But I notice that no one took time in opposition on the other side of the aisle. Maybe they just don't really care as much about this issue as we thought they did.

But the reality is, as I have said before, every vote against this bill is a vote for default. The Republican colleagues have an answer for that. They have a plan. They intend to default some day so they have a plan. They

have a bill they call the Full Faith and Credit Act. We call it the “Pay China First Act” because what it does is it says, in the event of a default, we will pay those people who own our bonds, we will pay foreign governments first, and everyone else gets put down to the bottom of the barrel. But they have a plan; the Republicans have a plan in the case that we default.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I think it is totally irresponsible to even have had a debate on this floor on a bill that would determine the payments of our debt in lieu of default. I think it is irresponsible. The fact that we have had this man-made brinkmanship is irresponsible. Once again, the Republican Party and their caucus is showing that they are not responsible enough to be ruling and to be governing here in the House of Representatives.

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

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

We have heard a lot of talk about how our Nation must pay its bills. But one major reason we are in this position is an unpaid for trillion-dollar stimulus bill that did not increase economic growth, did not create jobs, and simply added to our debt.

I know there are some on the other side who want to keep on spending no matter what the impact is on our credit rating. While I believe that we must increase our debt limit, I am clearly not satisfied that there are no provisions that would help us address the long-term drivers of this debt.

But I will say that it is disappointing the Democrats have walked away from the table. It is disappointing that we are not engaged in a more serious debate today, a debate about policy and how we reign in what really has become runaway debt.

But as I have said, as disappointed as I am in that, I cannot in good conscience let the Democrats’ refusal to engage lead to a default. I will vote “yes” on this legislation today. But it is hardly a solution to our looming debt crisis. That is why the Ways and Means Committee will continue to move forward on reforming Medicare and Social Security, as we have, with bipartisan proposals that are in legislative form, published for the public to view on our Web site.

We will move forward on tax reform, one that will help grow our economy, create jobs, and help address our debt crisis by a stronger, more vibrant economy that will provide opportunities for individuals to get work, increase their wages, and provide for themselves and their families.

I hope that Democrats will join me in these efforts. I believe it is only through a combination of those policies can we really get to the true solutions to this very significant problem facing our country. While this is a short-term solution to prevent what I think is essential that we do prevent, a default, it is not enough. As I have said, there is so much more to do.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, the debt ceiling suspension expired last week, and Secretary Lew says that Treasury will only be able to ensure that the U.S. meet its commitments through Feb. 27. Sadly, some in the House Majority still find it difficult to accept that Congress should actually pay its bills, buying into the myth that not raising the debt ceiling will somehow slow government spending.

My colleagues fail to acknowledge that the deficit, as CBO recently reported, fell by more than a third in the first three months of FY14, and CBO predicts it will continue to shrink and stabilize at around 4% of GDP. Last week, the Business Roundtable lamented that Congress’s inaction fosters continued uncertainty, increases borrowing costs, and dampens hiring.

The Speaker told reporters that he does not want to play chicken again with the full faith and credit of the United States. So let’s have a clean vote on the debt ceiling and put this behind us. It’s time to roll up our sleeves and tackle the real challenges facing our nation and start putting people back to work.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of S. 540 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3448.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—221

Andrews	Ciilline	Doyle
Barber	Clark (MA)	Duckworth
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Beatty	Clay	Ellison
Becerra	Cleaver	Engel
Bera (CA)	Clyburn	Enyart
Bishop (GA)	Coble	Eshoo
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Esty
Blumenauer	Collins (NY)	Farr
Boehner	Connolly	Fattah
Bonamici	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Foster
Bralley (IA)	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fudge
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Gabbard
Bustos	Cuellar	Gallego
Butterfield	Cummings	Garamendi
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Garcia
Camp	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Cantor	DeFazio	Green, Al
Capps	DeGette	Green, Gene
Capuano	Delaney	Grijalva
Carney	DeLauro	Grimm
Carson (IN)	DeBene	Gutiérrez
Cartwright	Dent	Hahn
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hanabusa
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Hanna
Chu	Doggett	Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda
Higgins	McDermott	T.
Himes	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Hinojosa	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Holt	McKeon	Schakowsky
Honda	McNerney	Schiff
Horsford	Meehan	Schneider
Hoyer	Meeks	Schrader
Huffman	Meng	Schwartz
Israel	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Issa	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Sewell (AL)
Jeffries	Moore	Shea-Porter
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Shimkus
Kaptur	Nadler	Sinema
Keating	Napolitano	Sires
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Slaughter
Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Kilmer	Nunes	Speier
Kind	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
King (NY)	Owens	Takano
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Kuster	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Payne	Tierney
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Titus
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Tonko
Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)	Tsongas
Levin	Peters (MI)	Valadao
Lipinski	Peterson	Van Hollen
LoBiondo	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
Loeback	Pocan	Veasey
Lofgren	Polis	Vela
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lowey	Quigley	Visclosky
Lujan Grisham	Rahall	Walz
(NM)	Rangel	Wasserman
Luján, Ben Ray	Reichert	Schultz
(NM)	Richmond	Waters
Lynch	Rogers (KY)	Waxman
Maffei	Roskam	Welch
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Carolyn	Royce	Wolf
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Yarmuth
Matsui	Runyan	
McCarthy (CA)	Ruppersberger	

NAYS—201

Amash	Fincher	Labrador
Bachmann	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bachus	Fleming	Lamborn
Barletta	Flores	Lance
Barr	Forbes	Lankford
Barrow (GA)	Fortenberry	Latta
Barton	Fox	Long
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bentivolio	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Gardner	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Marchant
Black	Gerlach	Marino
Blackburn	Gibbs	Massie
Boustany	Gibson	Matheson
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	McAllister
Bridenstine	Gohmert	McCauley
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	McHenry
Broun (GA)	Granger	McKinley
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Burgess	Griffith (AR)	Meadows
Byrne	Griffith (VA)	Messer
Capito	Guthrie	Mica
Carter	Hall	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Harper	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Harris	Mullin
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Cole	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Conaway	Holding	Nugent
Cook	Hudson	Nunnelee
Cotton	Huelskamp	Olson
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Crawford	Hultgren	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Hunter	Pearce
Culberson	Hurt	Perry
Daines	Jenkins	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
DeSantis	Jones	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Posey
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Renacci
Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Farenthold	Kline	Rice (SC)

Rigell	Sessions	Walberg	Cotton	Huffman	Neal	Stutzman	Van Hollen	Welch
Roby	Shuster	Walden	Courtney	Huizenga (MI)	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wenstrup
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Walorski	Cramer	Hultgren	Neugebauer	Takano	Veasey	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)	Crawford	Hunter	Noem	Terry	Vela	Williams
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)	Crenshaw	Hurt	Nolan	Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup	Crowley	Israel	Nugent	Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)
Rokita	Southerland	Westmoreland	Cuellar	Issa	Nunes	Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Wittman
Rooney	Stewart	Whitfield	Culberson	Jackson Lee	Nunnelee	Thornberry	Walberg	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Williams	Cummings	Jeffries	O'Rourke	Tiberi	Walden	Womack
Ross	Stockman	Wilson (SC)	Daines	Jenkins	Olson	Tierney	Walorski	Woodall
Rothfus	Stutzman	Wittman	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tipton	Walz	Yarmuth
Ryan (WI)	Terry	Womack	Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Titus	Wasserman	Yoder
Salmon	Thompson (PA)	Woodall	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Tonko	Schultz	Yoho
Sanford	Thornberry	Yoder	DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Pascrell	Tsongas	Waters	Young (AK)
Scalise	Tiberi	Yoho	Delaney	Jordan	Paulsen	Turner	Waxman	Young (IN)
Schock	Tipton	Young (AK)	DeLauro	Joyce	Payne	Upton	Weber (TX)	Young (IN)
Schweikert	Turner	Young (IN)	DelBene	Kaptur	Pearce	Valadao	Webster (FL)	
Scott, Austin	Upton		Denham	Keating	Pelosi			
Sensenbrenner	Wagner		Dent	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter			

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	Gosar	Rush
Amodei	Latham	Scott, David
Campbell	Lewis	
Cárdenas	Pastor (AZ)	

□ 1727

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL CAP LIQUIDITY REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3448) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for an optional pilot program allowing certain emerging growth companies to increase the tick sizes of their stocks, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 4, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]
YEAS—412

Amash	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Bachmann	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Bachus	Bridenstine	Castro (TX)
Barber	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Barr	Broun (GA)	Chu
Barrow (GA)	Brown (FL)	Ciçilline
Barton	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Buchanan	Clay
Beatty	Bucshon	Cleaver
Becerra	Burgess	Clyburn
Benishek	Bustos	Coble
Bentivolio	Butterfield	Coffman
Bera (CA)	Byrne	Cohen
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cole
Bishop (GA)	Camp	Collins (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Conaway
Black	Capps	Connolly
Blackburn	Capuano	Conyers
Blumenauer	Carney	Cook
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Boustany	Carter	Costa

DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Kennedy
DesJarlais	Kildee	Kilmer
Deuch	Kind	King (IA)
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	King (NY)
Dingell	Kingston	Kinzinger (IL)
Doggett	Kirkpatrick	Klaine
Doyle	Kline	Kuster
Duckworth	Labrador	LaMalfa
Duffy	Lamborn	Lance
Duncan (SC)	Langevin	Lankford
Duncan (TN)	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Edwards	Farenthold	Larson (CT)
Ellison	Farr	Latta
Elmiers	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Engel	Fincher	Levin
Enyart	Fitzpatrick	Lipinski
Eshoo	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Esty	Fleming	Loeb
Farenthold	Flores	Lofgren
Farr	Forbes	Long
Fattah	Foster	Lowenthal
Fincher	Fox	Lowey
Fitzpatrick	Frankel (FL)	Lucas
Fleischmann	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Fleming	Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham
Flores	Fudge	(NM)
Forbes	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Foster	Gallego	(NM)
Fox	Garamendi	Lummis
Frankel (FL)	Garcia	Lynch
Franks (AZ)	Gardner	Maffei
Frelinghuysen	Garrett	Maloney
Fudge	Gerlach	Carolyn
Gabbard	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean
Gallego	Gibson	Marchant
Garamendi	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Garcia	Gingrey (GA)	Massie
Gardner	Gohmert	Matheson
Garrett	Goodlatte	Matsui
Gerlach	Gowdy	McAllister
Gibbs	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Gibson	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (NY)
Gingrey (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Gingrey (GA)	Green, Al	McCollum
Gohmert	Green, Gene	McDermott
Goodlatte	Griffin (AR)	McGovern
Gowdy	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Granger	Grijalva	McIntyre
Graves (GA)	Grimm	McKeon
Graves (MO)	Guthrie	McKinley
Green, Al	Gutiérrez	Hahn
Green, Gene	Hahn	Hall
Griffin (AR)	Hahn	McMorris
Griffith (VA)	Hanna	Rodgers
Grijalva	Hanabusa	McNerney
Grimm	Harper	Meadows
Guthrie	Harris	Meehan
Gutiérrez	Hartzer	Meeks
McKeon	Hastings (FL)	Meng
McKinley	Hastings (WA)	Messer
Hahn	Heck (NV)	Mica
Hall	Heck (WA)	Michaud
Hanabusa	Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)
Hanna	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Harper	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Harris	Higgins	Miller, George
Hartzer	Himes	Moore
Hastings (FL)	Hinojosa	Moran
Hastings (WA)	Holding	Mullin
Heck (NV)	Holt	Mulvaney
Heck (WA)	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Hensarling	Horsford	Murphy (PA)
Herrera Beutler	Hoyer	Nadler
Higgins	Hudson	Napolitano
Himes	Huelskamp	

Fortenberry

Jones	McClintock	Pastor (AZ)
	Stockman	Price (GA)
		Rush
		Scott, David
		Westmoreland

NAYS—4

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Pastor (AZ)
Amodei	Gosar	Price (GA)
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cárdenas	Latham	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Lewis	Westmoreland

□ 1735

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 62 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

MEDICAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRMEN AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS RELATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3578) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to establish requirements for the adoption of any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF JOHN FAHEY AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for the appointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Roger W. Sant of the District of Columbia, on October 24, 2013, is filled by the appointment of John Fahey of the District of Columbia. The appointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF RISA LAVIZZO-MOUREY AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the appointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Patricia Q. Stonesifer of Washington, DC, on December 21, 2013, is filled by the appointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey of Pennsylvania. The appointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on the later of December 22, 2013, or the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington on Monday, February 10, 2014, for votes because of events in our district. If I would have been here I would have voted as follows:

On passage of H.R. 2431, the National Integrated Drought Information Systems Reauthorization Act, rollcall No. 55, I would have voted "yea."

On passage of H. Res. 447, a House resolution supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, rollcall No. 56, I would have voted "yea."

On approval of the Journal, rollcall No. 57, I would have voted "no."

ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2014, TO FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, February 14, 2014.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 25

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill, S. 25, the Secretary of the Senate shall amend the title so as to read: "To ensure that the reduced annual cost-of-living adjustment to the retired pay of members and former members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 will not apply to

members or former members who first became members prior to January 1, 2014, and for other purposes."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 540

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 82

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill, S. 540, the Secretary of the Senate shall amend the title so as to read: "To temporarily extend the public debt limit, and for other purposes."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1762

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1762, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 417

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from House Resolution 417.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE WISSAHICKON SKATING CLUB AND THE MERRITTON ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the skaters and families, current and past, of the Wissahickon Skating Club in Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania, and the Merritton Athletic Association in St. Catharines, Ontario.

This weekend marks the 50th anniversary of the Wissahickon Skating Club—Merritton Athletic Association Hockey Exchange. For five uninterrupted decades, these organizations

have taken turns hosting players and families for a weekend of festivities surrounding a youth hockey tournament. It is understood to be the longest uninterrupted exchange of its type in international competition.

Mr. Speaker, this tournament brings back special memories for me. As a youth, I can recall the bus rides to Canada and the warm hospitality of the families who welcomed my brothers and me into their homes. It was and remains more than a hockey game. It represents the genuine affection Americans and Canadians have for each other, expressed through the rich tradition of friendly competition and the great game of ice hockey.

Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of this very special engagement will be celebrated this weekend in Philadelphia. I hope this wonderful tradition continues with similar enthusiasm for the children of the children who will compete.

□ 1745

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, people all over the world will be celebrating Valentine's Day, a day of romance when we express our gratitude to the ones we love. We look forward to our chocolate, our candy, our flowers, and our cards.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, the women in our lives deserve more—equal pay for equal work. When our mothers, our daughters, our sisters put in a hard day of labor, they should receive the dignity and equity that they earn. Fair pay is the best gift we could give women and the families they cherish.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

(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, the Internal Revenue Service on Monday issued final regulations regarding the treatment of volunteer firefighters and emergency personnel under the employer mandate provision of the President's health care law, the Affordable Care Act. The agency determined that volunteer firefighters and emergency personnel will not be treated as full-time employees under the law, which I was pleased to hear.

Over 97 percent of Pennsylvania's fire departments and 90 percent nationwide are served by community volunteers. Today, by protecting these organizations from being defined as employers, they will no longer be forced to provide health insurance to their volunteers or face the threat of penalty, which would be devastating.

As a firefighter and EMS volunteer since 1983, I joined friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman LOU BARLETTA, along with numerous colleagues in the House, to force action from the IRS on this matter.

While this decision is long overdue, it is the right one. Our local emergency volunteer organizations now have the certainty knowing they will have the money to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is just a small fix to a massive law that is imposing economic harm on millions of businesses and families. Our work remains.

CHARLES DARWIN

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the birth of Charles Darwin 205 years ago tomorrow and to call attention to a resolution I have introduced with a number of other Members marking his birthday as ceremonial Darwin Day.

Through his work, Darwin discovered that the drive for survival of each species produces an evolution by natural selection. This discovery fundamentally changed our understanding of the world. It paved the way for innumerable advancements in the fields of medicine, technology, and education. Without his recognition that natural selection enables increasing complexity, our comprehension of the world around us would be vastly poorer.

To me, Charles Darwin represents much more than a discovery or a theory. He represents a way of thinking, a philosophy. His approach to life and to the world around him should be celebrated as much as his discoveries. It was his thirst for knowledge and his scientific approach that led to new truths that enabled him to uncover the theory of evolution. This lesson is as valuable as the discovery he made and the explanations he gave.

Thinking like a scientist is all too absent from our public dialogue, and this is why we should continue to celebrate Darwin as a master of clear, evidence-based thinking. We, in this House, would do well to emulate his vision and his thinking, and I urge my colleagues to join me in marking Darwin Day.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT 3407

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

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, on February 12, 2014, we honor the fifth anniversary of the crash of Flight 3407 in Clarence Center, New York, and remember the 50 men and women and the one unborn child who died that tragic night.

As Erie County executive, I was on the scene following the crash, and witnessing the grief of the victims' families will remain with me forever. Flight 3407 families had their loved ones ripped away in such a horrible and preventable accident, but with grace and courage, these families turned their loss into a crusade to make the skies safer for all of our families. Against very steep obstacles, Flight 3407 families prevailed and forced Congress to pass legislation requiring airlines to put well-trained pilots in every cockpit.

On the fifth anniversary, we remember those who died that night and extend our gratitude to their families for fighting to make sure their loved ones did not die in vain.

BREAST CANCER MORBIDITY RATES

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday in Memphis at 10 o'clock, I will be holding the first of a series of health forums on issues of importance to the people of the Ninth District. The one on Thursday will be on the racial difference in breast cancer morbidity. A New York Times story told of a study which showed that African American women have a greater likelihood than Caucasian women of dying from breast cancer in Memphis than any other city. We will have a panel to discuss it and try to find ways to have people get mammograms, change their diets, and see their physicians.

Under the Affordable Care Act, you don't have to pay a copay or a deductible to get preventative care. The Affordable Care Act could reverse that morbidity difference in Memphis. People need to get their mammograms.

People can go to community health centers that have been funded through the Affordable Care Act to get mammograms, watch their diet, and reverse this horrible trend. I encourage people to come to the Church Health Center on Union at 10 o'clock Thursday morning in Memphis to learn about this problem.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN BAHRAIN

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in solidarity with the people of Bahrain as they mark the third anniversary of the February 2011 popular protest. More than 200,000 people took to the streets to demand basic human rights and government protection.

Sadly, this anniversary will not be one of celebration. Rather than seeing a move toward reform, systematic human rights abuses and restrictions

continue, and freedom of association and expression have been curtailed drastically. Human rights defenders are jailed for life for peacefully calling for reform, while police officers convicted of torturing a prisoner to death are allowed to walk free.

As home to the 5th Fleet and thousands of U.S. servicemembers, the U.S. has an obligation to call on the government of Bahrain to enact meaningful reforms and adhere to its international human rights commitments. In the midst of increasing instability, it is time for the U.S. to hold its ally accountable and consider a contingency plan for a removal of the 5th Fleet.

MARRIAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you this evening. I know many of my colleagues would like to visit about a very, very important topic; and that is the topic of marriage. We are currently in the midst of National Marriage Week, which is a global effort with 16 other countries to promote marriage.

I think we are going to hear tonight, Mr. Speaker, some very important information on how important marriage is to our culture, to our families, to our society and, most importantly, in my mind, to our children.

So first I would like to yield to the Congresswoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) to speak on this topic.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HUELSKAMP for sponsoring this important topic this evening on National Marriage Week.

It is fitting and proper that we would set aside this period of 1 hour to focus on the institution that is the fundamental grounding institution of the United States of America. There are various units of government. We, here, are in the well of the greatest deliberative body that the world has ever known, the House of Representatives. That is at the Federal Government level. We have 50 State governments here in the United States. We have numerous county governments and numerous cities across the United States, but the fundamental institution, the fundamental unit of government is the family unit, and the family unit begins with husband and wife.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a creation of the Republican Party. Marriage isn't a creation of Western civilization or of the United States of America. Marriage, as an institution, was created by none other than the Creator of mankind itself, a Holy God, the God of the Bible, and it is stated very clearly in the book of Genesis that after God created man and woman, He then created the institution of marriage, and He cre-

ated it for a very simple reason: it is because God had a plan for man in the future, and that was through the propagation of the human race.

So as we are here talking about marriage this evening, my colleagues who will be joining us on this floor, we are here not to condemn anyone. My parents were married and then were divorced and then were remarried again, and that is a story that is repeated not just in America but in families across the world.

We are here not to condemn tonight because even though God creates an institution like marriage, and even though men and women can mess up and not necessarily fulfill what God had hoped for—God says He hates divorce, but it does happen—God is also the god of a second chance, and He gives people that opportunity, once again, to go back into a relationship.

So an institution that is meant for our good, it is one that, in fact, has been for good. It is good for man, good for woman, but most of all, good for the children that come from that union.

My husband and I are thankful that we have been blessed with five biological children. We have been privileged to serve as foster parents to 23 wonderful foster children. But you see, Mr. Speaker, without the umbrella and the protective element of marriage, that is the greatest security blanket that any child could ever know, to know that in their life, there is a mom or there is a dad that is crazy about them.

Many, many women raise children on their own in this country. Many men are raising children on their own. But we know that it is this fundamental institution of marriage that is the bedrock institution of this land, and so we are here tonight, as imperfect and filled with mistakes as we are—again, not condemning. We are here to lift up and support and encourage this wonderful gift given to us by the Creator but given to us for our good and for the building up of this country.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Congresswoman BACHMANN, I appreciate your leadership on so many issues. One of the inspiring parts of your life, to me, is you and your husband's efforts as foster parents. You have stories to share about the many children. Acting as a family, mom and dad to these kids, it sure must have made a difference in their lives.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, it really is something, and we had seen another couple in our church that were serving as foster parents. That is really what induced us to take on foster parenting. Our hearts broke when we saw the lives of some of these kids, and we knew we weren't perfect people. We knew we didn't have the perfect marriage, but we thought we could offer something into the lives of these kids.

One thing my husband said is, every child needs to know that at least one person is committed to them and at least one person is crazy about them. It

isn't to take away from the foster children's biological parents. Families go through rough patches. Families have challenges. Marriages have challenges. Nothing is perfect, and we are not standing up here saying any of us are perfect because we aren't, but what we do know is that a perfect God created a pretty good institution, and that is marriage, and that is the one thing that we felt that we could offer to our foster children.

□ 1800

We are an example of two very imperfect people in an imperfect home, but we were able to offer that model of what God had created, and that is bringing man and woman together, because we each, we are two whole people, but when we come together in marriage, we are stronger than two people together. So it is a very unique, three-stranded cord.

So I thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. As you know, there are many parts of the country where we are short of foster parents, foster families. If there is one thing you can say to a couple considering that, what would your advice be?

Mrs. BACHMANN. I would say think about it. It is not for everyone. But if you don't think you can do it—we didn't before we were foster parents. We took in one child, a beautiful girl. We took her from a homeless shelter, and we had the experience. It was good. We got a phone call from an agency, would we take another? We thought, okay, we will take another. And then we got a phone call, would we take another? And we took another. We got a phone call, would we take another? At that point, we didn't have enough places around the dining room table, so we blew out a wall and made the dining room bigger. And we just kept taking children into our home.

What we found—it was amazing. What I would say to parents is you will be amazed how your heart can expand. And it is all good, so I just encourage people to consider being foster parents.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Congresswoman BACHMANN, I appreciate your leadership both personally and here in Congress. So thank you for your time this evening.

Next, I would like to yield to a colleague, a freshman from California. I might remind the body that five Justices on our U.S. Supreme Court apparently didn't think California voters should decide some issues of marriage. But Congressman DOUG LAMALFA is becoming a leader here in Congress on that issue. I would like to yield to him and his thoughts on the issue of marriage, families, and protecting our children.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) leading on this very important topic here tonight, especially given that this is, indeed, International Marriage Week culminating on February 14, Valentine's Day. I am also

very pleased that my valentine is actually in town with me here for a few days, and it really, really picks you up because coming from California to the east coast does have its challenges in doing this job and doing it well.

That is really what the institution of marriage is. Your mate is your rock and your support when you are in a role like this, or whatever it is. It doesn't have to be this. It can be any job, or what she is doing at home, when your spouse is at home taking care of family, kids, and all that, you being a rock for them, too.

It is that partnership which is what marriage is. It was perfectly designed by God. It is the part where mankind gets involved where things can get a little messy. And so through prayer, through sticking to it, the institution of marriage is one that is a rock. It is kind of like—what is it?—a Nebraska defense years ago; you bend but you don't break.

That is what that bond of marriage is supposed to be. It is supposed to keep together. Yes, you have some tough days and you have some tough times, whether they are financial or there are things in your life, a stressful job or somebody makes mistakes in their marriage. That bond is what keeps you together. It is sad that in this day and age the sacred institution of marriage has been cheapened so much by you see what is going on in Hollywood, what you see with easy, no-fault divorce, that it makes it where people believe that maybe there is just an easy way out of this.

That is certainly not to say that people shouldn't have an out for a bad, bad marriage, an abusive marriage, but it also needs to be not taken lightly before you enter into it. So a successful blueprint, you will hear time and time again—there are statistics on it—is that if you, in your life, finish school, finish school, whether it is high school, trade school, college, grad school, whatever it is, grow up. Be a little bit mature before you enter this institution, then seek the bonds of marriage, then have kids. If you do it in that order, the percentages, the odds of being successful for you, your spouse, your life, and your kids—you create kids. You bring kids into the world. You have a responsibility, a big one, to help set them on a positive course.

I have heard stats before that kids coming from a marriage, a family with a father and a mother in the same home, have like a 70 percent better chance of being successful, of getting through their life, with getting through school, moving on, being supported to where it goes.

So the institution has so much good going for it. Indeed, it is one created by God and recognized by the Founders and is a cornerstone of this Nation's forming. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it says right above you on the podium there, "In God we trust." This is important trust we have in upholding marriage.

My colleague mentioned that being from California we do some strange

things out there sometimes. But, you know, amazingly, in California, two different propositions in the State of California passed, prop. 22 and then proposition 8, by the people of California, affirming that marriage is, indeed, one man and one woman. If you open the floodgates to other ideas, other concepts, you don't know where it ends. Multiple marriages? Same-sex marriage? There are so many things that are not what the institution is supposed to be about, indeed, an institution created by God, and it is supposed to be held up and respected by men and women.

Indeed, it is an important responsibility. It is a decision you make not lightly because it is a lifetime decision—at least, it is supposed to be. For me and my wife, we just celebrated 25 years this year. We are proud of that statistic, but even more so grateful for the institution and what it means for our kids and the stability this institution brings for them and for a nation, one nation under God.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank you, Congressman.

The gentleman from California raises some incredibly important points; number one, the personal aspect of marriage; also, the social aspect of marriage, particularly for our children.

I appreciate the efforts of voters in California. I apologize that a few Justices decided to attempt to overrule folks in California on this issue.

Next, I would like to turn towards a gentleman from Texas who has rapidly become a leader on this issue as well, and that is Congressman RANDY WEBER.

RANDY, could you share with us some of your thoughts about marriage and its impact as we celebrate National Marriage Week?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, TIM HUELSKAMP, for the opportunity to speak out today in support of marriage and also what I am going to call unmarried, and we will talk a bit more on that later.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, children are the only thing God can use to make adults, so we had better give Him a ready supply.

I would submit to those of us who are following this and listening that marriage has been the strong foundation of our culture and our society. Our government recognizes marriage because of the benefits it extends to our society. A healthy marriage creates stability, and it creates security, Mr. Speaker. A healthy marriage ensures a committed relationship with a mom and a dad to raise, to teach, and to instill values in those children.

A change in attitude towards marriage over the past several decades has been slowly corrupting our marriage culture. But it is important that we continue to recognize the important institution that is marriage and allow the conversation on its public policy interest to continue in the States.

This past week, sadly, Eric Holder, the Attorney General, has once again thwarted the Constitution, thwarted the separation of powers, and thwarted the popular will of the people when he announced that the Department of Justice—and I use the word loosely—would extend recognition of same-sex marriages nationwide, including my beloved Texas that has adopted a constitutional amendment to define marriage as a union between one man and one woman for our specific public-policy interests. We adopted that in Texas by over 76 percent of the vote in 2005.

Last summer, as we know, Congressman, you have already referred to it, the Supreme Court made yet another mistake. The Federal definition of marriage in the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, was ruled unconstitutional in the United States v. Windsor case. As a result of the vagueness contained in that decision, Federal agencies began developing interagency guidance that surpasses the limits set by our very own Constitution, set by the Supreme Court, and set by Congress. While some of those agencies are referring to State law, Mr. Speaker, in determining a couple's marital status based on where the couple resides, called the State of domicile, other Federal agencies are using the State of celebration or where a couple is married when they enforce Federal laws.

This latter practice is unconstitutional. Agencies do not have the authority to create law and, therefore, agencies, which are following "the State of celebration" in determining the recognition of marriage, they undercut State laws and inherently influence the debate within the borders of those States.

That is why I have introduced the State Marriage Defense Act. This act solves that problem. It provides that a marriage will not be recognized by the Federal Government if it is not recognized by the State in which the person lives, aka, the State of domicile. Every American's marital status in the eyes of the Federal Government would be the same as in the eyes of the State where he or she lives. That would simplify the law and do away with the confusion on the part the Federal agencies at least in that one regard.

So again, I have introduced the State Marriage Defense Act of 2014, which simply provides that a relationship will not be recognized as a marriage by the Federal Government if it is not recognized by the State in which that certain person lives. That is it in a nutshell.

My bill, the State Marriage Defense Act of 2014, is a states' rights bill. We in Texas don't want other States telling us—or the Federal Government for that matter—telling us how we should live, and we don't intend to tell them how they should live.

And now about what I call "unmarriage." Federal Government: leave marriage alone and leave it to the individuals who live in, contribute

to, and build families at the local level. Federal Government: divorce yourselves from this notion of dictating to the States. That needs to be an unmarriage.

I have been married to the prettiest gal this side of the Atlantic, TIM, for 37 years, and she is my girlfriend of 39 years. I understand that marriage is a commitment. It is a tremendous institution, and it undergirds our very society. I am glad to participate in National Marriage Week and to stand up and fight for states' rights.

I am RANDY WEBER, and there you have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman WEBER.

I have one follow-up question to try to determine in your mind exactly where do you think our Attorney General and the administration believes they have the authority to determine exactly what a marriage is? Can you explain that to me, Congressman?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. You know, I wish I could, TIM. Sadly, I think they have gone around the Constitution, gone around the Supreme Court, and gone around the Congress. I would say we have a constitutional crisis on our hands because here is an administration that is out of control, an Attorney General that is out of control, and, sadly for the executive branch, for someone who taught constitutional law, that is a scary notion to me because I can just assure you that I have read the Constitution many times over, and I don't have a clue where they get the authority, other than people have been silent and not stood up against that kind of what I would call "want to be kingship."

So I hope that enough people stand up and say enough is enough, get back to the basics and back to the Constitution. Again, as I said, unmarry this notion that the Federal Government has got to be in on our everyday lives.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you for your leadership. I appreciate your efforts on the State Marriage Defense Act. I am a cosponsor of that, and I encourage my colleagues to take a close look at that. It is not just the issue of marriage; it is the issue of who makes the decisions. As the author of the Kansas Marriage Amendment in 2005, I believe Kansans should decide that and Texans should decide that, not five unelected Justices here in our Nation's capital.

So, thank you, RANDY, for your efforts.

Next, I would like to yield to a Congressman from New Jersey. Congressman SCOTT GARRETT has been a critical leader on many issues of the home, the heart, marriage, family, and fiscal responsibility. It has been my honor to serve with Congressman GARRETT.

I yield the gentleman from New Jersey as much time as he might consume, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1815

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and

for leading this Special Order this evening in recognition of what week we are in, Celebrating Marriage Week, and recognizing the very importance that marriage has to our society.

Our society it can be said is built on four pillars: marriage, family, church, and the government, and today, we are faced with the reality that one of these pillars is crowding out and attempting to change the makeup of the other three. We have seen that some of our government's policies have discouraged traditional family marriage and traditional family structure as well, but I believe our government has an obligation to support policies that support marriage and support the American dream.

One of the most positive influences on a society is a strong family structure. Marriage itself is essential. It is essential to society, and it is essential to our American country and the American Dream. What I say is not ideology; what I say is data-driven. It is verified by the facts that marriage alone stands as a strong social fabric, a stronger economy, and a better future for our children. See, individuals who are part of a marriage household, a married household, are more likely to overcome disadvantaged backgrounds. They are less likely to live in poverty. Married individuals are more likely to earn more money, to save more money, and are less likely to be in debt. See, marriage is not only important for the economic health of our Nation, but it is also important for future generations as well. Children are more likely to succeed not only if they come from a married household, but the chances of prosperity, and this is interesting, are greater even further if they are raised in a community, a neighborhood, if you will, that shares the value of marriage. Children who come from a married household, to give one statistic, are 82 percent less likely to live in poverty and are more likely to gain a college education and succeed in society.

What is most essential to note is it is not only imperative for a child to be raised in a two-parent household, but it is also important for children to be raised, as I said a moment ago, in a community that values marriage and values family. Children who are raised in that sort of community will have higher rates of upward social mobility. I would note, to truly address some of the issues that Congress here tries to address, such as child poverty, we must address the root causes of those problems, and we must then acknowledge a solution to those problems as well.

So if you want to encourage economic growth, reduce poverty and ensure a prosperous Nation for future children, our government must encourage a strong family structure.

I said once before that this is not ideology-driven, this is data-driven. Why do I say that? Well, if you want to try to answer the question of what are the factors that are preventing, for exam-

ple, poor children from getting ahead, for mobility, we have data to support it. There is an important new Harvard study that looks at the best data on mobility in America that just came out recently. The name of that study is "Where is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States." It is a long title, but basically a study that came out of Harvard by economist Raj Chetty, and some of these colleagues over in Berkeley as well.

What they did was to dive down into the numbers, if you will, to see what are the characteristics most likely to predict mobility for lower-income children. This Harvard study asked which factors are the strongest predictors of upward mobility in various situations. In other words, which are the factors you can look to to see what is it that will bring children in poverty situations to a higher level. They went through all of the various factors you might imagine, but of all of the factors most predictive of economic mobility in America, one that clearly stands out above the rest is family structure, meaning what we are talking about here today, marriage.

I will quote from the study, if I may:

The strongest and most robust predictor is the fraction of children with single parent.

In other words, the strongest indicator of where they are going to have a problem with social mobility, in other words the indicator that says what is most likely to suppress or to keep children from being able to rise up and increase their stature in the community, to be able to go to college, get a job and support themselves and be productive in society, in short, live the American Dream, is whether or not they come from single-family households or whether they come from a married situation:

Children of married parents also have higher rates of upper mobility if they live in communities with fewer single parents.

Why do I say that? Well, again, what this recognizes is it is not just an isolationist situation, it is not just if you alone are married; it depends on whether or not you live in a neighborhood or you live in a community where everyone else around you is married, too. If you do, then you are a fortunate child because you live in a situation where you are more likely to be able to say: My future is good; my future is one where I am going to be able to prosper. My future is one where I will probably be able to move out of my current economic situation and do better.

So those two factors: it is whether you come from single parents or married parents, and also whether you live in a community where people around you are all single or people around you are all married.

So I think it is interesting. It is also interesting that this study comes not from some university that you might think of as being more conservative, but coming from Berkeley and Harvard, I guess we consider the source.

In closing, a lot of research, including some new research from Brookings Institution, shows what has already been shown, the first point, and that is to say if you are married, you have a better chance of rising up the economic ladder. This study now adds the additional feature of the community aspect.

My third point, what we are saying here tonight, is not ideology-driven at all. What I am referring to is a data-driven decision that we can make as Members of Congress. As a recent author pointed out, we just had the President of the United States standing before us saying that we must be a data-driven Congress and a data-driven government, and I agree with him. The data is now out there. The data shows to increase opportunity in America, to increase upward mobility in America, to sustain the American Dream, people of all races and people of all income levels have a far better chance if they come from a married family and a married community as well. So to understand this and have government have an effect on civil society, we must understand these parameters, and I applaud the gentleman for bringing this very important issue to the floor tonight.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentleman. You do indicate one study, but clearly what we do have are decades and decades of research, and obviously personal experience as well, on how important marriage is to reducing poverty, reducing crime. The number one single factor is the situation of marriage, and the gentleman from New Jersey has brought some additional issues as far as community.

We sit in this body and hear from the President and others: What can we do for the children? I wonder, it was about a year ago, and we have the President of France in our Nation as we speak, and there were more than 1 million French marching recently to say marriage is important. Were they saying marriage was important for them? Partly, but they were saying it is most important for the children. If you want to help the children, I beseech you, the research is clear. The Congressman has identified a study, and study after study exists, if you want to help reduce poverty, if you want to help self-esteem, let's help encourage marriage.

I appreciate your leadership on this. Next, I yield to a freshman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO). Again, this is National Marriage Week. It is close to Valentine's Day, and I hope you have gotten your Valentine gift for your sweetheart.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague, Mr. HUELSKAMP from the great State of Kansas, for holding this Special Order on the sanctity, the institution of marriage. Marriage, as we have heard, is the bedrock, the foundation of a society, and a strong society is necessary for a strong community. Strong communities are needed for strong States, and thus, they form a strong Nation.

We have heard over and over again the different aspects people have brought out.

Sociologists talk about how the family unit, a husband and wife, are the basic building blocks for a strong family, which is essential for strong communities. It has been proven over and over again, the family unit, people will have higher grades, higher economics when they come out of school. We toured several Head Start programs in our district, and I have asked the teachers over and over again: What percentage of the people are at the poverty level? It is 90–95 percent. My next question is: What percentage of the students here are from single-parent households? It is 85–95 percent all the time. That just shows you the importance of marriage.

Marriage is an institution passed down through thousands of years of human history. The three great religions, and others, recognize the importance of a marriage, and it has gone through the test of time and it has been understood to be the union of a man and a woman. It is sanctified by God, and it is interesting to note that children only come from the union of one-half of a DNA strand from a female and one-half of a DNA strand from a father. That is nature's law; that's God's law.

February is the month of lovers with Valentine's Day this coming Friday, February 14. February 14 is also the anniversary of my wife and I. I met her in the fourth grade, my fourth-grade sweetheart, Carolyn. This February 14 marks the 39th anniversary of Carolyn and I, and I am so proud of that fact. Somebody asked me today, What are you most proud of? I said, My marriage to my wife. We believe in a traditional marriage. We tend to stay that way. I just want to say: Thank you, dear. I love you, and happy anniversary.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the Congressman. I appreciate your compelling personal story. It is a story shared by millions of other Americans. It is something of the heart. We mentioned as well, it is not just of the heart and the home; it is for our community and the entire country.

The President and I can disagree on a number of things, but in 2008 there were some words that I think are clearly on the mark in terms of some items we have been discussing today. In his 2008 Father's Day address, the President said:

We know the statistics: that children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime, nine times more likely to drop out of school, and 20 times more likely to have behavioral problems or run away from home or become teenage parents themselves.

Without the institution of marriage, without particularly the institution of fatherhood, and we are facing a crisis epidemic of fatherlessness in this country, the President and I agree. It has an impact. It has an impact on every child. The lack of marriage and the

lack of stability and the declining awareness of marriage hurts our children and hurts our society.

It reminds me of a story that I believe was in Dr. James Dobson's book on raising up boys, and I do have two boys myself. He noted some years ago executives of a greeting card company decided to do something special for Mother's Day. So in a Federal prison, they set up a table inviting any inmate who desired to send a free card to his mom. The lines were long, and they had to make another trip to the factory to get more cards. Due to the success of the event, they said let's do the same thing on Father's Day, but this time, this time, no one came. Not one prisoner felt the need to send a card to his dad. Many had no idea who their fathers even were or how important it was.

So those who are listening, whether you are fathers or mothers or looking at that, recognize that even though this society, even though Hollywood will tell us it is all about you, it is not. It is all about someone else. It is all about that child. They need a father, they need a mother.

No one can be perfect. I have four kids myself, and I am reminded of that every day, oftentimes by my daughters themselves, but we are not asking for perfection, we are just asking for that time, that time to promote marriage and to spend the time with your spouse.

□ 1830

If you are not married and you have children, look at getting married. That will stabilize and bring many things to your children.

This is National Marriage Week. This is an opportunity here in our Nation not only to talk about marriage, but talk about its impacts, talk about how its loss has hurt our society. I firmly believe that we could spend endless amounts of money up here, and occasionally we do that, but you cannot replace the family, you cannot replace daddy, you cannot replace mommy. We can do our best. We can help our neighbors.

But as we debate the definition of marriage where we have a Court that on the one hand in June says we are going to let the States decide kind of unless you are in California, and then on the other hand there is a Federal definition or a State definition, at the end of the day it is all about how important marriage is. Marriage predates government. We might like to redefine it.

In 1856, the Republican Party had a number of things in their platform. One is very important. They demanded a free Kansas. Being a Kansan, we appreciated that and entered as a free State a few years later.

They also wanted to face numerous other things, including the twin evils of slavery and barbarism. They were talking about the issues of irregular marriage and the issues of traditional

marriage and how important it was and still is to society.

I appreciate many of my colleagues that joined us here tonight. But most importantly, I want to just speak again to moms and dads and spouses. Marriage can be tough, it really is, but God is calling you to do everything you can. It is just not you and your spouse. There is a third person in your marriage. God would like to bless and protect that marriage and give you many fruitful days ahead.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time on the special hour during National Marriage Week. I appreciate folks that are listening—my colleagues. Feel free to tweet out the message to encourage that. We can do many great things up here we think in Washington, D.C., but oftentimes it is that one little thing we can do for our neighbors and for our spouses as we celebrate Valentine's Day this week.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2012, ATTACK ON BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me for 30 minutes to speak on a topic, no matter where I go or what I speak on or if I am being interviewed somewhere, I am not the only one, it is other Members of Congress, too. This isn't a Republican issue. This is a bipartisan issue that Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker, confront wherever we go across the United States. I think that it has to do with the fact that Americans cannot countenance the fact that, when we had people who are serving us in harm's way, it appears that the United States of America, in one of the rarest occasions that anyone can recall, wasn't there for those who were serving us on foreign lines.

What I am speaking of, Mr. Speaker, is the night of September 11, 2012, what is known as "Benghazi." People still say to us, Mr. Speaker—again, Republicans and Democrats alike, because this is clearly a bipartisan issue. They say to us, when will we get the definitive report on Benghazi? When will we get some answers on what happened on that night, September 11, 2012? Because no American citizen should go and serve her country and not be protected by the Nation that sent her there.

Those who were killed that evening: Ambassador Chris Stevens, the first American ambassador to be killed in 30 years in the line of duty; Sean Smith, who was there that evening with our ambassador; and then also two men who gave their lives trying to protect our ambassador, Glen Doherty and Ty-

rone Woods. They weren't on the scene very long when they finally arrived in Benghazi.

The Senate intelligence report that came out said that perhaps 15 minutes had lapsed by the time they arrived on the scene until they were murdered by a sophisticated mortar fire on the roof of the annex.

Well, let's go back a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Let's take a look of what we know to be true so far.

We have had two reports that have been issued. One is from the Senate Intelligence Committee. I commend every American to go to the Senate Intelligence Committee Web site and download that report, read it for yourself, share it with your friends, share it with your family, and you will be shocked at what you find in these findings.

The media didn't pick it up. The report came out, it is true. It was reported in the media, it is true, that there had been a report, but what the findings said about the lack of management and the lack of accountability coming out of the White House and the State Department, quite literally coming to the very doorstep of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is shocking, and shocking is the fact that to this day there have virtually been no firings at the State Department for what happened at Benghazi, despite the fact of the report that was issued by the Senate Intelligence Committee and despite the fact that this week the House Foreign Affairs Committee issued another report after another investigation of what occurred at Benghazi. You see, there was a report, Mr. Speaker, that was issued prior to this one. It was the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

It is very curious that this Benghazi Accountability Review Board failed to interview the senior-most decision-makers in the Department of State. The facility in Benghazi, the compound where Chris Stevens and Sean Smith lost their lives, that particular compound is managed by the State Department; it is run by the State Department.

I would like to go over some of the findings this evening. In the minutes that we have together, I would like to go over some of the findings that were issued in this report. As I urge my fellow citizens in the United States to go to the Senate Intelligence Committee and read the damning report and the conclusions of that report, I also encourage my fellow citizens to go to the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs and download the report that was just issued this week also on Benghazi. The report is entitled, Mr. Speaker, Benghazi: Where is the State Department Accountability? Majority Staff Report, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee is a Representative

from the State of California, Mr. ED ROYCE. Mr. ED ROYCE said in September of 2013, the State Department cannot have a culture of accountability if no one, literally no one, is held accountable for the mismanagement and poor leadership of the Accountability Review Board it self-identified. In other words, a report which, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, was woefully inadequate in investigating Benghazi, what we will call the ARB, the Accountability Review Board, even that report said there were deficiencies in accountability at the State Department. We know there was woeful inadequacy, and this is something that has to be addressed.

I call on members of the media, Wake up. Take a look at what the American people want to know, and that is answers, answers about what led up to the night of September 11, 2013, in Benghazi. Were there alerts? Were there reports? Did we have any idea that this tragedy was going to occur? Absolutely we do. That is what this report shows from the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

What happened that night? What did the President of the United States do? Why is it that the media has absolutely no curiosity when it comes to where the President of the United States was that evening when the battle ensued? It actually wasn't evening. In Washington, D.C., it was 3:40 in the afternoon.

In the election that occurred in 2008, there were two Democrat candidates. There was Hillary Rodham Clinton and Barack Obama who were vying to become the nominee of the Democrat Party. One particular commercial was aired by Hillary Rodham Clinton. It was famously called "the 3 a.m. commercial," and the question that the ad asked is: Who would be the person that you want to answer the phone at 3 in the morning if a call comes for a tragedy?—inferring a foreign policy tragedy.

Well, the call did come, unfortunately, tragically, but it didn't come at 3 in the morning. It came at 3 in the afternoon. To be precise, Mr. Speaker, that call came in at 3:40 in the afternoon from a desperate security officer in Benghazi inside the U.S. compound who picked up the phone and made a call to the desk that he was to report to. That call immediately was transferred to the appropriate channels. Literally, Mr. Speaker, within minutes of the attack on the compound in Benghazi the President of the United States was informed not only that our American compound was under attack in what can only be called one of the greatest hellholes of the world, but he was also informed that our ambassador went missing and other Americans, as well.

What would a Commander in Chief do? What did our Commander in Chief do? I don't know. As a Member of Congress, I don't know where our Commander in Chief was that night. I don't

know as a Member of Congress what our Commander in Chief was doing that night.

I do know, again, in 2008 Hillary Rodham Clinton said she would be the individual who should appropriately take that call. She was the Secretary of State at that time on September 11, 2012. Where was the Secretary of State? She was here in Washington, D.C. What did she do when that phone call came in? She has testified before the United States Congress and answered questions.

But let's take and review again, for the few moments that we have, what this report states about that infamous evening. To understand anything this tragic, Mr. Speaker, we need to understand the context of the time. That is what this report begins to lay out, the context.

We know that in 2011, in May, our brave United States Special Forces took out the menace and the head of the al Qaeda organization, Osama Bin Laden. We are extremely grateful for the work that they did.

But despite that blow to al Qaeda's network, al Qaeda wasn't done, and al Qaeda still isn't done today. Al Qaeda's influence continued to spread, and it spread well beyond Afghanistan and well beyond Pakistan. It had spread into the area of northern Africa.

There is a disturbing trend that occurred in Libya. There was a concern led by our President of the United States, Barack Obama. He stated that the United States needed to unilaterally go in to Libya and begin bombing.

The leader of Libya was a man named Muammar Qadhafi. He had been the head of Libya for a number of years. He is not a good actor. He is not someone that the United States would consider a friend. As a matter of fact, we had discovered that Qadhafi was hoping to start a nuclear program in Libya. Events ensued and that program was stopped.

Qadhafi changed his ways, so to speak, and Qadhafi actually became a partner in fighting the global war on terror and was, in fact, jailing Islamic terrorists in parts of Libya. Qadhafi was acting in this manner, and yet at that time, President Obama felt that he needed to go in and bomb Qadhafi.

I severely disagreed with President Obama at the time, Mr. Speaker. This was the wrong action for the United States to take. President Obama didn't come to this body. He didn't seek permission from the United States Congress to declare war on Libya, Libya which had not declared war on the United States. But President Obama literally sent in United States airplanes and began bombing Libya.

At the time, Mr. Speaker, I was running to become President of the United States. At that time, I stated I was unalterably opposed to President Obama's policy. We should not be bombing in Libya, Mr. Speaker. That is what I said at the time. Why? Because we already knew that, especially in the eastern

part of Libya, this was the number one area where people were recruited, terrorists were recruited, to come and kill American soldiers in Iraq. This was also training grounds and training camps for al Qaeda and other terrorist forces in eastern Libya.

□ 1845

You see, Mr. Speaker, if President Obama went forward—I said at the time—and bombed Libya and created instability, the question would be: Who would take over for Muammar Qadhafi? Who would fill the leadership void? The only competing power structure was of terrorist forces. Arguably—I said at the time, Mr. Speaker—we could even conceivably see al Qaeda come in to fill the void.

Libya is a nation that is not a poor nation. They have oil revenues that finance that country. I was there recently, speaking with the prime minister and with the head of the justice ministry and also with the foreign affairs ministry. This is a nation that has a great deal of infrastructure, particularly in the Tripoli area, and there are revenues that have come in.

So, if the United States were to go in, as President Obama wanted to do and did, in fact, do in Libya, we could see that there would be bombing, destabilization and that there would be a fight for power. We could see terrorist elements come in, those elements that would be in line with the goals and objectives of al Qaeda, and we could see oil revenues used and go into the pockets of those engaged in terror in order to continue to finance global terrorist activities.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what has happened in this region. That is what President Obama's foreign policy in Libya led to—to terrorists being on the march—and that is the context of the time that led up to that infamous night, September 11, 2012.

In that disturbing trend that was occurring in Libya after a near total collapse after President Obama's ill-timed and unfortunate bombing in Libya, in June of 2012, there were nearly 1,000 Islamist militants who had converged on the courthouse in downtown Benghazi. They came in one night with 150 to 200 vehicles. For 2 days, they had a rally that was sponsored by the terrorist organization known as Ansar al-Sharia. This was in June of 2012, just a few months before September 11.

After this major rally that occurred and also in June of 2012, an improvised explosive device—what we call an "IED"—blew a hole in the wall that surrounded this very same compound where Chris Stevens was tragically murdered on September 11. So, in June, there was a terrorist explosion that occurred just months before the attack on our compound, but that was the second explosion and attack that occurred on our compound. That was the second attack on that compound.

Did we have notice? We absolutely had notice prior to that time with that second attack.

Elsewhere in Benghazi, the United Kingdom—our closest ally and intelligence English-speaking partner—shuttered their office. Their staff withdrew after a rocket-propelled grenade attacked the British Ambassador's convoy and two security officers were injured. It wasn't just the U.K. that pulled out of Benghazi, Mr. Speaker. The United Nations pulled out, and the International Red Cross pulled out. The U.S. flag was one of the only Western flags that remained flying in Benghazi.

Did we know? Did Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton know? Did President Barack Obama know that Benghazi was in a terribly precarious state leading up to his reelection in the fall of 2012? Absolutely, they knew what a precarious situation this was, because it was our U.S. intelligence agencies that did their jobs.

What have the investigations shown? U.S. intelligence agencies did their jobs. They extensively warned not only President Obama but also Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that there was a deteriorating security environment in eastern Libya, including the expanding operation of al Qaeda in that region and that it mounted a significant risk to United States' personnel and to United States' facilities.

You see, this is the first question that needs to be addressed:

Did the President of the United States know this was a volatile situation? The answer is, undoubtedly, "yes."

Did Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have ample warning? Did she know that this was a real concern that Benghazi could potentially be under attack? The answer is, without a doubt, absolutely, yes, she did.

As a matter of fact, it was Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, herself, who stated in testimony before Congress that she well understood and was certainly aware of this reporting by our intelligence community as well as the fact that extremists claiming to be affiliated with al Qaeda were active in the area in Benghazi. Still, after the United Kingdom pulled out and left, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made the decision that the United States would remain. After the United Nations pulled out, Secretary of State Clinton made the decision the United States would remain. After the International Red Cross pulled out, Secretary of State Clinton made the decision the United States and our Ambassador would stay and remain in a facility that was not secure to vulnerable attacks.

As a matter of fact, the United States taxpayers paid for hundreds of analytical reports that were done and completed by our intelligence services that provided strategic warning that militias and terrorists and affiliated groups had not only the capacity but the intent to strike the United States and Western facilities and personnel in Libya. They could, in fact, do that. In

fact, we even had a report that was entitled in June of 2012: “Libya terrorists now targeting U.S. and Western interests.”

Could we have been any more clear? Could the Intelligence Committee have been any more clear? They issued a bulletin to our President and to our Secretary of State, “Libya terrorists now targeting U.S. and Western interests,” and still they made the decision that our vulnerable facility would remain open.

What happened?

Before and after these attacks, a lieutenant colonel in our military named Andrew Wood appealed to Washington for added security in Benghazi. He knew. He was a military man. Lieutenant Colonel Andrew Wood led a U.S. military team. He asked for supplemental diplomatic security in Libya, and he recommended that the State Department consider pulling out of Benghazi altogether after the U.K. left and the U.N. left and the International Red Cross left—but his warnings weren’t heeded. In fact, tragically, his warnings went unheeded.

Despite the growing danger in Libya, State Department officials in Washington denied the request made by Lieutenant Colonel Andrew Wood. When Andrew Wood said that we should get out of Benghazi, he was told no. He said, If we are going to stay in Benghazi, at least add more security. Lieutenant Colonel Andrew Wood was denied. He was told, No, we are not going to give you more security in Benghazi. In fact, they took away security in Benghazi. This was after the compound was attacked with an IED explosive device. This was after a rocket-propelled grenade was fired at the British Ambassador’s convoy and the U.K. left and the International Red Cross left.

Numerous incidents—in fact, 16 different terror incidents—occurred in 2012. Despite the pleas from the military for more security, Secretary of State Clinton, as the Secretary of State, did not give in to those requests. The President of the United States did not give in to the requests for additional security, and yet our Ambassador remained on that infamous night of September 11, 2012, without adequate security. It was a tragic loss of life, I believe a preventable loss of life.

What is even worse from that consequence, if there can be anything worse than this loss of life, is that that very action emboldened America’s enemies. Our adversaries saw what we did. In the midst of this heightened terrorist activity, they saw we did nothing to protect our Ambassador. When they killed our Ambassador that night, they saw exactly how the United States responded. We did not have military on the ground.

I am not faulting our military. Mr. Speaker, what I am faulting and what I am suggesting is that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, despite ample warning, did

not put the United States military on high alert in this volatile region. What other region of the Earth besides Afghanistan would have had this level of violence on that particular night, especially after there were already protests going on in nearby Cairo and especially after threats had been made by terrorists of retaliatory actions in the Libya region?

It is shocking to me, Mr. Speaker—shocking—that the President of the United States, despite this knowledge, failed to do anything in response to the pleas for additional security or, at a minimum, pull our Ambassador out of that region. Yes, we have answers. We have answers, and we still have more questions.

Committee members on the Foreign Affairs Committee demanded that appropriate State Department officials be held accountable for these decisions, as they rightly should, so that these mistakes wouldn’t be repeated, yet neither the White House nor the State Department has stepped up to the responsibility. Instead, the accountability review board, which did the first review, was seriously deficient. It failed to even comment on the actions of our Secretary of State Hillary Clinton or of the most senior officials in the State Department.

Now, why is this? Could it be because Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, herself, selected four out of the five review members?

You see, isn’t it convenient, Mr. Speaker, when it is our Secretary of State who gets to decide who sits on her own accountability review board, overlooking the actions of what happened on that infamous night? She selected four out of the five who sat on that phony review board.

Those are my words, no one else’s.

So, when she is selecting four out of five of those who are going to review potentially her actions, is it any wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that this accountability review board, if that is what you want to call it, decided: “We don’t think that we will even interview Secretary of State Clinton. We don’t think we need to talk to her. We don’t think we need to talk to any of the senior decisionmakers in the State Department. Oh, no.” So they chose to bypass even interviewing those who were the decisionmakers.

Mr. Speaker, that sounds a lot to me like the IRS, after this terrible scandal that is going on in the IRS. Where they appear to be, in a corrupt manner, trying to deny to conservative tea party organizations their tax-exempt status, the IRS also decided not to interview any of the victims.

How can you have an investigation of the IRS when they don’t even interview the victims? How can you have an accountability review board if you don’t even interview the decisionmakers in the State Department, including the Secretary of State and her top advisors?

This is embarrassing, if it weren’t even more tragic, because, again, we

are talking about the unprecedented loss of life of four Americans, including our Ambassador.

Secretary of State Clinton, herself, championed the United States’ going into Libya going back to as early as 2011. She testified before the committee that she was engaged in the issues relating to the deteriorating threat environment in Libya.

That is pretty interesting, Mr. Speaker. You see, both Hillary Rodham Clinton—the Secretary of State—and President Obama believed that the United States of America unilaterally needed to go into Libya and start bombing.

□ 1900

That was their agreed-upon decision, and when the chips were down and when the threat environment was deteriorating in Libya and Lieutenant Colonel Andrew Wood said, Hey, we’ve got a problem here in Benghazi and we’ve got to either pull out or we have to have more security, the Secretary of State and those who serve under her don’t heed those warnings. Not only do they not pull out of Benghazi, but they don’t give the increased security that was required to keep the Americans who were serving us safe. When they do that, then that is a problem.

What is an additional problem, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that at the State Department not one employee was fired or even missed a paycheck over what happened in Benghazi. I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of Americans that don’t know that; that despite this tragedy, despite this lack of accountability, of anyone being held responsible—Oh, yes, we heard that there were four people who were going to lose their jobs. My foot, Mr. Speaker. Four people didn’t lose their jobs at the State Department. Two were reassigned, one retired, and another one had another similar situation. No one was fired. No one even missed a paycheck.

What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is listen to the good commonsense of the American people who are demanding answers.

What in the world happened in this lead-up before Benghazi?

We need to hold the Secretary of State and the President accountable for what they knew and why they failed to make the important commonsense decisions that any Commander in Chief should make.

We need to ask that second question, What in the world was the President of the United States doing that night when the attack happened in Benghazi? For over 8 hours, Americans were under attack and no one came to their aid or assistance, other than those who were at the annex who came and were willing to lay down their lives, and those who came from Tripoli. It took them hours and hours, but they were finally able to come to assist their comrades in arms.

Then also the third question that needs to be addressed, Mr. Speaker, is

this: What happened after that night in Benghazi? Why did Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, why did President Barack Obama continue to force the false fiction that there was a video that no one saw was the cause for a spontaneous outbreak that led to the deaths of these four Americans in Benghazi?

We have listened to people who were on the ground in Benghazi. They stated overwhelmingly that this attack was not spontaneous. It was planned. Yet for weeks afterwards, the President of the United States, as late as September 25, when he went to the United Nations, made a statement—this was after four Americans were killed—the President of the United States said this at the U.N.:

The future does not belong to those who insult the prophet.

Those were his words.

We need to get answers. Again, I encourage the American people, Mr. Speaker, to read this valuable report issued this week on Benghazi by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 5 p.m. on account of weather conditions in Oregon.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 10 and 11.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 10 and 11 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

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. 1954. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, February 14, 2014, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4743. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Volusia County, FL, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4744. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Venango County, Pennsylvania, All Jurisdictions); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report on Minority Depository Institutions 2013 Report to Congress; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4746. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Air Canada of Saint Laurent, Canada; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4747. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the performance report for the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments for FY 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4748. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the performance report as required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for FY 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4749. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fiscal year 2013 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4750. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fiscal year 2013 Performance Report to Congress for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4751. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Evaluation Findings — Performance Improvement 2013-2014 report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4752. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2013 performance report for the Biosimilar User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4753. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Consent Decree Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0650; FRL-9905-54-Region 5] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4754. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0675; FRL-9905-62-Region 3] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4755. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Dela-

ware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0492; FRL-9905-63-Region 3] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Title V Operating Permit Program; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0483; FRL-9905-21-Region 7] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Changes to Dispute Procedures [EPA-HQ-OARM-2013-0705; FRL-9803-9] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0755; FRL-9402-8] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4759. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4760. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4761. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-273, "Omnibus Health Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4762. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4763. A letter from the Director, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, for the Mississippi River Commission covering the calendar year 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4764. A letter from the Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4765. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Service, transmitting the Service's report, as required by Section 3686(c) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4766. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of

Justice, transmitting a letter regarding the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4767. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Impact and Related Procedures [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0007] (RIN: 2125-AF48) (RIN: 2132-AB05) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4768. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0635; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-081-AD; Amendment 39-17720; AD 2013-26-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4769. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0575; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-17718; AD 2013-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4770. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher, Segelflugzeugbau Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0019; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-045-AD] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4771. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0095; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-197-AD; Amendment 39-17699; AD 2013-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4772. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Impact and Related Procedures [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0007] [FHWA RIN: 2125-AF48] [FTA RIN: 2132-AB05] received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4773. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patterns of Safety Violations by Motor Carrier Management [Docket No.: FMCSA-2011-0321] (RIN: 2126-AB42) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 478. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 540), to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center", and for other purposes (Rept. 113-351). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4031. 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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4032. A bill to exempt from Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 certain water transfers by the North Texas Municipal Water District and the Greater Texoma Utility Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 4033. A bill to provide relocation subsidies for the long-term unemployed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4034. A bill to enhance homeland security by improving efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from an attack with a weapon of mass destruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiaries coordinated care and greater choice with regard to accessing hearing health services and benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4036. A bill to prohibit the Central Intelligence Agency from using an unmanned aerial vehicle to carry out a weapons strike or other deliberately lethal action and to transfer the authority to conduct such strikes or lethal action to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements

in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to training and rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4038. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain improvements in the information technology of the Veterans Benefits Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs to process claims more efficiently, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 4039. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take actions to provide additional water supplies and disaster assistance to the State of California due to drought, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 4040. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs; to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 4041. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Freedom Riders, collectively, in recognition of their unique contribution to Civil Rights, which inspired a revolutionary movement for equality in interstate travel; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 4042. A bill to require a study of appropriate capital requirements for mortgage servicing assets for nonsystemic banking institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 4043. A bill to suspend the debt ceiling temporarily, to hold the salaries of Members of a House of Congress in escrow if the House of Congress does not agree to a budget resolution or pass regular appropriation bills on a timely basis during a Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr.

BARBER, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SRES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4045. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. COHEN:

H.R. 4046. A bill to strike provisions that prohibit the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy from studying the legalization of marijuana, that require

the Director to oppose any attempt to legalize marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. CULBERSON:

H.R. 4047. A bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4048. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations prohibiting mobile applications from accessing certain content and functions of a mobile device when such applications are not actively in use unless the user is provided with a disclosure of such access and grants affirmative express consent to such access; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4050. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for alternate means of proof of period of military service for purposes of the interest rate limitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 4051. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to establish a competitive grant program for renewable fuel infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 4053. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish standards for the provision of mammograms at health care facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4054. A bill to make supplemental appropriations to provide additional funds to Americorps for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4055. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

H.R. 4056. A bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the

Federal fleet by encouraging the use of re-manufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4057. A bill to authorize funding for construction of U.S. Customs and Border Protection customs plazas at land ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 110. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Health Care Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing a correction in the enrollment of S. 25; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution providing a correction in the enrollment of S. 540; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for him-

self, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. CHU):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 105th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for

himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H. Res. 476. A resolution strongly supporting the restoration and protection of State authority and flexibility in establishing and defining challenging student academic standards and assessments, and strongly denouncing the President's coercion

of States into adopting the Common Core State Standards by conferring preferences in Federal grants and flexibility waivers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Res. 477. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should work within the framework of the United Nations process and in good faith with Greece to achieve longstanding United States and United Nations policy goals by finding a mutually acceptable name that must apply for all internal and international uses (erga omnes), for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H. Res. 479. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ENGEL:

H. Res. 480. A resolution honoring The Hudson River School Painters for their contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. CHU):

H. Res. 481. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 482. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 67th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and supporting the goals of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of the events surrounding the restriction, exclusion, and incarceration of individuals and families during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 483. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 484. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 16, 2014, through March 22, 2014, as National Young Audiences Arts for Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4031.

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. HALL:

H.R. 4032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8, clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section VIII, Clause 1, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States . . ." In addition, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 14 provides, "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Lastly, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 16 states "The Congress shall

have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4038.

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. COSTA:

H.R. 4039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 4041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 4043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4044.

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. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 4047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 & the Tenth Amendment.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DUFFY:
H.R. 4049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution: "To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of Particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;"

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 4051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico

H.R. 4052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, located at section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 4053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 24: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 38: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 60: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 164: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 184: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 292: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 401: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 422: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 445: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 455: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 460: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 498: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 506: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 519: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 521: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 522: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 533: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 611: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 654: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 669: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 685: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 718: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 809: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 831: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 855: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 863: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 875: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 883: Mr. STEWART and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 920: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 988: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1010: Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1015: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1020: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1074: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1076: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1084: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1125: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1229: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1252: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1281: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1312: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1339: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1354: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1362: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1423: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1428: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1507: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1518: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1528: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1551: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1590: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1630: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1731: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1739: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1750: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1761: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1770: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1851: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2053: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2078: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2123: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2130: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2229: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2291: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2479: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2499: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2504: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2536: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2548: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2575: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 2694: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2702: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2804: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2822: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2839: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 2870: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2911: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2959: Mr. CARTER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2985: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2996: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 3040: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3086: Mr. HALL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3105: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3118: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 3135: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3155: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3179: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3211: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3308: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3344: Mr. BERA of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3361: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3370: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3372: Mr. WELCH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3384: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3395: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 3398: Mr. NUGENT, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PITTINGER, and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

H.R. 3401: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3410: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3413: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3461: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3463: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3485: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3511: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3532: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3541: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3544: Mr. POSEY.

- H.R. 3546: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 3556: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3635: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 3658: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3672: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3676: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 3712: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 3717: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 3725: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3726: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 3740: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 3743: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 3771: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3788: Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 3793: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 3829: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3847: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 3851: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 3855: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. DAINES.
 H.R. 3857: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 3864: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3865: Mr. PERRY and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 3877: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3899: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 3902: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 3921: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 3930: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 3933: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 3972: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 3978: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3979: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BARBER, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3982: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3985: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 3991: Mr. DAINES and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 3993: Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 3996: Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 4001: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4006: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 4008: Mr. LATTA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4012: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 4026: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. KILMER.
 H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 19: Ms. ESHOO.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H. Res. 59: Mr. POCAN.
 H. Res. 302: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H. Res. 365: Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 418: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 425: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H. Res. 428: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H. Res. 442: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H. Res. 467: Mr. MCGOVERN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 1762: Ms. GRANGER.
 H. Res. 417: Mr. PERRY.