United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2014 No. 48

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 26, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANE BLACK 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.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, a famous storyteller Mark Twain once said, ''Never let the truth get in the way of a good story,'' and proponents of the Keystone pipeline are following that advice very well. Supporters are painting an awfully rosy picture of Keystone's benefits while completely ignore the truth about the devastating damage it could cause.

TransCanada, a Canadian company that wants to build Keystone XL, claims the pipeline is safe, but this is the same company that operates the existing Keystone pipeline which spilled a dozen times in the first year of operation. The worst spill released 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota, contaminating local soil and water.

TransCanada claims that significant spills will be few and far between, but engineers at the University of Nebraska found that the company ignored data on spills and failed to factor in the more corrosive tar sands oil transported in Keystone XL. The engineers determined that instead of being safe, Keystone XL could have as many as 91 major oil spills over the life of the pipeline.

This concerns me because Keystone XL will run through 2,000 miles of American farmland and over our country's largest water aquifer, the Ogallala. This aquifer provides drinking water for 2 million people and supplies water to more than a fourth of our Nation's irrigated farmland.

Most Americans understand that past oil spills have severe environmental impacts, but any Keystone XL spill will be truly catastrophic. Keystone XL spills are more dangerous because tar sands oil is heavier than conventional oil, meaning it would soak into soil and flow into water, sinking, contaminating miles of river and shoreline.

Tar sands oil is also the world's dirtiest oil, and approving the pipeline will accelerate its production, endangering our families, community, and climate.

When extracted and refined, tar sands oil emits 17 percent more carbon pollution than conventional oil production, which contributes to climate change. With 830,000 barrels of tar sands oil flowing through the pipeline each day, the metric tons of carbon dioxide added to the atmosphere each year would be equal to putting more than 5½ million more cars on our roads.

This means that building Keystone XL will undo the progress America has made to become more energy efficient and reduce carbon pollution for the sake of our environment. The bottom line is Keystone XL brings a whole lot of environmental risk and very little reward.

Proponents claim the pipeline will be great for the economy because it will promote jobs and reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. The data, however, doesn't support the claims that the pipeline will create 20,000 American jobs. The State Department says Keystone would only create 35 permanent jobs and fewer temporary construction jobs than initially projected.

Proponents claim the pipeline will lower gas prices and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. In reality, it will do neither. Prices at Midwestern pumps could actually increase. The pipeline will divert oil from Midwestern refineries designed to produce gasoline to Texas gulf refineries designed to produce diesel, which has a high overseas demand. Oil economists found a decline in gasoline production would increase gas prices in the Midwest between 5 cents to 40 cents per gallon.

We should not move forward on Keystone XL when we know the environmental impact far outweighs the projected minimal economic and job benefits. Our focus should be on strengthening our clean energy economy that has a job growth four times faster than any other sector. We have increased our solar capacity to power more than 2.2 million homes and made wind power an affordable alternative energy source.

When something seems too good to be true, it usually is. The Keystone XL pipeline sets false expectations about gas prices and job growth. The truth is it will only accelerate climate change, harm our environment, and jeopardize the health of our communities.

Printed on recycled paper.

REFORM THE LAVISH CONGRESSIONAL PENSION PROGRAM

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

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to invite support of my bill, H.R. 2357, which addresses the congressional pension program.

The congressional pension program becomes vested after 5 years of service, Madam Speaker. I claim to be no expert on pensions, but I know of no pension that vests after 5 years. This would involve a Member to serve not even three complete House terms and not even one complete Senate term.

My bill would increase the timeframe from 5 years, presently, to 12 years. At least if my bill became law, a Member would be required to serve six full House terms, two full Senate terms, or a combination thereto.

I am disappointed to say, Madam Speaker, that my bill has attracted zero cosponsors, and it has been surfacing for several days now. I am here today to invite every Member of the people's House to warmly embrace and support this bill. You should do so for two reasons:

Number one, it will result in reduced public spending;

Number two, it would send a message back to our constituents that we are willing and able to reduce our own perks and benefits.

I urge every Member of the people's House to come forward, Madam Speaker, and sign his or her name to this bill, and we will go down the path of fiscal sanity and fiscal responsibility before it is too late.

END OF LIFE CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, we have a health care crisis in this country, but one few have heard about because we don't think about it until it hits us or our family, but it almost always does.

As we approach the first anniversary of the Boston Marathon bombing, that tragedy might serve as an illustration. Who in that crowd in Boston, almost a year ago, thought they would be facing not just life-or-death medical decisions, but about who would decide whether a leg would be amputated or not?

Who speaks for our loved ones when they can't speak for themselves? Who speaks for us when we are unable to speak? And how would they know what we want? This has profound implications.

Over 80 percent of Americans feel they want to spend their last days at home, surrounded by loved ones, lucid, aware, and enjoying their company. Unfortunately, about three-quarters of us spend our last days in a hospital, maybe in ICU, with tubes up our noses and heavily sedated. Is that exactly what we want? Who decides? And how will people know what my decisions or your decisions might be?

The failure for us to deal with this issue—whether it is the health care system, the Federal Government, individual families—can lead to tragic consequences. People can get the wrong care, be removed from their loved ones, sometimes get intrusive, expensive, and painful care when that is not their wish, drugged and helpless.

The failure doesn't just lead to unwanted care and pain, denying people the treatment they want, but it can have huge consequences on families. The loved ones left can be racked by guilt and uncertainty that can increase the trauma and the depression after the passing of a loved one. Commentators as diverse as Billy Graham and Dr. Bill Frist have spoken out eloquently about this need for all of us to spare our loved one's doubt and uncertainty.

This is an interesting test for Congress. Can we take steps that are supported by over 90 percent of the population that will lead to better patient care and satisfaction that empowers families to face medical emergencies the way they want?

This is, it should be noted, not just an issue for someone who is elderly with a terminal disease. Any of the bright, young people on Capitol Hill living away from home, perhaps for the first time, perhaps with some friends, can fall and suffer a concussion slipping on the ice or in a soccer game or in a car accident.

What have we done on Capitol Hill to make sure we know in each office who speaks for us and our staff if we are no longer able? One simple solution is to support H.R. 1173, a bipartisan bill cosponsored by over 50 Members that Dr. PHIL ROE and I have introduced. The government that will pay tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of dollars towards operations would finally pay maybe $150 or $200 for a doctor to consult with the patient and their family to find out exactly what their choices might be and make sure their wishes are respected.

Don't just cosponsor the legislation, but use it to have a serious conversation with your staff and your family if you haven't had the discussion. Let's make sure that everyone on Capitol Hill is protected when the inevitable happens, and let's make sure the Federal Government is a full partner. Cosponsor H.R. 1173, and then let us work to enact it.

RECOGNIZING ROXCY O'NEAL BOLTON ON BEING RECOGNIZED AS A WOMEN OF CHARACTER, COURAGE AND COMMITMENT HONOREE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Roxcy O'Neal Bolton, a pioneer and champion for the rights of women and an honored constituent in my south Florida congressional district. Yet Roxcy is truly larger than life and belongs to our entire State as well as our Nation.

This week she will be recognized as a Women of Character, Courage and Commitment Honoree by the National Women's History Project. This accolade is a well-deserved acknowledgment of her efforts to lead American women out from lifetimes as second-class citizens into an era of far greater equality between the genders, all while being a committed wife and mother.

Just as she did in her home life, Roxcy demanded equal respect in the workplace. From equal opportunity to equal pay, she knew that if women banded together, we were going to make a difference.

In 1972, she founded Women in Distress, the first women's rescue shelter in Florida to provide emergency housing, rescue services, and care to women who found themselves in situations of personal crisis.

Roxcy was also a fighter on behalf of abused women. At that time, no one talked about rape, much less did anything about alleviating the horrendous trauma that the victim undergoes. Brave crime victims who actually reported their rapes were often treated callously. Roxcy used her amazing presence, her force of will and characteristic personality as aggressive tools for positive change.

As an outspoken woman, she made waves on these topics, and by 1974, her efforts facilitated the creation of the first rape treatment center in the country located in my regional congressional district at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami. In 1993, this center was proudly renamed after Roxcy. She is also known for organizing Florida's first crime watch to help curb crime against women.

For all of these efforts and more, Roxcy has been the recipient of numerous civic awards related to her work. That includes the prestigious induction into the Florida Women's Hall of Fame in 1984 for forcing police and prosecutors to make rape crime a priority, as well as illustrating to health departments the need for rape treatment centers.

She is a true champion for womankind. Her legacy as a champion for human rights, an end to sexual discrimination in employment and education, as well as in preserving and recognizing women's role in history will forever be remembered.

I am proud to have Roxcy O'Neal Bolton in my congressional district. As Roxcy would certainly say, the struggle for women's equality issues is far from over. Yet, with her example, I am confident that we will continue to push ahead and positively change the future for our daughters and granddaughters.

So, again, Roxcy, congratulations on being honored as a National Women's History Project 2014 Women of Character, Courage and Commitment. You have given countless girls and women the ability to pursue their full potential.

Congratulations to Roxcy, and may you keep fighting for many years still.

□ 1015

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan Border Enforcement Accountability, Oversight, and Community Engagement Act with my friend from across the aisle, Congressman STEVE PEARCE. This is a policy that will disproportionately impact the border and one that is humane, fiscally responsible, and rational. It is also a bill that reflects the best values, experiences, and expertise of the people who live along the border. And it is, in fact, written by people who live on and represent border communities.

Madam Speaker, today we spend $18 billion a year on border security and immigration enforcement. That is twice what we were spending just 10 years ago. We have a surge in border security, a surge in border personnel where we have seen a doubling of the size of the Border Patrol from just 10,000 10 years ago to more than 20,000 today. But this surge in resources and personnel and enforcement has not been accompanied by an adequate regime of oversight, accountability, or transparency.

Tens of millions of our fellow Americans live along our borders with Canada and Mexico, and millions more cross them on a regular basis. In the community I represent, El Paso, Texas, we have 22 million border crossings a year; 99-plus percent are legal with people who are crossing for legitimate purposes with all of the appropriate travel documents. But when you combine the millions of people who live and cross our borders with this unprecedented surge of resources and law enforcement without the necessary oversight or accountability or transparency, this will lead to predictable abuses of power that we have seen not just at the borders themselves but at interior checkpoints that are up to 100 miles into the interior of the United States: detentions, interrogations, and retention of personal property, all without probable cause.

While the vast majority of our border protection agents and our CBP officers are professional, and all of them face very difficult challenges in their job in terms of the level of vigilance they must maintain, the territory through which they must patrol, the unpredictable threats they must guard against, our office hears on a day-to-day basis from constituents who are harassed and hassled or otherwise treated with less than the appropriate dignity or respect. But there is no clear process that exists for these individuals to resolve their complaints. I will give you two examples, one from the northern border and one from the southern border.

Pascal Abidor, an Islamic studies Ph.D. student and one of our fellow U.S. citizens, was crossing the Canadian border on an Amtrak train when he was questioned by CBP officers. He was taken off the train in handcuffs and held in a cell for several hours before being released without charge. His laptop was confiscated and held for 11 days following his detention during which time his private messages and photos were reviewed by CBP officers.

We have a case, unfortunately, in the community I represent, a woman who has not released her name but a fellow U.S. citizen who lives in New Mexico who was crossing into the U.S. from Mexico. She was suspected of carrying drugs. She was detained, frisked, strip searched, and taken to a hospital. There she was invasively searched, X-rayed, and made to perform a bowel movement against her will by doctors at the request of CBP officers looking for drugs. At no time was she read her rights or given access to an attorney because even at the hospital, miles away from the physical border, Customs and Border Protection maintains that they are still in the process of a border interrogation. No traces of illegal drugs were found, and she was billed $5,000 for the exams.

While stories like these are exceptional, they should never happen. As a result of a more militarized border, we are also seeing migrants who are pushed away from community ports of entry into harsher and more dangerous terrain, leading to a jump in the number of deaths. Two years ago, we saw the second-highest number of migrant crossing deaths on record, even though we saw the lowest number of crossing attempts across our southern border. We have had over 5,500 migrants die in the attempt to cross into the United States over the last 15 years.

It is not just the individuals who have been victims of unfounded searches and seizures or who have perished in the desert who are failed by our current border policy. The Border Patrol agents and CBP officers who perform these toughest jobs in the Federal Government do not always receive the training or support they need to be safe in the field or to do their jobs effectively.

For the taxpayers who deserve to have their tax dollars spent responsibly, secrecy and lack of transparency has prevented a sober accounting of whether the $18 billion a year that we are spending on the border is money well spent. Our bill addresses these issues in five concrete ways:

First, robust oversight of all border security functions;

Second, a transparent and timely complaint process that is independent of the existing chain of command;

Third, increased and improved training resources for our agents and officers;

Fourth, engagement between CBP and border communities;

Fifth, new transparency measures.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in a humane, rational, and fiscally responsibility approach to the border.

OBAMACARE'S IMPACTS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I hope my remarks will help America better understand the damage that ObamaCare inflicts on patients, health care, the economy, and jobs.

Today, I share a letter by Dr. Marlin Gill of Decatur, Alabama, that details Washington's damage to America's health care. On March 23, 2014, Dr. Gill wrote me:

Dear Congressman Brooks,

As a practicing family physician, I plead for help against what I can best characterize as Washington's war against doctors.

The medical profession has never before remotely approached today's stress, work hours, wasted costs, decreased efficiency, and declining ability to focus on patient care.

In our community alone, at least six doctors have left patient care for administrative positions, to start a concierge practice, or retire altogether.

Doctors are smothered by destructive regulations that add costs, raise our overhead, and ''gum up the works,'' making patient treatment slower and less efficient, thus forcing doctors to focus on things other than patient care and reduce the number of patients we can help each day.

I spend more time at work than I have at any time in my 27 years of practice, and more of that time is spent on administrative tasks and entering useless data into a computer rather than helping sick patients.

Doctors have been forced by ill-informed bureaucrats to implement electronic medical records (EMR) that, in our four-doctor practice, costs well over $100,000-plus in continuing yearly operational costs, all of which does not help take care of one patient while driving up the cost of every patient's health care.

Washington's electronic medical records requirement makes our medical practice much slower and less efficient, forcing our doctors to treat fewer patients per day than we did before the EMR mandate.

To make matters worse, Washington forces doctors to demonstrate ''meaningful use'' of EMR or risk not being fully paid for the help we give.

In addition to the electronic medical records burden, we face a mandate to use the ICD–10 coding system, a new set of reimbursement diagnostic codes.

The current ICD–9 coding system uses roughly 13,000 codes. The new ICD–10 coding system uses a staggering 70,000 new and completely different codes, thus dramatically slowing doctors down due to the unnecessary complexity and sheer numbers of codes that must be learned. The cost of this new ICD–10 coding system for our small practice is roughly $80,000, again driving up health care costs without one iota of improvement in health care quality.

Finally, doctors face nonpayment by patients with ObamaCare. These patients may or may not be paying their premiums, and we have no way of verifying this. No business can operate with that much uncertainty.

On behalf of the medical profession, I ask that Washington stop the implementation of the ICD–10 coding system, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and replace it with a better law written with the input of real doctors who will actually treat patients covered by it.

America has enjoyed the best health care the world has ever known. That health care is in jeopardy because physicians cannot survive Washington's ''war on doctors'' without relief.

Eventually the problems for doctors will become problems for patients, and we are all patients at some point.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Marlin Gill of Decatur, Alabama.

Madam Speaker, America should heed the warnings of Dr. Marlin Gill of Decatur, Alabama. Failure to do so risks unnecessary patient deaths while destroying the best health care system the world has ever known.

HONORING GRACIELA TISCARENO-SATO

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the work and achievements of a local Hayward veteran and businesswoman, Graciela Tiscareno-Sato. I was honored to meet with her yesterday in my office.

Before coming to my office, Graciela was recognized by the White House as one of 10 Women Veteran Leader Champions of Change for the work of her Hayward business, the Gracefully Global Group. It produces books and educational materials highlighting the positive contributions of Latinos.

The daughter of Mexican immigrants, Graciela received an Air Force ROTC scholarship to attend the University of California Berkeley, where she obtained a degree in environmental design and architecture.

Graciela then served 9 years on Active Duty in the Air Force as an officer, receiving the Air Medal for combat air operations during the Iraq war.

Graciela is also a mom, and a fierce advocate for her oldest daughter, who has been blind since birth. I asked Graciela how she has accomplished so much for being so young. She gave me one word: tenacity.

Graciela brings her heritage and experience to work writing educational books for children. One of her most recent bilingual books is titled ''Good Night Captain Mama,'' and it tells the story of a mother's service as a pilot in the Air Force, and it is the first bilingual children's book about a woman serving in the military.

Graciela is also committed to bringing jobs and economic development to her hometown of Hayward. I look forward to working together with her to accomplish this goal. Graciela's story is truly one of resilience and determination, or, as she would put it, tenacity. Thank you, Graciela, for bringing positive examples of Latinos to schools and inspiring young students across the world. And congratulations on your much-deserved recognition by the White House.

I am proud to represent Graciela Tiscareno-Sato: veteran, business owner, daughter of immigrants, mother. Your work is inspiring to the next generation of leaders who want to dream big and reach for the stars.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Women's History Month. Our Nation is blessed to have so many women who have played important roles in its formation across the country.

I want to highlight one particular Renaissance woman from my neck of the woods, Tennessee.

My home in Gallatin has a special significance to me in that it resides on the property that used to be known as the Fairvue house, which was eventually sold off and broken apart. One resident of Fairvue was a particularly notable woman by the name of Miss Ellen Stokes Wemyss, and to say that she lived a notable life would be an understatement.

Born in 1895, Miss Wemyss lived a long, eventful life until she passed away in 2001 at the age of 106.

□ 1030

Over the course of her life, she marched in the Nashville Suffragette Parade, flew in an early airplane, and rode her horse into her eighties.

Miss Wymess was an avid traveler who explored glaciers in Alaska and bicycled in France through her eighties. She even worked her plantation farm well into her nineties.

When she wasn't working or embarking on adventures, she was giving back to our community, including giving to Volunteer State Community College, the Gallatin Day Care Center, Sumner Academy Day School, Sumner County Public Library, among many other local organizations.

I had the pleasure of meeting Miss Wymess several years ago before she passed away, and it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to share just a peek of her wonderful life here on the House floor.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, I encourage everyone to think about a role a woman has played in our rich American history.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CLEANUP OF VIEQUES AND CULEBRA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, Vieques and Culebra are two island municipalities of Puerto Rico. Each is home to beautiful beaches, to rich animal and plant life, and to warm, welcoming people.

For decades, the two islands were used as military training ranges. The U.S. citizens living in Vieques and Culebra were required to make tremendous sacrifices to ensure the readiness of our Armed Forces and to enhance our national defense.

Although Vieques and Culebra are no longer used for training purposes, both islands bear the scars of their past. Some of those scars are easy to see, like the impact of bombing on the once pristine landscape or like the threat that unexploded bombs in the ground and surrounding waters currently pose to the safety of residents and visitors.

Other scars might be more difficult to discern, like the effect that bombing-related contamination may have had on public health, particularly in Vieques.

The Department of Defense is currently conducting decontamination operations in both Vieques and Culebra. The cleanup of Vieques is being conducted by the Navy, while the cleanup of Culebra is being carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

Several days ago, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense about DOD's responsibilities with respect to Vieques and Culebra. The letter, which was signed by 16 of my colleagues in the House and Senate, makes three specific requests.

First, although many years have passed since the military stopped conducting training exercises on Culebra and Vieques, there are still meaningful gaps in information about the types and amounts of munitions used on both islands.

My constituents have a compelling interest in knowing which types of weapons were used, where they were used, and in what volume they were used.

Congress agrees. As a result of bicameral efforts, the report accompanying the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act encourages DOD to make public all of its historical documents related to its training activities on both islands.

Our letter to the Secretary requests an update about how DOD intends to implement this Congressional language and strongly urges DOD to collect, organize, and publish the relevant documents on the Internet in a single location.

Second, the report accompanying the 2014 Defense Appropriations Act encourages DOD to accelerate cleanup efforts on Vieques. Therefore, my colleagues and I also urged the Secretary of Defense to implement this Congressional guidance by allocating the funding necessary to complete the cleanup of Vieques as rapidly as possible.

Finally, the letter reminds the Secretary that there is a serious public safety threat in Culebra that requires resolution. As a result of a rigid legal interpretation, DOD refuses to fund the cleanup of a 400-acre parcel that formerly served as the bombardment zone and which now has popular beaches, pedestrian walkways, and campgrounds.

This is unacceptable. Since 1995, there have been over 70 incidents in which members of the public have encountered unexploded bombs in this part of Culebra that could have caused them great harm.

Last March, a young girl visiting a Culebra beach suffered burns after she picked up an artillery shell containing white phosphorous.

Earlier this year, local authorities had to close the same Culebra beach when a 100-pound unexploded bomb was discovered underwater close to shore.

I have filed multiple bills to require DOD to fund the cleanup of this parcel and to remove this public safety threat, but DOD has opposed my efforts. The letter urges DOD to reconsider its position in this matter.

The use of Vieques and Culebra as training ranges may have ceased, but the legacy of such use must be addressed by DOD. Working with my colleagues, I will continue to do everything within my power to ensure that DOD fulfills its legal and moral responsibilities.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY WILDCATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, when it comes to college basketball, there is simply no place like my old Kentucky home.

I rise with the distinct honor of congratulating my hometown University of Kentucky Wildcats men's basketball team on moving on to the Sweet 16 in the 2014 Men's Division I Basketball Tournament.

This season has had its ups and downs, but this group of young men—the youngest average age of any team in the tournament—is coalescing at just the right time.

This momentum is a testament to the players' willingness to put team ahead of self—a lesson we here in Congress could stand to learn from—and the ability of Coach John Calipari and his staff to mold raw talent into a cohesive, disciplined attack on both the defensive and offensive ends of the court in just a few short months.

Hard-fought victories by these Wildcats over Kansas State and an unbeaten Wichita State team—a very likable team—have set up what might well be the main event of the entire tournament, not just for residents of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, but for college basketball fans all around this country—a rematch between the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville, the two previous national champions.

With all due respect to Duke and North Carolina, the University of Kentucky-University of Louisville rivalry is the greatest and most competitive rivalry in all of college basketball. One of the reasons for this is this is a nonconference rivalry. After the original dream game in 1983, the general assembly of Kentucky mandated in State law that these two great programs in college basketball play against one another each and every year.

Our Wildcats won the meeting earlier this season between these two squads and are now looking to repeat the events of the 2012 tournament in which a victory over archrival Louisville in the Final Four paved the way for the University of Kentucky's eighth national championship.

This year's young Cats were second in the Southeastern Conference in average points scored and fourth in terms of points allowed, demonstrating that their physical play is equal opportunity on offense and defense.

Both statistics are grounded in these players' ability to pound the glass for rebounds, led by forward Julius Randle, who has averaged a double-double all season and routinely finds ways to rebound and drive when double-, triple-, or even quadruple-teamed.

While Randle and other big men—including freshman Dakari Johnson and future draft prospect Willie Cauley-Stein—collapse opponents' defenses, the outside shooting threats of twins Aaron and Andrew Harrison and James Young keep the Cats a threat from the perimeter.

As any college basketball fan can tell you, these young men have a lot to live up to, given the legacy of the University of Kentucky and the lofty expectations of the most passionate fan base in all of college basketball, the Big Blue Nation.

The Wildcats represent the greatest tradition in the history of college basketball as the winningest program of all time, in both the number of total wins and total win percentage.

As Coach Cal said at the beginning of the season:

> Kentucky doesn't just play college basketball; we are college basketball.

Even former coach and current Louisville coach Rick Pitino said that the University of Kentucky is the Roman Empire of college basketball.

This new batch of Cats, young as they are, has already lived up to this imposing pedigree. While Friday's game against Louisville will be a significant challenge, I know it will be ''On, On, U of K'' to the Elite Eight and the Final Four; and I know, for many in the Bluegrass, a win over the Cardinals will be enough to call this season a success.

In fact, I am so confident this game will go in favor of the Wildcats that I have made a friendly wager of locally distilled Kentucky bourbon with my good friend, the Member from Louisville, JOHN YARMUTH.

While he thinks I will be eating crow, I am pretty sure that the Wildcats will be eating some Cardinal come Friday night.

REFORM THE MILITARY SYSTEM

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, last week, as the world watched in disbelief, the trial of Brigadier General Sinclair concluded much as it began, flawed and unjust.

Even with the world watching, the military once again demonstrated its outright incompetence at administering justice.

Brigadier General Sinclair walked out of the court a free man, even though he had pled guilty to these charges:

He pled guilty to an inappropriate relationship with his accuser; an inappropriate relationship with another female Army captain; an inappropriate relationship with a female Army major; possessing and displaying pornographic images and videos on his computer in Afghanistan.

He pled guilty to using a government-issued travel card for personal purposes for a trip to Tucson, Arizona, and a trip to Fort Hood, Texas, to see his mistress.

He pled guilty to attempting to start an inappropriate relationship with a female Army lieutenant; sexually explicit communications with a female Army major, requesting and receiving nude photos and a sexually explicit video of her.

He pled guilty to vulgar language to describe female staff officers; impeding an investigation; and adultery with his accuser.

Again, these aren't the charges the judge found Sinclair innocent of, but all of the charges Sinclair pled guilty to.

His punishment? No demotion in rank, no forced retirement, no jail time.

Instead, a small fine that he will pay with his generous taxpayer-funded pension and a potent message to those that are thinking of coming forward: you will be dragged through the mud, and you will be punished, not the perpetrator.

A civilian would have been fired. The misuse of government funds and the gross misconduct by General Sinclair, who pled guilty to all of those charges, should have been more than enough to fire him.

I would like to say that I was shocked by this unconscionable decision, but after working on this issue for 3 years, I have learned that this pattern is the rule, not the exception.

Whether the Army intended it or not, this was a high-profile test case for whether the military can hold its highest officers accountable for committing serious offenses. It failed.

The military seems to be determined to make our point for us. The current military system of justice is incapable of meting out justice in an impartial and effective way.

When Sinclair was challenged by his staff for his conduct and remarks towards women, the general replied:

I'm the general. I'll say whatever [expletive deleted] I want.

You know, he is right. In the military, misogynous attitudes and conduct, even violent crimes against women, are condoned and, at times, even celebrated.

In 2010, a skit was performed for General Sinclair's benefit, where a soldier wore a wig and dressed as a female officer and offered to perform oral sex for the general. This skit was performed in front of the general's wife and more than 500 people; yet this gross performance of General Sinclair's sexual misconduct was no cause for concern at the time.

Until these cases are taken out of the chain of command, the reality and perception will continue to be that the military justice system is tainted under command influence and is inherently unjust.

The American people look at how this case was handled and see that a commanding officer without legal expertise and a built-in conflict of interest is not competent to prosecute serious crimes.

It should now be clear to everyone in Congress that the military is incapable of holding perpetrators accountable. It is our duty to reform the system which we created in the first place, not the commanders whose legal training and built-in conflicts of interest have proven to be so effective.

This case is an embarrassment to the military; and, frankly, it is an embarrassment to Congress. When will we be willing to say ''enough'' and do our duty to protect our servicemembers from predators like General Sinclair?

□ 1045

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. To my colleagues, I say good morning.

Madam Speaker, it is good to be an American, and it is good to have the opportunity to celebrate the greatest democracy in the world. That is why I stand today and join my Democratic colleagues as they appear on the east steps in calling all colleagues to stand under the bright shining Sun to celebrate that democracy, for, today, Democrats will stand united, calling upon our Republican friends to push for a vote on comprehensive, reasonable, sensible immigration reform.

I stand with these icons:

Remember always that all of us—that you and I especially—are descendants from immigrants and revolutionists—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The land flourished because it was fed from so many sources, because it was nourished by so many cultures and traditions and people—President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Everywhere immigrants have enriched and strengthened the fabric of American life—President John F. Kennedy.

He never strayed away from his strong Irish heritage. Then, of course, in Women's History Month:

I am a beneficiary of the American people's generosity, and I hope we can have comprehensive immigration legislation that allows this country to continue to be enriched by those who were not born here—former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a descendant of Jamaican immigrants. My grandmother and grandfather came by way of the Panama Canal. Today, I can go to the Panama Canal and see my grandfather's name X'd there, for he worked with his hands to build the Panama Canal. Then the family traveled with small suitcases to South Carolina and, ultimately, made a life in this great Nation. What a privilege it is to serve in this body as a descendant, as someone who has recent immigrant grandparents who came to this Nation for opportunity.

Finally, let me offer these thoughts through this quote:

This issue has been around for too long. A comprehensive approach is long overdue, and I am confident that the President, myself, and others can find the common ground to take care of this issue once and for all—House Speaker John Boehner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you today to stand with those eloquent and important Americans, Presidents and Secretaries of State who have indicated that we are better for the immigrant opportunities that we have been given. Mr. BOEHNER, we want a vote now.

As you look, you will see a picture of Leader PELOSI and of myself and of my colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL). We are not important, but the children are who are here, who are diverse in their understanding of cultural diversity. Madam Speaker, these children speak Chinese and Spanish. They are 2 years old and 3 years old and 4 years old. They are in the Barbara Jordan International Child Care Center. We know we need child care, and they understand the richness of what happens with diversity.

Let me share with you very briefly that there are 16.4 percent of Texans who are foreign born: 42 percent are Latino or Asian; 87 percent of children with immigrant parents are U.S. citizens, and 75 percent of those children are English fluent. These are individuals who want to contribute to America. Asian-owned businesses in Texas create $40.2 billion in revenue, and Latino-owned create $61.9 billion in revenue from their businesses.

Here are the results of deporting rather than putting forward comprehensive immigration reform legislation, not for people who want to do you harm but who want to do you good. I am glad that H.R. 1417 is in the bill that we want to vote on. That is the bipartisan Homeland Security bill that I helped write that came out in a bipartisan manner, but this is what America will do to herself without comprehensive immigration reform:

We will lose, in wages, $33.2 billion if you deport every person who is nonstatus. In tax revenue, you will lose $14.5 billion. In jobs creation, you will lose $77.7 billion in the decrease of gross State product. This is from the State of Texas alone.

So, in actuality, comprehensive immigration reform creates jobs, and it creates opportunities. But do you know what? It is the right thing to do.

As a young child, I looked to the Statue of Liberty for such inspiration. I remember school trips of my going to the Statue of Liberty, and I am reminded of that extending arm that said it welcomes those who are worn and those who are forlorn. It welcomes them to the greatest democracy in the world.

Give us a vote right now. We want to vote for comprehensive immigration reform. We want these children to grow up in a democracy that is befitting of this great Nation.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, as I have mentioned a few times when I have come to the floor in the last 14 months now, I am a member of the freshman class, elected in 2012. I am proud of that fact. I am proud of it for several reasons, but one of the things that is significant about this class, particularly on our side of the aisle here as Democrats, is that it is the most diverse group of individuals ever elected to the United States Congress in a single class. In fact, its diversity is such that it is made up of a majority of minorities, women, and LGBT members—a majority minority class. Its diversity gives us tremendous strength. As I sit with my colleagues, it is amazing to me the vast perspectives that we bring, and I think it has brought to us much better opportunity and a much better ability to see the needs of this country and to address them.

It is the diversity of this Congress, and especially of this Congress elected in 2012, that is its principal strength. I say that because it is my view that it is the diversity of our Nation that is our greatest strength. What makes America exceptional is its diversity, and that diversity is the result of a culture and of values that have been welcoming to people from all corners of the world to come here and make the U.S. home—to build businesses, to bring their families, to invest in community—and to be a part of something that we have never seen before on the

face of the planet, which is a nation of immigrants.

For far too long, however, the need to reform our obsolete immigration system has been a low priority for the House leadership. It has been, essentially, on the back burner. Americans have said loud and clear that they want Congress to act on comprehensive immigration reform, and it doesn't seem to matter whom we talk to. For people on the left and the right, across the different regions of this country, the need for immigration reform is increasingly clear, not just because it reflects our values, but because many see it as in our vital economic interest that we reform our obsolete immigration policies and return to the values that made this country so great. It is that welcoming value, that value that says: Come here. Be a part of this Nation. Help grow it. Help build it, and help contribute to its productivity.

Last year, when immigration reform was, obviously, coming before us because so many Members were expressing the need for it, we heard the Speaker say that the Senate should act first and that he would await Senate action before bringing comprehensive immigration reform to the floor of the House of Representatives. Last year, the Senate acted. The Senate acted in a bipartisan fashion by a vote of 68–32 and passed comprehensive immigration reform. It was not a perfect piece of legislation—none of them are—but they passed comprehensive immigration reform, which is something that people in this country have been asking for for a long time.

But nothing. Nothing was brought to the House. In fact, while we had immigration reform ready to go—we have a bipartisan bill here in the House of Representatives—silence from the leadership on the Republican side.

Then earlier this year, in January, the Speaker said that, once he had been able to present to his Conference the principles by which the Republican Conference would pursue comprehensive immigration reform, we would be able to then turn to this question and move forward on what the American people have been asking for for a long time. That was in January. Next week, it is April, and the House and the American people still wait.

There is overwhelming support for comprehensive immigration reform. It comes from labor. It comes from our business community. It comes from the agriculture community. It is so rare that we have an issue like this that is number one fundamental to who we are as Americans, and it is so rare that we have an issue that unites the people who very often on this very floor have their differences manifest in the debates of Congress. Now we have an issue that is consistent with our history, that is consistent with our values, and that is supported by big and small businesses, by agriculture interests, by organized labor, by Democrats and Republicans.

It is long overdue. It is time for us to get about the business of the American people and to take immigration reform up now.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. I come before this body today, Madam Speaker, to address the urgent need for passing immigration reform and finally replacing our broken immigration system with one that secures the rule of law, that secures our Nation's borders, and that ensures that we fix this problem and issue going forward.

Look, nobody is happy with how things are today with regards to immigration. Why should we be? We should, in fact, be ashamed as a country to look ourselves in the face and say: We are a country in which we don't even know who is here. There could be 10 million people or 15 million people here illegally. We don't enforce the law at workplaces. There is no mandatory workplace authentication. We are not serious about border security. These are the things that the Senate bill and H.R. 15 would remedy.

We have an unprecedented level of investment in border security. We make sure that businesses verify every employee who goes to work in order to ensure that one is there legally to work. We make sure the people we need in our economy to work and have jobs are able to get the permission to go to work the next day. H.R. 15 would create over 150,000 jobs for American citizens. It would reduce our budget deficit by $200 billion. It would secure our border, reflect our values as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws with an immigration system that makes sense for our country, that makes sense for American citizens, that makes sense for reducing our budget deficit, and that works—fundamentally works—to help make America more competitive.

That is why there is an unprecedented coalition around H.R. 15, our comprehensive bipartisan immigration reform bill. It is a coalition so strong that, if this bill were placed on the floor of the House tomorrow, it would pass.

It is a coalition that unites business and labor, a coalition that unites the agriculture industry with farmers and with farmworkers, a coalition that includes members of the faith-based community, from the evangelical traditions, to the Catholic tradition, to the Jewish tradition, to the Muslim tradition. The full diversity of faith in our country supports this bill and this approach to immigration reform.

It is a coalition that includes the technology community and that includes the innovators of tomorrow's economy. H.R. 15 includes entrepreneurship visas. It includes a route where high-skilled workers who are trained at our universities with Ph.D.'s in engineering and math are able to stay in our country to deploy their talents here rather than our route of current dysfunction of an immigration system that forces them back to overseas countries where the jobs follow them.

□ 1100

We want that talent here to make our country stronger. H.R. 15 does that.

We call upon the Speaker to move forward with bringing this bill to the floor. There has not been a single immigration bill considered by this House, and that is why moments from now my colleagues will be launching a discharge petition to bring H.R. 15, immigration reform, to the floor of this House.

Madam Speaker, you may ask, What is a discharge petition?

A discharge petition is a way that the membership of this body, the 435 fine men and women who make up the United States Congress, can go around a Speaker who is unwilling to schedule a bill for a vote, and we ourselves can schedule the bill for a vote.

Normally, the Speaker decides what bills are considered on this floor. But if 218 of 435 Members—that is half of this body, a majority of this body—sign a discharge petition, that bill will immediately come to the floor of the House for an up-or-down vote. And that is all we are asking, Madam Speaker.

We know that there are people in this body who might have heartfelt convictions against fixing our immigration system. They can vote their conscience, just as we vote ours. But when we have a majority of this body ready to act in concert with the Senate, in concert with the President, in harmony with over 75 percent of the American people who support fixing our immigration system, it is time to act.

No Speaker, no majority leader, should stand in the way of overwhelming opinion both inside this body and outside this body. The time for finally fixing our broken immigration system, replacing chaos with order, replacing unruliness with the rule of law, replacing a lack of certainty with security and certainty, and an investment in our future, is now.

I call upon all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in the face of the failure of this body to act, to sign the discharge petition, take back control of this Chamber for a solid, commonsense majority of Democrats and Republicans who want immigration reform to pass now. We can do that simply by signing on the dotted line on the discharge petition, as I intend to do moments from now.

I call upon all my colleagues to sign the discharge petition and finally fix our broken immigration system.

BUILDING FUTURES RHODE ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Building Futures, a Providence-based work training program that prepares Rhode Islanders for careers in the construction industry. This program has made a real difference in the lives of 145 Rhode Islanders by placing them in registered apprenticeships as bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and other construction trade apprenticeships. This success is due, in large part, to its dedicated and talented staff, led by director and founder Andrew Cortes.

I was pleased to stand with Andrew as mayor of Providence in 2007 to help launch Building Futures, which has become a national model for work training programs, and recently to be with him and many others to celebrate their success at Building Futures and to hear directly from so many who have benefited from this program who are now holding good-paying jobs in my State.

Addressing the skills gap is one of Rhode Island's and our Nation's most pressing challenges. We know that too many people are searching for good-paying jobs, but too often, even though they are hardworking, they lack the particular skills they need for the jobs that are available.

Building Futures is helping to restore opportunity by bridging the skills gap and strengthening Rhode Island's workforce. Today, I am proud to salute their efforts and congratulate them on a job well done.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I think what we are engaging on today has the potential of being truly historic. We need a vote on immigration reform.

Several weeks ago, I was home in the district I represent. I go home every week. The Secretary of Commerce was visiting in Silicon Valley. She gave a good speech. After she finished her speech, she invited questions. The very first question was from a young man—a scientist—who said this:

> I started a company. I am about to hire four Americans. But my visa is up next month. What am I supposed to do?

As I was talking to that young man, another young man came forward—another scientist who has just formed a company. He is about to go into a hiring mode, but his visa was about up.

So when you take a look and listen to the people in Silicon Valley saying we are going to lose jobs in America because we have a dysfunctional immigration system, that shows the problem that we have allowed to fester.

Recently, I met with farmers. They told me that they are not planting crops this year because they can't identify who is going to pick those crops. About 80 percent of the migrant farmworkers in America are here without their proper documents. Do I think that is a good situation? No, I do not.

A number of years ago, when I chaired the Immigration Subcommittee, we had a wonderful witness, Dr. Richard Land, then the head of the Southern Baptist Convention, and this was his testimony. He said:

> We had for many years two signs at the southern border. One sign said, ''No Trespassing,'' and the other sign said, ''Help Wanted.''

Those farmworkers who are here picking the vegetables that we will enjoy at our meals responded to that ''Help Wanted'' sign.

Sometimes people say you should do it in the legal way. Get to the end of the line. And this is from someone who was a former immigration lawyer. I used to teach immigration law at the University of Santa Clara. The truth is, there is no line to get into. We have created a dysfunctional system that does not serve American interests.

H.R. 15 is not a perfect bill. No piece of legislation is. But it was a bill that attracted broad bipartisan support in the United States Senate.

This discharge petition says just one thing: Let's have a vote. Why would the Speaker of the House and the Republican leadership refuse to allow this body to have an up-or-down vote on that bill?

A discharge petition is something that has been in the rules of the House for many, many decades. It has been used occasionally in the past to actually un-bottle-up bills that the leadership didn't want the body to vote on. Most recently, campaign finance reform came to the floor of the House because of a discharge petition.

A lot of Members of the House say that they favor immigration reform. Here is an opportunity to hold every Member of this House accountable. If you favor reform of the immigration system, you should favor having an up-or-down vote on H.R. 15. If you favor an up-or-down vote, we expect you, no matter what your party designation, to sign this discharge petition so the House of Representatives may have an opportunity to address this question and vote ''yes'' or ''no'' on this bill.

I hope that members of the public who are aware of the need for immigration reform to reform a system that is not serving our economic interests, that is breaking up families and leaving children in foster care while their parents are deported, will call their Members of the House of Representatives and ask them to sign this discharge petition. It is in the rules. It is what we expect.

We need a vote.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me here today, as well as those advocates tirelessly working for comprehensive immigration reform.

Nine months have passed since the Senate moved on a strongly bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill. In that time, we have heard nothing but excuses and empty promises from the Speaker.

Yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed what so many of us already know: immigration is a boon for our economy. It will reduce the deficit by nearly $1 trillion, raise wages, and increase the Nation's productivity. It will make our country richer and create opportunity for all. But because the Speaker refuses to give us a vote, we have seen more families ripped apart, more jobs go overseas, and more people get stuck in a broken, outdated, and inefficient system.

We can't afford to wait any longer for this House to take up immigration reform. The time has come to move this forward.

Immigration reform isn't just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. Our country needs it, the American people support it, and there are enough votes today in the House of Representatives to pass it.

I invite all my colleagues to join me in signing the discharge petition so we can finally bring immigration reform to a vote.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, this week, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office told us that the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform legislation in this House, H.R. 15, will reduce the deficit by $900 billion over the next 20 years—$200 billion in the first decade alone.

In today's economy, immigration reform is a vital lifeblood. By adding 11 million to our workforce here in the United States, our economy will continue driving our recovery. This influx of workers will increase consumption, pushing businesses to grow and hire more employees to meet their new consumers' needs.

Thanks to the Congressional Budget Office's report, we are reminded that bringing 11 million hardworking men and women out of the shadows is not simply a moral battle, it is not only an attempt to legalize millions of hardworking people who are already here in our country, it is an opportunity for us to create employment for our fellow Americans. It will supercharge the economy of this great Nation.

I think it is important for all of America to understand that comprehensive immigration reform is the best thing that we can do for our economy. The economists have reminded us of that. But, unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, what stands in the way is a

decision by the Speaker of this House to just offer the opportunity to put that bill on this floor so that we as Members of Congress can vote on this legislation.

Should it pass, should it fail, that is the objective as to why we are elected to this House—so that we can debate, so that we can deliberate, so that we can help make decisions that move this country forward.

All we are asking is that we have the opportunity to vote on the floor of the United States Congress on a bill, an issue, that will unleash this economy, and that is something that I think every American wants to see happen.

We have millions of Americans who are out of work. Some have been out of work for years. This comprehensive immigration reform will unleash this economy and create more jobs for American citizens more than anything that this Congress can do today.

I think it is incumbent upon every American to urge your congressional Member to vote on comprehensive immigration reform. Should they choose to vote ''no'' or choose to vote ''yes,'' that is the prerogative of that elected official. Unfortunately, the Speaker of this House will not give us that opportunity.

Once again, Americans, the best thing that we can do as a country is to get our economy back on track and allow hardworking Americans the opportunity to go back to work, to have the dignity of bringing home a paycheck for them and their families.

Comprehensive immigration reform is that answer. The economists have said so. But, unfortunately, some politicians refuse to face reality and refuse to supercharge the American economy. We are just one vote away, one opportunity away, from doing that.

□ 1115

WHAT WE KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 2½ minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, last week, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences released a new report titled ''What We Know.''

The report states unequivocally that climate change is a scientific fact, that human activity is linked to climate change, and that, if we do not act soon, the problem will get far worse and more expensive for us to deal with.

This is not a super-PAC or a political association tied to a candidate or to a group of scientists. This is a group of scientists representing the leading experts in their fields, and they are speaking to us in one unified voice.

In Georgia, agriculture is our State's number one industry; and yet, as damaging and unpredictable as the weather patterns are making life difficult for our farmers, Republicans in our State suggest that the science is not well settled.

Madam Speaker, I hope that they get a chance to read this latest evidence. The science is settled. The only debate that remains is whether or not we will take action before it is too late.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 25, 2014 at 5:54 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4275.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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 11 o'clock and 16 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

Reverend Jonathan Weaver, Greater Mt. Nebo AME Church, Bowie, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

To You, O Lord, the God of the universe and the author and finisher of life, we come today expressing our thanks for all that You have done for us, not just within the last few moments, but over the sweep of our lives, the triumphs as well as the turmoil.

We pray that as the Members of Congress deliberate today, grant them even greater wisdom so that their actions will honor You in what they do to serve the people they represent.

Help all of us to continue to look beyond ourselves and our personal interests and to seek ways to make life better for those around us, both near and far.

I pray that even with and through our differences, that You will unite us as a people, so that our Nation will continue to prosper and honor You.

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. WILSON of South Carolina. 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. WILSON of South Carolina. 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND JONATHAN WEAVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this morning to express the gratitude of the House for this morning's opening prayer by one of Maryland's most dynamic and inspirational faith leaders, my dear friend, Pastor Jonathan Leslie Weaver.

Pastor Weaver likes to share with visitors to his church this verse from Psalms 68: ''Blessed be the Lord, who daily loads us with benefits.''

For the past 25 years, Mr. Speaker, Reverend Weaver has been sharing the benefits of his care and his wisdom with his flock at Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church in Bowie, Maryland.

Pastor Weaver has overseen its growth from 100 members in 1988 to more than 1,600 today. It now has more than 50 ministries serving the church and our wider community.

Under the pastor's leadership, the church is engaged in numerous charitable works, including reentry programs, community-based violence prevention, and antihunger projects.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Pastor Weaver has been at the center of an economic empowerment effort which has advantaged literally tens of thousands of people in our area and now has five chapters throughout our country.

I thank Pastor Weaver, along with his wife, Pamela, for their many years

of service. They are a blessing to our community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

BACKLOG AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I know that the House shares my deep concern over the backlog of benefit claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is nothing short of a black eye for our government. This country has made promises that it is our duty to keep, and the House has acted to tackle this problem.

Even so, reform won't get very far if it is carried out by managers who have proven that they are not up to the job. So we recently introduced H.R. 4031, the VA Management Accountability Act. This measure gives the VA Secretary the authority to fire and demote officials who aren't performing.

The principle here is simple. When you are not getting the job done, you have got to go. At the VA, it has been quite the opposite. For all the incompetence we have seen and all the lives that have been lost, the evidence shows there has been no accountability. Only half-measures and little slaps on the wrist.

At any agency that has fallen down on the job this would be unacceptable. But to have it happen in the health care system for America's veterans? I think it is shameful.

The VA is failing our veterans and their families. It is time we hold these people accountable and get people in there who can fix this backlog once and for all.

I am going to applaud Chairman MILLER and the Veterans Affairs' Committee for their leadership. I am pleased this legislation has already picked up the support of several veterans' organizations. I would urge all of my colleagues to back this critical measure.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF RALPH WILSON

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Ralph Wilson. Wilson is best known in my western New York community as the founder and owner of the Buffalo Bills for a remarkable 55-year tenure. He was a savvy businessman and true lover of the game of football.

I remember Mr. Wilson calling me to his office to discuss his concerns about the new NFL collective bargaining agreement. He believed that agreement was stacked against smaller market teams like Buffalo, and I found him to have a better command of the details than anyone on the subject. He was passionate not only about his beloved Buffalo Bills, but about its place in our community as well.

Mr. Wilson's interest in our community did not stop at football. His foundation donated over $11 million in the past two decades, including to the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, the community food banks, and the Hospice Foundation of Western New York.

Mr. Speaker, we are forever grateful for Mr. Wilson's dedication to western New York and to our Nation as a World War II veteran. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Agriculture Week. It is a time to celebrate the extraordinary diversity, abundance, and evolution of American agriculture.

In 1960, the average U.S. farmer fed 26 people; today, Mr. Speaker, the average U.S. farmer feeds 155 people by using less land, less water, less energy, and less fertilizer.

Thanks to agriculture research which has given rise to new technologies and techniques, America's producers are adopting practices which allow them to meet food, fiber, feed, and fuel demands and preserve our natural resources for generations to come. From high-tech irrigation tools to biotechnology, growers are producing a more stable, safe, quality, and affordable food supply.

As we recognize National Agriculture Week, we have much to celebrate but many challenges ahead. Knowing the forward-thinking nature of producers, combined with these exciting advances in agriculture, I am confident we will meet all of the demands of our growing world.

As cochair of the Modern Agriculture Caucus and the rural caucus, I am committed to ensuring Federal policy reflects sound science and strives to complement, not undermine, this innovation.

LET'S PASS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because today the Democrats will present a discharge petition to force a vote in this House on something that so many Americans know to be absolutely essential, which is comprehensive immigration reform.

The Senate has weighed in with 78 ''yes'' votes. This is a Senate where you don't get 78 votes for just about anything—bipartisan support for comprehensive immigration reform.

The reason I rise today, Mr. Speaker, is because yesterday in Financial Services we had a very interesting hearing on why debt matters. We talked a lot about what we need to do to continue to put our country on a sustainable path and to help this recovery be stronger.

We had David Cote, CEO of Honeywell; Alice Rivlin of Brookings; Doug Holtz-Eakin of the American Action Forum; and Jared Bernstein from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. They agreed on one thing enthusiastically: that one of the most important steps we can take to spur growth in our economy, and to help our fiscal situation and balance our budget, would be to pass comprehensive immigration reform. The Senate has done so. It is time for this House to do the same and stand up for the economy and American families.

GOOD LUCK, DAYTON FLYERS

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as a proud alumnus of the University of Dayton, I am here today to wish good luck to the Dayton Flyers.

The University of Dayton men's basketball team has advanced to the NCAA tournament's Sweet 16 for the first time in 30 years. The Dayton Flyers are the only team this season to have upset two top 25 teams in the second and third rounds of the NCAA tournament.

But the city of Dayton has a history of being underestimated. Orville and Wilbur Wright started working on their so-called ''flying machine'' in a Dayton garage. As we all know, these pioneers of aviation went on to complete the first manned flight, transforming the way we travel and engage in commerce.

It is fitting that the University of Dayton bears the Flyer name in honor of the Dayton tradition of succeeding despite all odds.

Congratulations to the Dayton Flyers and Coach Archie Miller. You have a vast fan base of students, faculty, and alumni throughout the country who will be cheering you on tomorrow night.

ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR WOMEN

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, far too many women face financial pressures simply due to outdated policies that hamper their opportunities for success.

I recently hosted an event in Los Angeles with Congresswoman ROYBAL-

ALLARD and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO to discuss women's economic agenda. Over 200 women showed up to talk about this.

We heard from women like Sonia and Caryn. Sonia has been a hotel worker for 9 years, barely making it on minimum wage, while balancing her work with the needs of her three young sons. Without paid medical and family leave through her employer, whenever one of her boys was sick, she had to stay home without pay.

For mothers like Sonia, we must increase the minimum wage and ensure employers provide paid family and medical leave for all of our families.

Caryn's life has turned around after she was finally able to access affordable child care in San Pedro, after struggling to balance taking care of her daughter as a single mom and building a future. Because of that she has already earned an associate's degree and is now studying for her bachelor's degree.

The success of our Nation relies upon the economic security of these women because when women succeed, America succeeds.

FOUR YEARS AND OBAMACARE IS STILL FAILING

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, according to an institute at the University of New Hampshire, the number of long-term unemployed Americans has more than doubled since 2007, to a gruesome 39.3 percent.

The President has had more than enough time to get our weak economy back on track. Instead of working with Congress on pro-growth reforms to our tax system and encouraging businesses to hire more workers, he has focused his attention on implementing his disastrous health care takeover, destroying jobs.

American families have felt the duplicity of the ''Unaffordable Care Act.'' They have lost health care plans. They have been forced to pay higher insurance premiums and receive smaller paychecks due to reduction in work hours.

A key to economic recovery starts with repealing and replacing the takeover with a commonsense, patient-centered solution. Our workforce should not lose 2.5 million more jobs because of government mandates. We must work together to promote jobs.

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

NATIONAL LIHEAP ACTION DAY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about a critical Federal program that helps seniors and low-income families in Michigan and across the country with their utility bills.

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, provides short-term assistance to help households with their heating costs in the winter and cooling costs in the summer. In Michigan, more than 600,000 households received LIHEAP assistance last year. Nationally, LIHEAP serves 6.7 million people.

These mostly one-time payments provide a financial bridge to ensure that vulnerable populations do not have to choose between paying their energy bills and affording the other necessities of life, like food and medicine.

Today is National LIHEAP Action Day, and constituents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations are all in town to ask Congress to provide adequate funding so residents across the country are able to continue accessing this vital program. Please welcome them into your offices, and please support the critical LIHEAP program.

With this year being one of the coldest winters in decades, many agencies are struggling with record numbers of people seeking assistance. LIHEAP benefits have already been cut; it is not time to cut them again.

□ 1215

HONORING ILLINOIS ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR SHERYL GRAY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a caring and innovative educational leader from Illinois' 14th Congressional District.

For her hard work, Sheryl Gray was named Illinois Assistant Principal of the Year by the Illinois Principals Association.

Since she began at Prairie Trail School in Wadsworth, she has created and implemented fresh ideas that bring together students and their families in education.

Her brainchild Partnership and Achievement Lead to Success, or PALS, has been extremely successful in educating and empowering at-risk children. She has also devoted her time to improving Prairie Trail School's special education program and increasing school attendance by supporting families who are in need.

A servant to the Lake County community, Sheryl Gray is an inspiration to her students and to the next generation of educators.

With more leaders like Sheryl in schools, all of our children will be able to reach their true potential.

RAISE THE WAGE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, during the past 40 years, we have made tremendous progress in America technologically, medically, socially, and—for many of our citizens—economically, but not if you are a family trying to get by on the minimum wage.

In real value, today's Federal minimum wage is about 30 percent below the days when President Ford pardoned Richard Nixon and Cannonade won the Kentucky Derby.

As American productivity has surged, the economic status of the American worker has weakened and, along with it, the capacity of American consumers to continue driving our economy.

Even Walmart executives have admitted an obvious cause and effect. When their employees can't afford to shop in their stores, profits will suffer.

Madam Speaker, a fair minimum wage has the power to make work pay a little better, to give families a shot at a stronger future, and to grow our economy substantially.

It is a corrective to obscene corporate welfare, whereby American taxpayers must support low wage workers when their employers don't.

It reaffirms the basic American idea that, if you put in 40 hours a week, you should be able to put food on your family's table every day.

PARALYMPIC CHAMPION EVAN STRONG

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor Evan Strong in celebration of his continued achievements in the 2014 Sochi Paralympic Winter Games.

Bordering the Tahoe National Forest, Nevada City is home to 3,000 people, including Evan and his wife, Mariah. Today, I join the members of that community in recognizing his accomplishments, generosity, and strength.

Evan Strong grew up with a strong passion for sports. Whether it was surfing the waves in Maui or skateboarding around the neighborhood, you could not find him without a board in his hand. Unfortunately, shortly before his 18th birthday, Evan, on his motorcycle, was struck head-on by a drunk driver. Three days later, his left leg was amputated.

Today, 10 years after his accident, Evan remains the most dominant athlete on the adaptive snowboarding circuit.

Evan's story of overcoming adversity is an inspiration to California and to athletes all across the country. By turning an obstacle into opportunity, he has earned every title in the sport of adaptive boardercross, including a Winter X Games gold medal, a world championship title, two overall titles, and 11 world cup titles.

Perhaps most extraordinary, his historic performance in the 2014

Paralympic Winter Games led the United States to a sweep in the men's snowboard cross event and to earn himself the first gold medal in the games.

I congratulate Evan on his remarkable achievements. You make California and our Nation extremely proud.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, the National Association of Letter Carriers Buckeye Branch 78 arrived in Washington for its national conference. I rise to honor these dedicated postal workers and thank them for the great service that they provide, bringing news during tragedy and triumph.

America's letter carriers have a long history of delivering the mail for well over 200 years. Their tireless commitment helps ensure the timely delivery of prescriptions, paychecks, Social Security checks, and other communications to countless Americans and keeps the stream of commerce flowing.

In light of the fiscal challenges faced by the United States Postal Service, a number of postal workers have been presented that they could potentially be downgraded; thus we would downgrade Postal Services, hurt postal workers, and shutter post offices.

As we continue these debates on this House floor, I wish to reassure the National Association of Letter Carriers Buckeye Branch 78 that they have an ally in me.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Supreme Court heard arguments in the Hobby Lobby case. This business is simply asking that owners' rights under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are respected.

In an ironic bit of timing, the administration just effectively waived the March 31 deadline for signing up for an ObamaCare plan.

Despite President Obama's continuous extra-legal rewriting of his health care law, he remains unwilling to accommodate religious businessowners who are providing health care coverage for employees.

Yesterday also brought a news report from North Carolina of 200 substitute teachers having their hours cut in order to comply with ObamaCare mandates. The teachers' plight is not unique.

As Republicans noted during the original debate over this law, putting the government in charge of 1/7th of the economy is a recipe for disaster.

We need to repeal ObamaCare and enact health reform that empowers patients, not bureaucrats.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT DEADLINE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, with the deadline to sign up for the Affordable Care Act approaching, I want to encourage everyone, especially young people and people in my district, to sign up for health insurance.

For those who think the process is too cumbersome or you won't get an affordable rate, listen to this story from a 29-year-old woman from New Jersey, Fawziah Qadir. She said: My employer agreed to provide $300 a month towards any health plan I could find.

Unfortunately, trying to find an affordable insurance plan on her own in New Jersey where she lives, she said, was insane. One quote was over $700; others provided flimsy coverage.

Full of frustration, Fawziah's mother told her about the health care insurance marketplace. She says that when she logged onto healthcare.gov, she was surprised to find out how easy it was to enroll.

With her employer's contribution, she has a comprehensive plan that costs just $63 a month. That is less than a cell phone bill or a cable bill, and we are talking about something much more important—our Nation's health.

Don't wait. Go to healthcare.gov and find a plan that works for you.

RUSSIAN VIOLATION OF THE INTERMEDIATE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Napoleon of Siberia has launched cold war II. He seems to be on a mission to restore the Soviet empire. He invaded Georgia, then Ukraine. He seized Crimea. Putin's next target? Well, no one knows.

However, quietly, behind the scenes, Putin seems to be resurrecting a cold war nuclear program in violation of the 1987 INF Treaty with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what good is a nuclear treaty if not all sides abide by it? Will Russia's cheating start a 21st century arms race?

Representatives MIKE ROGERS, JOE HECK, and I have introduced a resolution stating that the Russians have violated the treaty and there must be consequences. Russia cheats on treaties, invades other nations, and we basically watch and talk and say that just isn't nice.

The President said of treaties in 2009: ''Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words mean something.''

However, as my grandfather used to say: ''When all is said and done, more is said than done.''

What are the consequences for Russian violation of the INF Treaty? We shall see.

And that's just the way it is.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago, Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment to guarantee equal rights for American women. Although we have made progress leveling the playing field, we still have a ways to go.

Women earn more advanced degrees and make up half of our national workforce, but the return on their educational investment doesn't come close to their male counterparts. Women still earn 77 cents to the dollar men earn and are working lower wage jobs in a time when their families are becoming more dependent on their salaries.

I am working to balance the inequities that disadvantage American women and, consequently, their families. I cosponsored House Joint Resolution 56, the constitutional proposal for an equal rights amendment, and I supported the Paycheck Fairness and Fair Minimum Wage Acts. These bills are good for working women and good for their families.

Today, I urge my colleagues to stand up for the many unemployed women and impacted families in their districts by passing an unemployment insurance extension immediately.

Let's honor Women's History Month by supporting fair wages for all, promoting equal treatment under our laws, and by supporting vulnerable women by extending safety net benefits like unemployment insurance.

CONGRATULATING SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Slippery Rock University, which is celebrating its 125th anniversary this year.

In 1887, the citizens of Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania, saw the need for affordable and accessible higher education in their community. In less than 18 months, land was purchased from my good friend and colleague JIM GERLACH's family, to whom it had belonged for three generations.

On that land was soon established Slippery Rock State Normal School. It opened to 168 students on March 26, 1889, with its ultimate object to make the student an educator. It was purchased by the Commonwealth in 1926 and was granted university status in 1983.

After 125 years, Slippery Rock University has nearly 80,000 proud graduates. It offers a broad array of undergraduate and graduate programs to more than 8,000 students and is consistently recognized as a great place to learn and work.

For as long as this impressive institution remains standing, Slippery Rock's commitment to intellectual development, leadership, and civic responsibility will endure.

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, in the year 2000, the people of Nevada overwhelmingly voted to legalize medical marijuana 65 to 35 percent. Thirteen years later, the State legislature passed an enacting statute, and last week, the Las Vegas City Council and the Clark County Commission both approved the establishment of dispensaries.

Similar action has taken place in 18 States, creating a patchwork of conflicting State, local, and Federal laws and regulations. As a result, there is a great deal of uncertainty and confusion for Nevadans and doctors, patients, and businesses in other States where marijuana is legal.

As more States move towards legalizing marijuana use, it is important that Congress address the issue to ensure consumers and businesses are protected and are able to operate without fear of Federal prosecution.

That is why I am cosponsoring the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act, the Truth in Trials Act, and the Marijuana Business Access to Banking Act.

I have also joined a bipartisan group of my colleagues to call on the Appropriations Committee to ensure the Department of Justice is not wasting taxpayer dollars.

These are commonsense proposals that preserve states' rights and ensure patients and businesses are protected.

ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, for generations, Montanans have been dedicated to stewardship of our lands. Montanans know how to best preserve and protect these lands, so that future generations can enjoy them.

That is why so many Montanans were upset by Interior Secretary Sally Jewell's recent comments inferring that the President would take action and unilaterally designate new lands as national monuments under the Antiquities Act.

Comments like these concern Montanans, who recall recent efforts by the Department of the Interior to designate millions of acres along the Hi-Line as a national monument without local involvement. This unilateral action is unacceptable to the people of my State.

That is why I am proud to support the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act, which requires public participation and local support before the President can make any new monument designations.

The American people deserve a voice in the monument designation process, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

□ 1230

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND THE WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Women's History Month and to recognize the important role that women play in our workforce, businesses, and homes.

In fact, 40 percent of working women are the primary breadwinners in their families, and it is just a fact that the success of our Nation relies on the economic security of women. Unfortunately, outdated policies are constraining the ability of women to participate fully in our economy. Many face a lack of good-paying jobs, a high cost of education and child care. In fact, two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and the poverty rate for women is 14.5 percent—the highest in two decades. Women earn just 77 cents on the dollar. For African American women, it is only 64 cents on the dollar. For Latinas, it is a shocking 58 cents on the dollar.

That is why House Democrats have launched an economic agenda for women: When Women Succeed, America Succeeds. We have got to raise the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour, increase tipped wages which haven't been raised in 23 years, have equal pay for equal work, paid sick days, and access to quality, affordable child care.

Women are playing an expanded role in our economy and in our country. It is time we recognize their contribution because, when women succeed, America succeeds.

COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, March is Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

Sadly, colon cancer is the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths among both men and women in this country, including over 2,000 Ohioans, but it doesn't have to be.

As the American College of Gastroenterology reminds us, colon cancer screenings can prevent cancer from occurring in the first place. In fact, evidence shows that colonoscopies could prevent over 50 percent of colorectal cancer deaths in the U.S. When colon cancer is detected early, the survival rate climbs to 90 percent. The American Cancer Society reveals that screenings have reduced the rate of colon cancer incidences by 30 percent over the last 10 years. Still, more needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, I urge all Americans, particularly those over 50, to talk to their doctors and ask if screenings are right for them. Cancer is a killer, and colon cancer can be more deadly than most, but we can fight back by taking proactive steps to diagnose and combat the disease at its outset.

WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the women's economic agenda and to acknowledge Women's History Month. Women's History Month is a time when we pause to recognize the extraordinary contributions that women have made throughout our Nation's history.

As a husband to my wife, Nancy, who is a leader in health care for women, as the proud father of two accomplished daughters, and as the grandfather of three girls with so much promise, I am absolutely committed to making our country's full range of opportunities available and a reality for all of America's daughters.

That is why I introduced, earlier this month, the Women's Economic Bill of Rights, because all women have a right to equal pay and because all women have a right to fair treatment in the workplace and to economic and retirement security. The Women's Economic Bill of Rights is about standing up in Congress to make sure that we strengthen our commitment to advancing women's economic security for current and future generations.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution because we know that, when women succeed, America succeeds.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, our economy continues to struggle, and that means hardworking Americans are struggling. Far too many Americans are having trouble making ends meet, and government overreach is only making things worse. The worst example of this overreach is the President's deeply flawed health care law.

We just had ObamaCare's fourth anniversary this past weekend, and what do we have to show for it?

Americans can't keep their plans even if they like them. Families are being forced to pay more for their health care insurance. Women are unable to stay with their doctors despite the President's promise. Seniors are facing cuts to their hard-earned Medicare benefits. Businesses are afraid to hire more workers.

House Republicans have a plan to get Washington out of the way—to create an America that works—and addressing these problems is a great place to start.

WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I was proud to host a women's economic agenda event at the Young Women's Leadership Academy in San Antonio, Texas. It was a great way to celebrate Women's History Month by having a conversation about what we can all do to ensure that women in our Nation are empowered. There were three specific issues that we spoke of that concern our Nation greatly.

The first one was fair pay, making sure that when women put in a full day's work they make the same amount of money as men do. The second was family leave, the ability to be able to take time off to be with sick parents or when you have a child. That is extremely important for working women. Also, there is child care. Many women are unable to take and keep jobs because they simply don't have the child care resources they need to make sure their children are safe so they can go on to work.

It is imperative that the United States Congress takes up these issues and continues to make sure that there is parity in our society and that women are able to enjoy the same benefits as men.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand action on comprehensive immigration reform.

For over a year, we have experienced nothing but broken promises from our Republican leadership. The Senate did its job in passing a bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–32, but Speaker BOEHNER and House Republicans have refused to consider this responsible proposal even though it has the votes to pass right now.

The reason for this is clear: Republicans would rather protect themselves from a primary challenge than address the challenges that face our Nation. That is why House Democrats have resorted to introducing a discharge petition this week to demand a vote on immigration reform.

This is supposed to be a democracy. Comprehensive reform is backed by a majority of the American public, including the business community, labor unions, and religious organizations. Comprehensive reform would grow our economy, strengthen families and open doors of opportunity for millions of Americans who want to embrace the American Dream.

America has always been a nation of immigrants, continuously revitalized by those who come to our shores to make better lives for themselves and their families. Now is the time to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women's History Month.

March is the time to honor our foremothers by recommitting to the fight for complete equality between the sexes. Democrats know that the biggest challenge to attaining complete equality is through economic justice. My daughters are growing up in an America where women still make just 77 cents to every man's dollar. This wage discrimination is compounded even further when you consider that women also represent nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers and that they often have jobs with no sick leave. If women have to choose between their jobs and their families, clearly, we still have a lot of work to do.

First, we must extend unemployment benefits. Women struggling to find work need that bridge to help pay the bills while they look for work. We must also increase the minimum wage, fight wage discrimination by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, and extend paid family and medical leave to all women by passing the FAMILY Act.

This agenda is the perfect way to celebrate Women's History Month and to honor all Americans who have fought for equality and fairness. As President Obama said, ''When women succeed, America succeeds.''

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I rise in memory of a trailblazer, Georgia Lee Lusk, the first woman to ever represent New Mexico in the House of Representatives.

Georgia was elected in 1946 and served Congressional District One, my district. Georgia is in our history books as a woman who wasn't afraid of a fight. She grew up on a farm in Carlsbad and went to Highlands University in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Georgia went to Washington to fight for better education and better care for veterans. As a school administrator, she had seen the effects of book shortages and overcrowded classrooms on young students. As a mother of three boys who all fought in the Second World War, she knew all too well the challenges faced by those returning from war. Georgia served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and worked across the aisle to make sure that veterans received the benefits provided to them in the GI Bill of Rights. She fought for Federal aid to education, hot meals for students, and helped establish what we now know as the Department of Education, and she did so much more.

Mr. Speaker, as only the third Congresswoman in New Mexico's history, I am determined to carry on Georgia's fight—a fight for better care for our veterans and a better education for our students. When women succeed, America succeeds.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1459, ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 524

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. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, 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 Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 27, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the following: (a) a measure addressing the Medicare payment system for physicians; and (b) a measure addressing Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 1459, Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act.

It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule makes in order three amendments, two of which are Democrat amendments, in addition to a manager's amendment. The rule also wisely provides for same-day authority for the legislative day of Thursday to consider the so-called ''doc fix'' bipartisan proposal, which may come forward for our consideration, as well as for the consideration of measures aimed at supporting the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression and expansionism. So this is an important rule. Therefore, it deserves our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in support of the rule as well as of the underlying legislation primarily because it is my bill. I appreciate the hard work and support of the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), in forwarding this important bill to the floor of the House for our consideration.

I have to admit, Mr. Speaker—perhaps because the underlying bill is my bill—that I have had a closer consideration of the discussion, of the comments, that have been made about it, and I have taken some of them rather personally. To be honest, I am, quite frankly, amazed at some of the inaccuracies and the misinformation that has taken place by some outside groups in blogs, in Internet descriptions by special interests groups, and, actually, even by some Members of the floor.

□ 1245

When I originally saw some of the reports that said this bill would stop the creation of any more national parks, nothing could be further from the truth, because actually the President can't create national parks; only Congress can. It has nothing to do with national parks.

Eventually, they changed it to say this will stop creation of national monuments. Again, that charge is simply ridiculous.

The essence of this bill is very simple. What it says is the President should be treated like everyone else. Congress, if they are going to make any kind of land decisions, must have an open process where they have hearings and markups and bring things for an open vote.

If an agency of the government is going to make some sort of land designation, they have to go through NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, the process which provides for input—public discussion and public advice—about it. The only one who cannot do that is the President.

When the administration testified about this bill in committee, I was amazed, because they said the President should not have to go through the open process of obtaining public input on his decisions because even though the entire Federal branch has to, he is only the head of the Federal branch, he is not the Federal branch.

That just does not make sense to me. The idea is that everyone, including the President, should ask for public input.

One of the groups, the National Resources Defense Council, wrote on their blog that NEPA was the Magna Carta of environmental laws. They wrote:

Much like the Magna Carta protected people from dangers of monarchical rule, NEPA protects people by providing transparency in Federal projects. Both the Magna Carta and NEPA espouse the ideas of public participation in democracy by giving citizens a voice in government decisions.

Yesterday, in a different bill in a different committee, the administration testified against the bill, saying it would stop public comments about this particular issue. I am sorry, but that is why I get so confused about the rhetoric about this particular bill.

What we are asking is that before the President uses this authority, it go through NEPA to provide for public comment and concepts.

If NEPA is the Magna Carta and it provides for citizen voices in democratic decisions, how can you then say that this bill, which provides for NEPA and that kind of policy, would eviscerate one of America's bedrock conservation laws?

This is simply intellectual gymnastics at the highest level. Either getting public input is good, in which case we should pass this bill, or getting public input is bad, in which case there are a lot of things that we should change around here. I happen to think that getting public input is good. Because it does one thing: it solves problems before they develop.

In our State, we have had a National Monument that has been designated by Presidential proclamation for almost 20 years now. We are still dealing with issues of what kind of grazing rights were or were not included in that proclamation, what kind of roads were or were not open. Even though we tried to solve the problem, because the President had no concept of what School Trust Lands were in that area, and we have tried to exchange those out, not all of those exchanges have yet to be consummated.

Another of the monuments that the President recently proposed, they have already come to us and said there are problems within the boundaries of that monument. We have found private property we didn't know existed. We don't know whether there are provisions in there to allow duck hunting to go on, but we are not quite sure how you accomplish that. We are really not quite sure which land agency is responsible for the administration.

Those issues are all the issues that could be settled before you make the designation. And if, indeed, the NEPA process was required, those would become the issues that would be brought up, they would be understood, and they would be dealt with before you make the initiative.

So I have had people tell me that this is actually the ''No More National Monuments'' bill. It would stop national monuments. It is patently false. It is a false premise. It is a scare tactic, not an argument. And it is incredibly wrong.

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

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

I am here with my good friend from the Rules Committee, Mr. BISHOP, and he made a passionate case. He cares deeply, as do many of us, about issues affecting our public lands under the Antiquities Act. But the real antique here is our outdated immigration system. That is the antique.

When I have my town hall meetings in my district across Colorado, and join my friends across the country, what I hear from my constituents is not, Let's alter the process whereby a President might designate something as a National Monument. That is not the number one issue. That is not the number five issue. It is not the number 10 issue.

What my constituents demand, what Colorado demands, what our Nation demands, is we replace our antiquated, out-of-date, ill-conceived, completely

dysfunctional immigration system with one that works for our country, with the principle of securing our borders, with the principle of creating jobs for Americans, reducing our deficit, ensuring that people who work here pay taxes, ensuring that companies have a responsibility to authenticate and verify that their employees are here legally. That is what the country needs. It is what more than 75 percent of the American people support.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a bipartisan immigration reform bill, H.R. 15. If we were to advance that bill to the floor of the House, it would pass tomorrow. It would pass the next day.

But instead of that bill being even presented in the Rules Committee for a vote and despite my repeated desires to the chair of that committee, to the chair of the committee of jurisdiction, Mr. GOODLATTE, as Mr. BISHOP has witnessed over a period of months, saying, When will you bring forward this bill, when will you bring forward this bill, when will you fix our broken immigration system, we have not advanced one single immigration-related bill that addresses any one of the flaws in the immigration system to the floor of the House this entire legislative session.

So our patience is wearing thin, Mr. Speaker. And I have great respect for you, Mr. Speaker, and for the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR. Great respect. And I understand it is the prerogative of the majority party to control the bills that are being debated on the floor. But in the absence of leadership, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of you bringing a bill forward that allows us to fix our broken immigration system, we the Members of this body, Democratic and Republican, have no choice but to take it upon ourselves to bring this issue forward to the floor of the House.

I am going to tell you a little bit about, Mr. Speaker, the way we can do that.

These are the rules of the House. I strongly recommend them as a bedtime read, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, they have a provision called the discharge petition that provides a way that the Members of this body, 218 out of 435, meaning a majority of the Members of this body, can sign a discharge petition for a bill. That means that despite a Speaker or majority leader that refused to schedule that bill for debate, if a majority of Members sign the discharge petition, it goes right to the floor for a straight up-or-down vote.

That is all we are asking for, Mr. Speaker: a straight up-or-down vote. I am confident H.R. 15 would pass tomorrow if we had that opportunity. I call upon my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to sign the discharge petition. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my friends across the country to inform their Members of Congress that they want to see action on this important issue.

In no way, shape, or form should this detract from the passion Mr. BISHOP has for obscure provisions of the Antiquities Act and the NEPA process surrounding the establishment of public monuments, but this simply isn't the issue that galvanizes our country. This simply isn't the issue that reduces our deficit by $900 billion over two decades.

Whatever we do to the Antiquities Act does not create 150,000 jobs for American citizens, does not boost GDP, and is not backed by an unprecedented coalition of labor and business, farmworkers and agricultural companies, the faith-based community, police and law enforcement, and the business sector.

We have the opportunity to do something great for our country, Mr. Speaker—the opportunity to show real leadership by, of course, encouraging you, Mr. Speaker, to bring forward immigration reform. And if you prefer to bring forward several components, we will work with you to ensure that we can address some, if not all, of the issues within our broken immigration system.

But failing your leadership, Mr. Speaker, the membership of this body, under the rules of the House, has asserted itself under a discharge petition to bring comprehensive immigration reform, H.R. 15, immediately to the floor of the House for an up-or-down vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Is a discharge petition the process provided in the House rules to allow a majority of the House, without the support of the Speaker or the Rules Committee, to bring a measure to the floor that has not been reported by committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The discharge process is addressed in clause 2 of rule XV.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is it correct that any House Member can file a discharge petition if a committee has failed to act on a bill after 30 legislative days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member is free to consult the standing rules of the House. The pending business on the floor debate is House Resolution 524.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, are there any provisions in the current rule that would allow for an up-or-down vote on immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not construe the pending resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is it true that H.R. 15, the bipartisan immigration reform bill, has been pending before several committees and has not even faced a vote in committee since it was introduced in October?

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people will determine what is relevant and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is relevant here is the fact that this body, which wasn't even in session last week, which is working 9½ hours this week, is simply not addressing the issues that the American people are demanding that we address.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why perhaps only 8 or 12 percent of the American people approve of the institution of Congress. It is precisely because of the issues that people care about and they want us to solve. And it is not a partisan thing. These are the issues that my Democratic and Republican and Independent constituents all want us to solve. They all want to make sure that we reduce the deficit, secure our borders, and implement mandatory workplace authentication of workers. These are commonsense provisions that are supported across the ideological spectrum.

There has not been a committee vote on H.R. 15. There has not been a floor vote on any legislative proposal to address any dimension of our broken immigration system.

That is why I join my colleagues in signing a discharge petition under the rules of the House to bring forward this bill for immediate consideration on the floor so that this body can work its will to finally replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to see the passionate fervor of the gentleman from Colorado on this issue. I wish that that passion and fervor had been there a couple of years ago when I had an immigration bill on the floor that dealt with many of these issues.

Unfortunately, today, we have an issue that is extremely important to those of us who live in the West. I think my county commissioners, all of whom see this as a very, very critical issue, will take some kind of umbrage to saying that this is not a significant thing, especially if you are one of the county commissioners that lives in the West and the Federal Government has control of your land—the entire county. Take Wayne County, for example: 3 percent of its county is private property, and that is not a small county. The rest is controlled by the Federal Government.

There is the constant fear by these people that the President, by a stroke of a pen or picking up a telephone, can make a ruling or a proclamation that will change their lives significantly; that will make their economy turn upside down. And there is not a thing they can do about it. This is the reason we have asked for this bill—to at least give these county commissioners the chance of having public input before the decision is made. That is why this becomes so significant.

These county commissioners want to be treated fairly, as all people want to be treated fairly, and one of the problems they have in being treated fairly is simply this particular archaic act.

The original Antiquities Act was passed in 1906. Think about that for a minute. What kind of environmental laws were there in 1906? Also consider the state of the Nation in 1906. In 1906, the States of Alaska, Hawaii, Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma were not part of the Nation.

□ 1300

Even my State of Utah was less than a decade old as a State in this particular Nation.

A lot is made often about how the Grand Canyon was created by using the Antiquities Act. Actually, it was. Unfortunately, it was a monument using the Antiquities Act, but the Grand Canyon had actually been a national forest before it was created a monument; and when it was created as Grand Canyon National Park, that was done by Congress because only Congress has the ability to create national parks.

So one of the situations we have is the situation is extremely different from 1906 till today; and one of the things that also is different is that the Antiquities Act has been used in the past, but it has basically been abused in the current time.

There are three criteria for which the Antiquities Act is supposed to be able to be used to create a national monument. One is it has to have a specific element that needs to be protected: archaeological, historical, geographical.

Secondly, it has to be in imminent danger of being destroyed.

Third, it has to be in the smallest footprint possible, which meant, when they were debating it in 1906 on the floor, the debate was very clear they were talking about 2 to 300 acres.

President Bush created thousands of acres of a national monument. Fortunately, it was in water, but he created one because it had a lot of fish without ever deciding what the significant factor was.

The President has created a couple of national monuments, our current one, for structures that were already under preservation status. There was no imminent danger.

When President Clinton did the Grand Staircase-Escalante, that was not 200 acres. That was 1.9 million acres, which is larger than a couple of our small States combined. So the criteria for the use of the Presidential authority has changed radically.

Also, the way it has been used has changed radically. Look, from the Depression era to the beginning of 1976, let us say, roughly a half century, the Antiquities Act was only used nine times.

President Roosevelt, in his four terms, only used it three times, and one of those was reversed by Congress.

When President Carter came into office, he then used it 15 times in his 4 years.

President Clinton then used it 22 times, all of which were in his last 4 years.

President Obama has already used it eight times, and is counting.

It is very clear that we are doing it differently than it was in the past. All those other uses of the Antiquities Act were done, actually, to designate a specific topic and try to preserve it. What we are finding now is it is being used as a political weapon, a ''gotcha'' effort, a power play, without letting anyone know about it.

In the case of the Grand Staircase-Escalante, the Governor, the morning, at 2:00 in the morning, was explaining what public trust lands were to the White House. At 12, the President then designated the Grand Staircase-Escalante monument without ever dealing with the issue of school trust lands in those particular areas.

What I am saying is, we need to change something now because we are starting to use the Antiquities Act as a political bludgeon, and it shouldn't be that way. The most mellow way, the most moderate way of doing that is simply doing this bill that says, okay, we are not going to take the power away from the President. All we are going to do is, before you use it—you can't surprise people with it—you have to go through the NEPA process, which requires public comment, public input, which is what every other agency in the Federal Government has to use. Congress has to go through that same process.

The only one who is exempt from public comments is the President. That is why this is important. That is why this is vital, especially to people who live in high rural areas that have a lot of Federal land in which they are frightened that the President could upend everything simply by a stroke of a pen, and they don't have an avenue to give input. This bill gives them input. It is easily the most moderate approach that will ever come about the Antiquities Act on this floor, and I think it is worthy of supporting the rule and bringing it to the floor for a final vote.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, let's replace the antiquity that is our broken immigration system with one that reflects our values as a country. The hole in our border security is wider than the Grand Canyon the gentleman from Utah mentions. Let's fix that.

The hole in our values is wider than the Grand Canyon. Let's fix that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that honors our American values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA), the chief sponsor of the bipartisan immigration reform bill, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families and moves our country forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a champion of immigration reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families, keeps our families together, moves our country forward.

We demand a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. May I ask an inquiry?

Was that for a vote on Tule Springs or something else? Apparently, it was something else.

Mr. POLIS. Was your inquiry through the Speaker?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my earlier announcement that all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only. I am not prepared to yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to try until the gentleman from Utah allows our consent request.

I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a true leader on immigration

reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Would the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Utah if he does accept the request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah indicated he will not yield for any request for unanimous consent.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does the RECORD show a response for the gentleman from Utah to the request from the gentlewoman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood that that is the feeling of the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. How does the Speaker know the ''feelings'' of the gentleman from Utah?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman stated that he will not yield to any more unanimous consent requests of this type.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN), a leader in the fight for immigration reform, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to bring up H.R. 15.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that honors our American values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chair of the Democratic Caucus, for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair first asks the gentleman from California to please remove the badge from his lapel.

The gentleman from California may now proceed.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that has been held up for more than 733 days to honor our American values so that I can wear this tag later on in the future with great pride.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), a leader on the fight for immigration reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites families and moves our country forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear a response on the last four inquiries from the gentleman from Utah. I was hoping the Speaker could pose the question to him, if he would accede to our request for a unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair the gentleman from Utah would not yield for any more unanimous consent requests, and therefore, they will not be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from Utah—and I will be happy to yield him a moment for an answer—how many of us need to come forward and ask for a vote on replacing the antiquity that is our broken immigration system until you will accede to a simple request for an up-or-down vote?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman for giving me his time, which I would be happy to talk about the bill that is actually before us and will be here because it is a wonderful bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Utah chose not to answer the simple question of how many people we need to have to bring up this bill. I know that we can get more people to come down because, guess what? We stand ready to solve the issue of our broken immigration system. We also stand ready, as Americans, as Democrats, as Representatives, to work with our friends on the other side of the aisle to fashion a solution that works for our country.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill introduced by Mr. GARCIA that is nearly identical to the measure already passed by the Senate.

We need comprehensive immigration reform. And if the leadership of this body, Mr. Speaker, yourself, and the leader, Mr. CANTOR, are serious about wanting to pass a jobs bill, are serious about wanting to reduce the deficit, they will act on this bill, because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting this bill reduces our deficit by $900 billion over 20 years. It boosts economic output, raises capital investment in our country, and increases the productivity of both labor and capital.

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, what we have here and what we are doing under the rules of this body is we are using another method called the previous question where we, in the minority party, can actually get a vote where, if we defeat the previous question, we can then bring forward immigration reform, H.R. 15, the bipartisan bill. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker, is that we ask our friends on both sides of the aisle to join us in a procedural motion to defeat the previous question.

Since the gentleman from Utah has thus far refused to allow a unanimous consent request—although I certainly am hopeful that he will as more Members of this body request that, out of courtesy, at least to have an up-or-down vote on immigration reform—we do have another outlet, and that is the previous question, which will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, another leader in the fight to replace our broken immigration with one that works.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request so that this House can address replacing the real antiquity that is our broken immigration system.

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that reduces our deficit by $900 billion over the next 2 years, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, and $200 billion in

the first year, and gives people an opportunity to participate out of the shadows of government and yet, be taxpaying citizens out in the front of society and be Americans who contribute to our economy and provide workers that we need to be a 21st century economy that is effective in keeping us as the world's number one economic power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, with due respect, our desire that we are placing before you is to have a debate about immigration.

Mr. Speaker, not 1 hour, not half an hour, not 10 minutes, not 1 minute of floor time for the last entire year and a half has been scheduled for debate on this important topic: replacing our immigration system with one that works. There is no desire to embellish or debate through motions. There is an earnest desire to debate the merits of the bill. We can accomplish that in three ways here, Mr. Speaker:

We can defeat the previous question and bring up immigration reform; the continued enthusiasm from my colleagues can convince Mr. BISHOP to allow for the unanimous consent request to bring up H.R. 15; or, third, my colleagues can sign the discharge petition now at the desk, and once that petition receives 218 votes, it will advance immediately to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), a leader in the fight to replace our broken immigration system with one that works, for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request.

□ 1315

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Utah how many more of my colleagues need to urgently request that this bill come forward before he would kindly consider our unanimous consent request to allow this bill to be debated on, even recognizing you may be opposed to it and others may support it, at least allowing us to have this debate?

How many more Members need to come forward and request that for him, as a courtesy, to consider that?

I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I, again, appreciate the gentleman from Colorado giving me the opportunity to speak about the issue that is at hand. I would even be happy if he would give me the opportunity to speak about a good immigration bill, which is mine, but since that is not the case, let me go, once more, to the issue that is at hand.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah is immersed in the arcane aspects of antiquities law. I certainly understand his passion for that. I truly do.

The gentleman from Utah and I have had a many great discussions on managing our public lands, which is a big part of his district and is certainly a big part of the district that I represent, but the true antiquity in the room is our broken immigration system.

The gentleman from Utah has the ability to allow us, through unanimous consent, to bring H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, to the floor of the House to solve this issue.

Every Member of this body, Democratic and Republican, has the ability to sign a discharge petition. Once it reaches 218 signatures, no Member—not the Speaker and not the majority leader—can prevent that bill from being voted on in a straight up-or-down vote. It is time to simply demand a debate, demand a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to act on legislation that has already passed the Senate with more than a two-thirds majority, including support from the home State of the gentleman from Utah, the senior Senator.

We passed a bill that the President would sign. We have a chance to pass bipartisan legislation that reduces our deficit, that secures our borders, that requires workplace authentication.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that just this morning, Congressman GARCIA filed a discharge petition on H.R. 15, finally allowing the membership of this body to go around a Speaker or a majority leader that is unwilling to address the issue of immigration, to bring forward our solution, our bipartisan solution, H.R. 15.

Now, again, I and many Members of this body are happy to consider other proposals. The gentleman from Utah has mentioned that he has a proposal. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have a number of proposals.

Some have even passed through the Judiciary Committee, but not one immigration bill has been debated or voted on in the entire year and a half of this legislative session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), a leader in the fight for immigration reform, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for allowing me to ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that reduces our deficit by $900 billion. This is an American values reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think reducing our deficit by $900 billion is a good idea. I really do. I think the American people agree that reducing our deficit by $900 billion is a good idea; and if all that stands in the way of us reducing our deficit by $900 billion is allowing this request to move through, I would certainly urge my friend from Utah to reconsider.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time for the moment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the American people, regardless of where they stand in the ideological spectrum or their party—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Greens, Libertarians—all agree that the time is now to pass immigration reform. A recent CNN poll showed 81 percent support for immigration reform.

Another poll showed that 72 percent of Republicans support the package of reforms that are included in the Senate bipartisan package and the House bipartisan package.

So what are we debating here, Mr. Speaker? Are we simply refusing to discuss any solutions? Mr. Speaker, we have offered unanimous consent request after unanimous consent request, which the gentleman from Utah has not agreed to one of those; and, Mr. Speaker, on others, you have read his mind and assumed that he hasn't agreed, although we haven't heard from him on each of those.

We filed the discharge petition. I hope that that soon has 218 votes, but very soon, Mr. Speaker, there will actually be a vote right here in this body on the previous question; and if we defeat that motion on the previous question, we will bring forward H.R. 15, the bipartisan immigration reform bill.

A similar version passed the Senate with more than two-thirds' support, and I am optimistic that that bill will pass the House today.

Let's have some debate on immigration reform. Rather than working 9½ hours this week, the American people

want to see a Congress that tackles problems and works towards solutions.

They want to see a Congress that creates jobs for Americans, makes sure that we have workplace enforcement of our immigration laws, and secure borders. It doesn't happen by itself.

Absent this body taking action, the hole in our border security will continue to be as wide as the Grand Canyon, as the gentleman from Utah has mentioned.

The hole in our national spirit and our identity and our values will be just as wide if we continue to refuse to act to unite families and bring together Americans and to finally reflect our history as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws.

It is not inconsistent to be a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws, but under the current chaos and disorder that is our immigration dysfunction, we appease no one.

It is not good for our security when we don't know who is here. It is not good for American business when they don't know who is here legally and who is not, nor when companies that hire people under the table for cash are rewarded.

It doesn't reflect our values, as a country, to tear an American child from their parent and, at taxpayer expense, sending a parent back to another country away from their child.

It doesn't reflect our values to, at taxpayer expense, keep people detained for months or even years who have committed no criminal act in our country.

These should all be addressed, Mr. Speaker, through a bill with broad bipartisan buy-in, with support from across the ideological spectrum that would pass tomorrow if we can simply defeat the previous question or if the gentleman from Utah will entertain one of my colleagues' unanimous consent requests or if 218 of us sign where I have signed on demand a vote, the discharge petition now at the desk on immigration reform.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am actually prepared to close and will reserve the balance of my time until that time.

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

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity in this body to address an issue that is in the hearts and in the minds of people across our country, of businesses across our country, of faith leaders across our country, and that is reconciling our immigration system with our values and with our economic needs, as a country.

We can do it, Mr. Speaker. We can, with one bill, reduce our deficit by $900 billion. We can, Mr. Speaker, secure our borders and prevent people from entering this country illegally. We can, Mr. Speaker, ensure that every company verifies the people that work for it are legally here through a national database.

We can, Mr. Speaker, create 151,000 jobs for Americans. We can, Mr. Speaker, grow our economy by an additional 4.8 percent over a 20-year period. We can, Mr. Speaker, unite an American child with their parents, so they can grow into the great Americans that they will become, if only we let them.

There are millions of aspiring Americans throughout our country—in my district, in my State of Colorado, and across the country—people who want nothing more than to play by our rules, to speak our language, to pay taxes, and to spend money in our stores, generating jobs for our economy, if only we will let them.

We need immigration reform, Mr. Speaker, which is why an unprecedented alliance has come together from across the spectrum in support of immigration reform. In the faith-based community, leaders in the evangelical movement, the Catholic Church, the Jewish faith, and many others have joined arm-in-arm saying: demand action, the time is now.

The business community—from the tech community to the farmers to agriculture—are united around replacing our broken immigration system with one that works, so we have the pipeline of talent we need, so that America remains competitive and to prevent the offshoring of jobs overseas.

Workers across the country are united, in organized labor, in saying: we want to replace our broken immigration system with one that works because, when we have a large illegal workforce in our country, it undermines wages for American workers.

We need to prevent the undermining of wages for American workers by replacing our immigration system with one that works and one that requires workplace authentication of all people that are employed.

At this time, I will move down to the well, where I have a sign that will be displayed with me, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 and demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah if he has changed his mind and will yield for that purpose?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have not.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we will not give up. The American people will not give up. American companies will not give up, whether they are Fortune 400 companies, whether they are tomorrow's start-ups, which contains an entrepreneurship visa bill within immigration reform. We will not give up.

This issue gets larger and larger, bigger and bigger the longer we wait. There may be 10 million people here illegally today. If this body takes no action, Mr. Speaker, there might be 15 million people here illegally in 10 years.

The problem does not solve itself. We need to have enforcement of the law and border security and a rational way to deal with the issue within our country.

I encourage my friends, Mr. Speaker, on social media, on Twitter, on Facebook, to demand a vote and join me in simply allowing this body, Congress, the only body that can solve this bill—I know, Mr. Speaker, many of our State legislatures have debated around the edges and discussed whether instate tuition works or what benefits might be denied to people who aren't here legally.

But our State legislators across the aisle—Democratic and Republican—know that only Congress can secure our borders and replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

□ 1330

That is why I encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to join me in demanding a vote, demanding a debate, and bringing to the floor comprehensive immigration reform, or, if you prefer, Mr. Speaker, a series of bills designed to address issues within immigration reform to see how we can move forward to get on the same page with the Senate and fundamentally address this issue in a way that creates jobs for Americans, secures our borders, restores the rule of law, and reduces our deficit by $900 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform that reduces our deficit by $900 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. The longer we delay in passing immigration reform, the greater costs of inaction. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office shows that H.R. 15 would reduce our deficit by $900 billion. Imagine including that, $200 billion in the first decade, in the baseline budget for the House of Representatives being worked on by Mr. RYAN and his associates on the Budget Committee.

What could that $200 billion do? Could we reduce the marginal rate? Could we reduce tax rates for corporations that keep jobs here rather than outsource them overseas? Could we reduce our deficit with that $200 billion? Could we invest it in tomorrow's infrastructure to help America remain competitive?

The answer is yes. $200 billion is generated from fixing our immigration system in a commonsense way that more than 80 percent of the American people support. Immigration reform means that housing units would be increasingly in demand and residential construction spending would increase by $68 billion per year over a 20-year period. Under immigration reform, over $100 billion more in additional taxes would be paid, allowing, again,

tax reductions to others or investments in education and infrastructure, including revenues to State and local government.

I hope the majority is listening to former Speaker Hastert who said in an op-ed recently:

> Immigration reform will make us safer, and it will make us economically stronger. It is politically smart and morally right.

And when we look at ourselves at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we do need to stand for what in our own faith traditions and in our own conscience is morally right. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that what is morally right is an immigration system that reflects our values as Americans, one that honors our ancestors, one that honors my great-grandparents who came to this country from foreign shores at a young age and had their families here and allowed their great-grandson to serve here in the United States Congress.

Today's immigrants are no different from my great-grandmother who came in 1905 to this country from Eastern Europe. If only we will provide them the opportunity and a pathway for them to be and become the good Americans that they already are and contribute to make our country stronger, we will be strengthened as a nation; jobs will be created for Americans; we will prevent foreign workers from undermining wages for American workers; we will secure our borders to prevent people from sneaking across and working in this country illegally; and we will require that companies authenticate the legal status of all workers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my plea has not fallen upon deaf ears.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, every day we fail to act, the economic and human toll increases. Every day we fail to act, we sacrifice significant levels of investment in our country as well as lose out on talented and entrepreneurial potential Americans to overseas corporations.

I represent a district that contains the Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder. Like a lot of great schools across our country, many of our graduate students in computer science and engineering are from other countries. They are here on student visas. And when they receive their master's or their Ph.D., rather than allow them to stay here, work here, and make our country stronger, we force many of them to return overseas where the jobs follow them to make another country stronger. In some cases, countries that have differences of opinion with us on a geopolitical landscape, like Russia and China, allow these students to make their countries stronger rather than ours.

Our economy, our faith leaders, our businesses, our workforce, and our families are all crying out for the House to debate this bill and to demand a vote now. I urge House leadership to heed their calls and put H.R. 15 on the floor for an immediate vote. It will pass; it has the votes. It will become the law, and it will solve this issue. The time is now. Our country and our families demand a vote.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In all due respect, I have been called very sarcastic in the past, and I probably am. So as I speak to you now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be considered flippant in anything I say, but in all due respect, the speaker was not just divining what I was thinking at the time. I clearly said at the very beginning of what my purpose was and for what I would yield, and you did that very well.

The continuous requests for unanimous consent were for immediate consideration of a bill which, in my humble opinion, I think is a poorly written bill. There are better bills out there. I have one of those. In fact, a couple of years ago, I had one of those that I would have liked the support of the other side, as well.

Perhaps if we had talked about some of those that I think actually go to the point of the issue and are properly written, it may have been somewhat different. But, instead, I am going to come back to the issue that is at hand which deals with the Antiquities Act and how the Antiquities Act has been abused.

Congress has recognized that in the past. It is kind of ironic, and I don't think many people realize this, but not every State allows the Antiquities Act to be used in their State. Congress, in 1944, withdrew the use of the Antiquities Act in the State of Wyoming. Responding to an abuse later on, the State of Alaska was withdrawn from that consideration. Even the ranking member of our committee has introduced legislation and voted for it, and it passed this House, which would limit the use of the Antiquities Act in his district.

So people are recognizing that there is a reason—a reason—that the use of the Antiquities Act has changed over the years, and not necessarily for the better. The best way of solving that problem is not necessarily taking that act away or that power away, but simply making sure that the President of the United States gets public input before he actually pulls the trigger.

Now, you may ask why I consider this such a significant issue. Well, to be honest, it is for two reasons: one, I am from the West; and number two, I am a schoolteacher.

You see, when the Antiquities Act is used without public input, it has the potential—and has in the past and could in the future and I think will in the future—to destroy economic patterns that take place, especially in rural counties. When that happens and that disruption takes place, then the ability of raising revenue for local needs becomes significant. And it is more difficult in the West than it is in the rest of the Nation. Let me try to illustrate why.

The States that are in red are the States that are considered public land States. Those are the ones that have the greatest potential of having abuse of the Antiquities Act foisted upon them. The States that are in yellow have very little public lands. In fact, two-thirds of everything the Federal Government owns is found in the red States.

What I am holding up here is the ability of these States to generate funds for their education system. As you can look over the past two decades, those States in the eastern portion of this country—the yellow States—have increased their education funding at twice the rate of those of us who live in the West. And the simple question has to be: Why do you think this takes place?

There is a distinct correlation to the amount of Federal land and the inability of States who have all that Federal land to raise money for their education systems. That is one of the continuous complaints that we have.

When monuments are made without getting the input of local citizens, the chance of making this even worse is a reality. It has happened in the past, and it will happen in the future. So I am not saying do away with the act altogether. What I am simply saying is make sure that the people who live in these red States who have a more difficult time funding their education system have the ability of making a statement before final action takes place, before simply a pen is signed to a proclamation that can change the dynamics of everything. It has happened in the past.

So that is why this is not simply a procedural bill for me. This is a bill that impacts my kids. It impacts my profession. It impacts the future of education in the West and should not be dismissed as insignificant. That is why this issue becomes so vital to those of us who live in the West because it has a direct impact on the way we live.

The gentleman from Colorado did say one thing in which I agree. He said that at some time we should all play by the same rules. That is the purpose of the underlying bill. The President should play by the same rules Congress has to use and as every agency of the Federal Government has to use, which is simply to come up with the concept that before decisions are made you get public input. And that is why all the discussion I have seen in blogs and from special interest groups are so confusing to me, because at one time we say, yes,

it is important that we get public input, except for this particular bill in which public input is bad. That does not make sense. That is mental gymnastics of the worst variety.

If this bill were to pass, it would not change the Antiquities Act, it would not prohibit the President from making national monuments, and it would not prohibit Congress from establishing national parks. All it would do is simply say you have got to go through the NEPA process which requires public input, especially from those who are going to be directly impacted.

And we have seen that if you mandate that ahead of time, you solve problems before they develop. We have practice, we have proof, and we have examples of where the monument was created without getting the input and problems developed which still have not been solved.

Don't do that. Do it the right way. We can do that, and we can make this effort happen. And, once again, of all the concepts of how to deal with the Antiquities Act and the problems it presents for those of us who live in the West, this is easily the most moderate approach, a simple approach which simply says, look, before you do it, listen to us. Let us have the chance to say something.

That is the way it ought to be and the way it should be. This bill is actually a vast improvement on a 100-plus-year-old bill that has outlived its usefulness and has changed not necessarily for the better over that course of time.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the comments that had been made. I would have appreciated it if people would also recognize the significance of this bill to those of us who live in the West. I wish they would also look at the bill as it is written. It is a very positive approach. It is something which we can all support, and it is a very good bill. I am biased because it is my bill, but it still is a very, very good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to close to reiterate the fairness of not only the bill but also of the rule, the other parts of the rule, the appropriateness of the underlying pieces of legislation, the potential of putting up other issues that are significant that must be addressed this particular week.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 524 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

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. BISHOP of Utah. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 2 p.m.

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 524;

Adopting House Resolution 524, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1228.

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. 1459, ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H. Res. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, 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 230, nays 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—14

Blumenauer
Campbell
DelBene
Duckworth
Gabbard
Gallego
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Schwartz
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1425

Messrs. SCHRADER, MCNERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. CONYERS, NADLER, and GUTIÉRREZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TURNER and GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 142 I was unavoidably detained en route to the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 2014, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 142. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on ordering the previous question.

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. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 190, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—227

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

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

NOES—190

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

NOT VOTING—14

Barton
Campbell
Cárdenas
DelBene
Duckworth
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Rangel
Schwartz
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1433

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:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I was participating in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense's Classified Hearing and missed the vote on passage of the H. Res. 524, a resolution providing consideration on H.R. 1459—the "No More National Monuments" Act and adding two bills to the Suspension Calendar. It was my intention to vote against the rule.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

CORPORAL JUSTIN D. ROSS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1228) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 Packerland Drive in Green Bay, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building", 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 Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) 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 418, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—418

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers

Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Barton
Campbell
DelBene
Duckworth
Hinojosa
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Schwartz
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1442

Mr. SCHRADER 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the 'Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 material on H.R. 1459.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1459.

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

□ 1445

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1445

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, President Obama has not been shy about his willingness or his desire to circumvent Congress and take unilateral action on a variety of issues. This lack of shyness includes the designation of new national monuments.

In fact, during the President's first term in office, an internal memo was leaked that showed plans to potentially lock up more than 13 million acres of Western land with the simple stroke of the President's pen.

Major land use decisions such as this should not be made behind closed doors and should fully involve the local citizens whose livelihoods would be directly affected by such action.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act, sponsored by our colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). This legislation would require public participation before a President can designate a national monument under the Antiquities Act.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat this last sentence that I gave because this is the heart of the legislation. This legislation would require public participation before a President can designate a national monument under the Antiquities Act.

Over 100 years ago, the Antiquities Act was passed to allow a President to unilaterally designate national monuments without any input or involvement from the people, communities, or elected officials of the areas that would be directly impacted.

However, this authority was intended to be used under narrow circumstances and in emergencies to prevent destruction of a precious place; but unfortunately, we have seen this power abused by Presidents of both parties. It has been used as a tool to score political points, rather than to protect areas facing imminent threat or harm.

National monuments are one of the most restrictive of all land use designations. They can significantly block public access and limit public recreation and other job-creating economic activities.

The American people and their elected leaders deserve to have a say in which of their lands deserve special protections as national monuments and which should, instead, be allowed to contribute to the full range of recreational, conservation, economic, and resource benefits that carefully managed multiple-use lands provide.

H.R. 1459 would guarantee public involvement and ensure that the designation process is transparent by requiring all national monument designations made under the Antiquities Act to comply with the NEPA process.

Most, if not all, major land use decisions are statutorily required to go through the NEPA process. Designations made by the President should be treated no differently than those other processes.

I will openly state, however, that I—and many of my Republican colleagues—believe that NEPA is a law that should be streamlined and updated. However, this bill is about transparency and ensuring that the public has a voice.

So let me ask the rhetorical question, Mr. Chairman: If my Democrat colleagues believe that the NEPA is a worthwhile law that works and that NEPA is important, why should they oppose making sure that Presidential designations should not go through the same process?

This bill continues to uphold the original intention of the Antiquities Act, which is to allow the President to act in emergency situations. It protects the President's ability to act if there is an eminent threat to an American antiquity by allowing for a temporary emergency designation of 5,000 acres or less for a 3-year period.

After that time, in order to ensure public participation in the process, the designation would be made permanent if the NEPA process is completed or if it is approved by Congress.

The bill would also limit national monument declarations to no more than one per State during any 4-year Presidential term and prevent the inclusion of private property in monument designations without the prior written consent of the property owners.

National monument designations deserve public input from the people and communities who are directly impacted. This bill is necessary to stop unilateral actions by the President and ensure participation by the American public.

I commend subcommittee Chairman BISHOP for his work on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this week, the majority advanced a bill that would block the administration from implementing a stream buffer zone rule intended to protect waterways from the impacts of mountaintop removal coal mining, adding to the list of their attacks on the environment.

House Republicans ignore the fact that Americans want clean water, clean skies, and more—not less—national parks and national monuments because, now, they are forcing a vote on H.R. 1459, a bill that will make it harder for Presidents to create new national monuments, adding layers upon layers of duplicative oversight and unnecessary congressional review.

This is not what our constituents are asking Congress to do. It is simply another attempt by the majority to stall the protection of Federal land.

In its 100-year history, the Antiquities Act has been used by 16 out of 19 Presidents. In fact, Teddy Roosevelt used it to protect the Grand Canyon, and over half our national parks started out as national monuments.

Congress should not be diluting this popular tool or making it more difficult for future Presidents to set land aside and honor our shared history, but that is exactly what this legislation is trying to do.

There are two ways to create a new national monument. Congress can pass a law, or the President can use the Antiquities Act.

As we all know, it is becoming increasingly difficult to pass a law, even for popular bipartisan conservation measures. Bills languish in Congress for years, and the Antiquities Act is often the only way to move some of these projects across the goal line.

The majority will refute this by pointing the finger at the Senate, blaming the other side of the Hill for inaction, and highlighting their own track record of passing bills out of the House.

That is a smokescreen. They have only moved a fraction of the conservation bills sitting before the House. Many do not even get a subcommittee hearing, and some of these proposals have been around for 10 years.

As Democrats, we are very pleased to create new wilderness in the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. Don't get me wrong. This is a good legislation; but passing one standalone wilderness bill, one national monument, and one new national park bill in 3 years is not proof that Congress can do the work of conserving land and creating national monuments.

For example, I introduced a bill to establish a national monument in my district that would honor and recognize land considered sacred by Native American communities in the Southwest.

It is an area full of ancient petroglyphs increasingly under threat for looting and vandalism. A national monument designation will ensure that these cultural treasures receive the level of protection that they deserve.

This proposal is supported by the National Congress of American Indians and every tribe in Arizona. Like many of my colleagues with similar national monument proposals, I am unable to get even a hearing on that particular bill.

If the majority is truly concerned about public input or congressional review of national monuments and conservation of Federal land, why don't they consider bills to establish new monuments, parks, heritage areas, or wilderness?

Nearly 100 conservation designation bills have been introduced in the last two Congresses. Four have become law. This track record doesn't prove that we need more Congressional review. On the contrary.

If the majority is so eager to apply NEPA to the Antiquities Act, why are they trying to limit its scope for other activities on public lands?

In the Natural Resources Committee alone, the majority has considered and advanced measures to limit public review for timber operations, mining activity, and oil and gas leasing.

Following this logic, there is too much review when foreign corporations want to extract American taxpayer-owned natural resources, but not enough when we set aside land for future generations.

House Republicans have attempted to rewrite California water law, undermine the Endangered Species Act, blow up the Stream Buffer Rule, and encourage State and private takeover of Federal lands, a trust owned by all of the American people.

Putting up barriers to Presidential proclamations of national monuments, as envisioned by H.R. 1459, is just another feather in the antienvironmental cap.

H.R. 1459 will set up arbitrary per-State limits on Presidential monument designations and require congressional review of any monument under 5,000 acres. Monuments over 5,000 acres won't have to be approved by Congress, but they will be delayed by a process intended to evaluate the environmental impact on major Federal actions.

I hate to break it to the majority, but conservation and the establishment of national monuments don't have the same footprint as open-pit mines and oil wells.

Republicans want us to believe that this bill is about protecting private property. The Antiquities Act only applies to Federal land—let me repeat, only applies to Federal land.

If there are some concerned about people who have inholdings within that Federal land, why are they standing in the way of Federal land acquisition and depriving those property owners who are willing sellers of the right to sell?

H.R. 1459 is a wasteful and duplicative piece of legislation that will, like most bills passed out of this House, have no chance of ever becoming law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1459, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Washington and for his yielding time.

You have just heard one view of what the bill does from our friends on the other side of the aisle. I would bring a different view.

Just a couple of months ago, Secretary Jewell visited a city in my district, Las Cruces, with the full intent—my belief—to create a Presidential executive order creating a monument.

Keep in mind, that monument bill could not be passed through this House under Democrat rule. It could not be passed through the Republican-controlled Senate with a Republican sponsor. It could not be passed through the Democrat-controlled Senate when they had a filibuster-proof majority.

Now, then the President is going to come and unilaterally declare almost one-third of a county to be restricted. The West is starving education because of the public ownership of land. Any time you create a monument, you restrict the ability of local economies to survive.

So the first monument—the first wilderness area that was created by Congress is in my district, the Gila National Wilderness, and they are starving for jobs in that entire region. They are asking: When can we have our jobs back?

So the gentleman describes that it is somehow we, as Republicans, objecting. No. All we are saying is that the President needs to live by the same rules as everyone else. The President is not above the law; neither is his Secretary.

This bill is very simple. It is transparent.

□ 1500

It says that the NEPA process is about public involvement. That public involvement is what has scared away both Democrats and Republicans trying to make this 600,000-acre wilderness happen in the 2nd District of New Mexico.

This bill needs to be passed because Washington needs to understand the people own the land.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank my friend and colleague for the time.

Mr. Chair, since Congress passed the Antiquities Act in 1906, both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used the power granted under the act to protect some of our most recognizable, most beloved natural wonders: Grand Teton in Wyoming, Zion in Utah, Olympic in Washington, and the Statue of Liberty. That is a few.

Last week, I had the opportunity to backpack for 7 days in what is the best known and most visited—4.4 million people last year—the Grand Canyon of the United States.

In 1908, Republican President Teddy Roosevelt granted national monument designation for the Grand Canyon under the Antiquities Act, and all but two Presidents since then have used this authority.

At that time, it was critical to protect the Grand Canyon because tremendous development was being proposed, both for tourism purposes and for commercial uses and mining and other issues, so that was an extraordinary step that that President took back then.

Why would we turn back the clock? Why would we strip this President or future Presidents from having this authority to preserve and conserve national treasures when they are indefinitely stalled, as was the Grand Canyon, in the morass of Congress?

It was dysfunctional for a different reason back then; but it is just as dysfunctional or more dysfunctional today as it was back then. There is going to be no protection passing this House easily or freely with this majority in charge.

Now, it is true that there have been some controversial designations, one mentioned previously and earlier by Chairman BISHOP; but I would also note that no one—no one—has proposed legislation to repeal that designation by President Clinton.

If they are so aggrieved and it is so egregious, I wonder why they haven't done that. Perhaps because it enjoys tremendous popular support, except from among a few people.

Now, they say this is about more control. Let's take a look at what they have done with control. Over the last 4 years, the Republican majority has proposed legislation to sell off public lands.

They have passed multiple bills that would open our public lands, virtually unregulated, as of yesterday, to mountaintop removal, mineral, and energy extraction. They shut down access to our national parks because of their stupid government shutdown last fall, and they found out that wasn't too popular.

Then they held a hearing to find out why the parks were shut down when the government was shut down. Look in the mirror, guys. That is why the parks were shut down. They found out that the parks and these monuments enjoyed tremendous support from the American people.

There have been 89 conservation bills introduced from both sides of the aisle in this House in the last two Congresses, and only four of the 89 have become law. This Republican majority is genuinely openly hostile to conservation designations; yet, today, they are pretending that they actually really care about these iconic places, and they are just making a couple little changes to the law to include more public input.

You know, I have an experience from the Clinton administration for the Steens Mountains in Oregon. We only got it done because President Clinton and Secretary Babbitt said: we are going to make that a monument.

Now, we don't have as much flexibility in designation, but if you would legislate something, we will work with you.

We had a meeting in my office with the Republican Senator, a Republican Member from Oregon, myself, a couple of other Members came in and out, and the Secretary, and we hammered out a bill to protect the Steens Mountains in Oregon, and it passed on a bipartisan basis in a Republican Congress, with a Republican House and a Republican Senate. Unfortunately, those are the old days.

As I said earlier, 16 out of 19 Presidents have used this power. Teddy Roosevelt said it best, I think, about the Grand Canyon, that we should:

> Let this great wonder of nature remain as it now is. Do nothing to mar its grandeur, sublimity, and loveliness. You cannot improve on it, but what you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and all who come after you, as the one great sight which every American should see.

Today, the majority here would undo the potential for future legacies under the Antiquities Act.

Just one side note: Chairman BISHOP made much of talking about, in a Dear Colleague letter, that there was a provision in legislation, of which I was a sponsor, critical and unique to my State, designating the O&C lands, and he said it precludes new monument designations.

Yes, he is right. That was in there at the insistence of the Republican majority. I would have been happy to take it out, but I will cut him a deal. I would be happy to negotiate.

He voted for that bill, but it also includes 1.2 million acres of old growth preservation, 90,000 acres of wilderness, 300,000 acres of riparian set-asides, and 150 miles of wild and scenic designations.

If he will fully support those conservation provisions in my bill, I will, perhaps, negotiate with them, that they could say: well, we won't do any more monuments in that area because we have already had a massive conservation victory.

But that is why it is in the bill. They insisted, not me. Let's not create phony arguments here.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this horrible legislation.

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, it is nice to see that the assault on the authority of this branch continues. It is sad that it continues from within, and it is interesting to hear westerners talk about issues that are particularly acute in Western lands.

I happen to hail from a State that is 87 percent owned by the Federal Government. The key word there is ''owned.''

If you want to protect natural resources that are Federal—which, by the way, this law takes into account—the Federal Government already owns them. You do not have enough authority by virtue of ownership interest over the last 110 years, almost, to protect things? Things have not changed.

I have heard criticism about the mining reform law of 1874 from my colleagues. Here is something from 1906, and it is like, if you can't protect it by being the owner, as the Federal Government—under the land management auspices of multiple Federal land use agencies, I am wondering why—and I heard somebody say these areas enjoy tremendous support of the people—what is the problem with allowing the people to participate in the process of monument designation?

Why is it awful for these people who want these areas, want to enjoy them, to say, hey, you know, we are thinking of making a monument of this, and even though you control it by virtue of ownership and countless regs? We want to use the regulation that applies to that, to let the people who enjoy them so much participate in the process. We want to cede all authority to the executive branch because we happen to disagree on some things?

Let me tell you, as a member of the Republican side of the aisle who has been advocating for the creation of 96,000 acres of wilderness in a bipartisan context with my colleague from Nevada—which I can't get through yet. I am frustrated too.

I fail to see the harm in allowing the people that so much appreciate these Federal lands to participate in their further designation, adding another layer of administration, as monuments.

Let's, please, defend our authority as this branch, and let's support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1459. This bill is a solution in search of a problem. The reference to public participation in the name of the bill implies that there is a complete lack of public input in the process of designating these monuments, that these designations are dropping abruptly and arbitrarily out of the White House.

I will tell you, as the Representative of the newest national monument in the country, that is just not the case.

Before President Obama added Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands to the California Coastal National Monument, literally, the entire community in that area that I represent, all of the interested stakeholders were not only engaged, they had been engaged for several years.

That includes everyone from the business community, local tribes, conservation groups, and local governments, to schoolchildren in the area. There was no opposition to this proposal.

People came out to public meetings, and that included a public workshop that Secretary Sally Jewell had herself. She came out to the area. I assure you, there was no shortage of public input, no shortage of public participation, so this premise that there is a lack—an absence of public participation is, at least in my experience, totally false.

But so is the political narrative behind this bill, this idea that President Obama has somehow overreached in his exercise of executive authority. In fact,

President Obama has been much more judicious than many of his predecessors in deciding when to designate these monuments.

Prior to this President, 16 Presidents from both parties have used this authority under the Antiquities Act over the course of more than a century, and that ranges from President Roosevelt's designation of the Grand Canyon to 140,000 square miles of marine monument that were designated around Hawaii by President George W. Bush.

By comparison to his predecessors, President Obama has been very sparing in using the Antiquities Act, and he and his Cabinet have been very careful to bring the public in and to be very transparent, so the narrative about executive overreach is also false.

Limiting the Antiquities Act, as this bill would do—and I want to emphasize this—will harm jobs and economic growth; and in the case of my district, in Mendocino County, the community understood that one of the reasons for broad support of this monument designation is that the community understood it was good not just for the environment, but good for the economy.

The travel and tourism industry is one of Mendocino County's biggest industries, bringing in over $300 million annually, and everybody understood that this monument designation was going to significantly boost that part of our economy; and it is going to happen now, this summer, thanks to what President Obama did.

So why should a community like Mendocino County wait on a monument designation, especially in a situation like this, where there was no opposition to the proposal? No one is saying that Congress shouldn't play a role in protecting our public lands.

It is important to note that bills to protect this part of the Mendocino coast were introduced first more than 2 years ago, so the 112th Congress had a full chance at it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we know that Congress can be slow, that there are uncertainties in the process of moving through Congress.

The question is: Why, in the case of something like this, when there is no opposition, all these economic benefits, should my district or any other district have to wait for this critically important designation?

I think we should be very careful about repealing a bill that has stood the test of time and worked well for both Democrats and Republicans for more than a century, and I request a ''no'' vote on H.R. 1459.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes now to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend and, really, one of my heroes, Congressman BISHOP of Utah, for bringing attention to, I think, this very important topic, especially one to my home State of Utah.

To my friends across the aisle, I think you have to twist yourselves into pretzels in order to object to this bill. In 1996, nearly 2 million acres in the heart of my district were locked up in the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument—nearly 2 million acres.

It was the largest national monument created in the history of the United States. This massive monument was created with a stroke of the President's pen, without any consultation, without even notice given to the local population, no phone calls, no conversations, nothing.

The President didn't even have the courage to step into my State when he created this monument. He stood on the Arizona border and said: I create a national monument over there.

If the President desires to create new large national monuments, surely he can believe that conducting a thorough environmental analysis is a good thing. NEPA was specifically designed to mandate that Federal agencies stop and think about proposed actions and make sure that those actions are appropriate.

It also mandates that all of those who are impacted by that decision would have sufficient information and approval. If the creation of a national monument is a good idea, shouldn't the monuments have to undergo public scrutiny?

□ 1515

And if the President can take 5 years—5 years and counting—to approve, say, the Keystone pipeline, can't we take an appropriate amount of consideration before we create another massive monument? That is what democracy is all about. That is all that this bill asks for.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To the previous speaker and others who have complained about Grand Staircase-Escalante, you could introduce a bill to repeal it. Why don't you?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), one of my classmates.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of this bill not just because it is about amendments and the importance of public input, but ultimately because it is about two central tenets that the Founding Fathers laid out that I think are important to both Republicans and Democrats alike.

Quite simply, their belief was that three, four, or five perspectives were always better than one. They didn't want to see unilateral action, they didn't want to see a king, and the idea of overstepping on that front was contrary to what they set up; and secondly, that the individual was to be the sole repository of power in our political system and that any government had legitimacy only inasmuch as there was consent by the governed. And what you see with many of these monument-type activities is no consent by the locally governed.

So I very much believe in land conservation and have been an advocate for a long time, but I believe in a process that prescribes to that which the Constitution laid out necessary in that process.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. It sounds good, but it should be known as the ''Preventing New Parks Act.''

This bill would severely restrict this and any future President's authority to establish a national monument, eliminating a crucial part of our Nation's conservation strategy. In this current poisonous climate, the majority has made it nearly impossible for Congress to conserve land for future generations using the legislative process. This past Congress, in fact, was the first since World War II to not protect a single acre of land as a national park, monument, or wilderness area—not one single acre.

Just last year, there was a significant bipartisan effort on the part of the President and others to designate the Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, but that bill failed to even make it out of the committee—with public support and with family support, failed to make it out of committee. Just yesterday, we celebrated the first anniversary of the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument located in my State of Maryland and designated as a national monument by President Obama using his authority under the Antiquities Act.

I was in the Oval Office with the descendants of Harriet Tubman and the people of that community who had been working for years for this designation. I saw what it meant to the community. They believed that it meant economic development, also.

Had H.R. 1459 been passed a year ago, this monument to a national hero would probably be stuck in the arbitrary hurdles and redundant research this bill proposes.

National monuments are an important part of telling our American story, and yet, currently, only 26 of our Nation's 460 national parks have a primary focus on African Americans, and

just eight are dedicated to women. That includes the Harriet Tubman Park.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS. Rather than rolling back the President's ability to preserve both our national history and our natural heritage, we should be encouraging this and future administrations to continue to work for the common good—for the public good—that this necessary preservation work entails.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive bill, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Wyoming, I want to address what the previous speaker mentioned. She was talking about the Tubman bill.

Had this bill that we are debating here today been in effect, we wouldn't have had the problem with the Tubman issue right now. The Tubman issue was designated as a national monument, but it didn't go through the local process, and as a result—as a result of that—there are flaws in that designation. Thus, the bill that the gentlelady from Maryland is introducing is to correct the flaws that were put in place because of the monument designation.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the State of Wyoming is exempt from the Antiquities Act. I don't know if you knew there is any State that is exempt from the Antiquities Act.

In 1950, when Grand Teton National Park and the Jackson Hole National Monument were combined, lawmakers and President Truman exempted Wyoming from further congressional designations. Now 48 percent of Wyoming is Federal land. We have the first national park, the first national forest, and the first national monument. We have nine total national forests and one national grassland within our State borders. Yet, without having to comply with the Antiquities Act, we created the national migratory bird refuge in Wyoming, which is a massive area that happened with local input.

You don't need the Antiquities Act as it exists to continue to create Federal designations. They can be done with local and State input, which is exactly what this bill will allow. If there are additional unique and special designations necessary, they should go through the congressional process and not be usurped by unilateral Presidential powers.

This is 2014. We are not back in the era when Presidents needed to designate areas that were at risk of being degraded. The ethic of a nation for conservation has come far beyond that. Let's adapt our laws to the morality and the ethics of the times. Let's pass this bill and give people involvement in decisions that are made in their States.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1459. This bill will clearly undermine the Antiquities Act, one of our country's most important environmental and historic preservation tools, and one that has been critical to protecting beautiful land in my home State of Delaware.

Currently, Delaware is the only State in the Union without a national park. That means that every summer as families flip through the guidebooks of national parks and search through the Internet for outdoor vacation ideas, Delaware is not on the map, except, of course, for our beautiful beaches. The good news is that, last year, the Antiquities Act helped fix this problem. It allowed for the creation of the First State National Monument, including the historic Woodlawn property, through a process that involved broad public input and public participation.

The Woodlawn property is 1,100 historic acres spanning the border of Delaware and Pennsylvania. It had been privately owned and used for public recreation for over 100 years and was about to be sold, potentially leading to extensive residential development. In response to considerable public outcry about the possible loss of this great property, a private foundation, the Mt. Cuba Center, stepped in with an incredibly generous donation of more than $20 million to protect the property for future generations. Given the various limitations related to the management and transfer of the property, the Antiquities Act provided the right path for us to move quickly with plenty of public input to ensure that the monument effectively represented our community's goals.

As part of this process, we held over a dozen public meetings on the creation of the monument, including a hearing attended by the National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis and hundreds of Delawareans and Pennsylvanians who expressed strong support for the protection of the Woodlawn property. The First State National Monument continues to enjoy virtually unanimous, enthusiastic support from all stakeholders in our community, including colleagues on the other side of the aisle representing districts in Pennsylvania.

The provisions in this bill under consideration today would have jeopardized this process, and we may not have been able to realize the tremendous gift.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CARNEY. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican President, a great outdoorsman, and a lover of nature, said this about the importance of protecting our national treasures. He said:

> It is not what we have that will make us a great nation; it is the way in which we use it.

Let's continue our Nation's tradition of protecting our public lands in a way that reflects the greatness of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 9¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1459, the ''No More National Monuments Act.'' I have experienced the Antiquities Act firsthand through my community's efforts and success in establishing Fort Monroe as a national monument in November of 2011.

The history of Fort Monroe is older than the history of the United States, and the story of Fort Monroe is really the story of our Nation. Fort Monroe is also known as ''Freedom's Fortress,'' witnessing both the beginning and the end of slavery in our Nation, and it played a crucial role in nearly every military engagement right up to its closure in 2005. After its closure, the city of Hampton and the entire Hampton Roads region united in support for the inclusion of Fort Monroe in the National Park System.

The creation of Fort Monroe National Monument was the culmination of years of hard work led by then-Hampton Mayor Molly Ward, the citizens of Hampton, conservation and historic preservation groups, Hampton's City Council, Virginia's Governor, and Virginia's congressional delegation. These parties worked together at the local, State, and Federal level to urge the President to use his powers under the Antiquities Act to take immediate action to establish Fort Monroe as a national monument.

While I supported legislation introduced by my neighboring colleague, Congressman SCOTT RIGELL, to enshrine Fort Monroe as part of the National Parks System, this bill stalled in committee and was never given a proper hearing. Without the President's statutory authority to protect this land, it is doubtful that Fort Monroe and the history of the site would be protected as it is today.

Mr. Chairman, had the underlying bill been law in 2011 when President Obama designated Fort Monroe as a national monument, we would be nearing the 3-year approval deadline included in this bill, and the powerful role that Fort Monroe played in our Nation's history would be in danger of

being lost to future generations as the legislation to authorize the President's designation lingered in committee.

While this legislation has been introduced to promote more public participation in the designation process, in my experience, the administration, including the President and the Secretary of the Interior, both went to great lengths to make sure that public input was a top priority in the decision to designate Fort Monroe as a national monument. This legislation, should it become law, would jeopardize the ability of other communities to protect sensitive Federal lands in their areas the same way that my community was able to do.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I oppose the passage of H.R. 1459, and I hope other Members will oppose the legislation as well.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

□ 1530

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, it is with great disappointment that I come to the floor today in opposition to this attempt by my Republican colleagues to undermine the Antiquities Act, a law that has resulted in the protection and preservation of some of our Nation's most cherished lands. The Grand Canyon, Zion National Park, the Cesar Chavez National Monument, and many more have all been protected under the Antiquities Act by Presidents of both parties.

This issue hits close to home for me and my constituents. Last March, President Obama designated the Rio Grande del Norte in northern New Mexico as a national monument under the Antiquities Act. The result was years of work and the community coming together to find consensus on a path forward that respects our traditions and respects our culture. Protecting the Rio Grande del Norte had broad support and a strong coalition worked with the administration and Secretary Salazar to show that protecting this land needed to be a top priority. Whether it is for recreation, farming, or sustaining a way of life, the Rio Grande del Norte impacts all those who visit and all those who live off the sustenance it provides.

It is one of the crown jewels of our State, and if it were not for the Antiquities Act, this majestic land that represents our culture and drives the local economy would not have received the protections that will ensure its vitality for future generations. This attack on the Antiquities Act is an attack on the preservation of lands that are a part of who we are, our rich history as a diverse Nation, and our ability to enjoy these lands in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friend from Arizona how many more speakers he has.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I have one more speaker, and then I will close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1459 because it could have severe unintended consequences for the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, which I represent.

This is yet once again an attack on the President's authority, but in this case, H.R. 1459 would create unnecessary obstacles regarding the President's ability to conserve lands and protect our country's most notable destinations.

The Antiquities Act has been used to protect a site in my district that commemorates the outstanding achievements of a great American inventor, Thomas Edison. This great innovator produced many of the inventions loved across the world—silent and sound motion pictures, the motion picture camera, phonographs, and the electric storage battery.

For more than 40 years, Thomas Edison's laboratory complex located in West Orange, New Jersey, was cranking out innovation after innovation. The laboratory employed at one time over 100 people, working on various projects from chemistry to physics to metallurgy.

In 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower used his authority under the Antiquities Act to establish the Edison Laboratory as a national monument. One year prior, in 1955, Congress had established Thomas Edison's home as a national historic site. Six years later, the Edison National Historic Site legislation combined the two into a unit of the National Park System.

Recently, the laboratory complex underwent an extensive renovation and had a grand reopening in 2009 to welcome America to explore two new floors of the laboratory that were previously closed to the public. The museum collections at Thomas Edison National Historical Park are by far the largest single body of Edison-related material in existence, and it is the third largest museum collection in the National Park Service.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I don't believe Thomas Edison would appreciate this partisan bill which could turn out the lights on our future national monuments that honor innovators such as him.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1459.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as I said on the rule, sometimes I am amazed at the kind of misinformation and inaccuracy that is taking place about this bill. This bill does not stop parks. It does not stop monuments. We have heard about the Grand Canyon being made a monument under this act, under this power, but please realize it was a national forest before that, and it was made a park by Congress because only Congress can make parks.

The gentleman from Delaware, I appreciate him being here, he still has his park because only Congress can go through that particular process.

I also get somewhat confused when people talk about how this is a way of rolling back any kind of protection. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government owns over 635 million acres. We already have 336 million acres that presently are in a protected status. There is no way they can be touched by anyone at any time for anything. And those that are for development are only 38 million acres. It is almost a 10 to 1 ratio between the two of them.

I want you to think back on when the Antiquities Act was originally passed. It was 1906. The States of Hawaii, Alaska, New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma did not exist. They were all territories. My home State had only been in the Union for a decade. There were very few environmental laws. Today, if you were to list all of the environmental protections that we have on the statutes, both by the Federal Government and by the States, it would take four or five pages, small type, just to list them all. There could have been a reason for doing this. This is back in the era when there was no Bureau of Land Management. There was not even a Park Service when this was being done. The majority of the designations Teddy Roosevelt made were in territories that were not States. Things have changed since that time. Unfortunately, this law hasn't.

And if you don't allow the NEPA process to allow public input, you make mistakes. You made mistakes in Utah—and, yes, we have had bills that have been filibustered by the Senate to make those changes, but 20 years later we are still trying to work through what ought to have been there.

The gentlelady from Maryland was here, and I appreciate her concept. Her Harriet Tubman national monument is a good idea. The unfortunate thing is it was poorly done because you didn't take the time to go through the NEPA process and get some public input. It is still in draft status. This is the boundary within the green. The stuff with the stripes on it are private property they just kind of found within the boundary that now they have to try to get approval to try to acquire that property. The white is also other private property that right now they don't think they need to acquire.

Now, how come we missed all that stuff? It is simply because the President decided to use the Antiquities power without taking the time to get public input to go through those situations.

Yes, a lot of Presidents have used this stuff.

One other thing, too. The proclamation that created Harriet Tubman said there would be 11,750 acres set aside. The Park Service says it is actually 25,000, and no one knows the difference—25,000 acres of Federal, State and private lands. See, that is the problem. If you rush this stuff through without taking the time to get input from people, you make mistakes.

Don't make mistakes.

The National Resources Defense Council said that NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, which regulates the requirement to have public input before you go forward with that, held that the Magna Carta protects people from the dangers of monarchy, and NEPA protects people by providing transparency in Federal projects. Both the Magna Carta and NEPA espouse the ideals of public participation and democracy by giving citizens a voice in government decisions.

Giving people the chance to have a voice in government decisions is the purpose of NEPA. Every Federal agency has to use NEPA. Congress has to do something very similar because everything requires some kind of hearing. The only person that doesn't have to do that is the President when he uses this archaic act, over 100 years old, in situations that have changed.

Instead, what was said about this in some of the misinformation going out, they said if this bill is passed, it eviscerates one of the America's bedrock conservation laws. Look, you can't say it is good to have public involvement except here, in which it is bad to have public involvement. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the administration said. The administration said the President should not have to go through NEPA, should not have to get public input because he is only head of the executive branch, he is not an agency of the executive branch. That is intellectual gymnastics, and one of the reasons why we have problems.

This bill doesn't stop anything. Any monument that was made could easily be made. This bill recognizes there may be an emergency situation, and anything less than 5,000 acres can be done.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to say was, this is a damn good bill. And there is a reason why it is a good bill: because it simply requires the President to have public information and get the input of people.

If there is an emergency situation, it allows for them to create something under 5,000 acres on an emergency basis without doing NEPA, it is just that Congress has to respond within 3 years to validate it, otherwise it reverts back. Anything that he wants to do with NEPA, he can do it regardless of the size. It is the appropriate thing to do.

This bill moves us forward and takes a bill that may have been appropriate in 1906—but we are certainly living in a different time and a different era, and we need to make sure that a President, before he puts his pen to a paper, has actually talked to local people, and it has not always happened.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just say that at the direction of the Republican leadership, this House has approved a remarkable series of anti-environmental bills in this Congress. While conservation bills languish and are stalled in Congress, we have seen time and time again House Republicans vote to deregulate mining, make drilling on public lands less safe, prevent Federal regulation of fracking, open virtually the entire coast of the United States to unsafe drilling offshore, give away precious public lands, override State and local water laws, and just yesterday, weaken existing limits on dumping coal mining waste in streams and rivers.

In the last 6 years, 7.4 million acres of public lands have been leased for oil and gas drilling; only 2.9 million protected for the future legacy and conservation, for the future use of the public and this Nation. That imbalance is directly the responsibility of a lack of action by this Congress.

Each of these measures were not only poor public policy, but also poor use of our time. They were, thankfully, dead on arrival in the Senate. This bill, H.R. 1459, is simply another bill in this series of deeply flawed proposals, and it will rightly suffer an identical fate.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of points. It is pretty hard to follow-up on what the author of the legislation did, talking about the history of this legislation and why there needs to be some changes. I thought he did that in a very, very good way.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, at least the previous speaker, but also others, have mentioned about different pieces of legislation that we have passed out. I understand that they are probably in opposition to having more exploration, making us less energy dependent with offshore legislation, with onshore legislation, and so forth.

But, Mr. Chairman, what wasn't said in that argument was that in every case, in every case the legislation that the gentleman lamented that we passed, we had a hearing in the committee. We had a hearing and went through the normal legislative process. When you look at what the intent of this legislation is all about, it is simply to have a hearing with consultation and transparency with those that are affected, nothing more. You may not like it, but at least you have that transparency.

Several Members said we haven't passed national park legislation in several years, and that is true. There is some pending, and obviously we hope to have that done by the end. But this point needs to be made, too. The National Park Service, by their own admission, has over a $10 billion backlog in maintenance. Shouldn't we, as the keeper of the taxpayers' purse, look at that and say before we rush on some of this, let's make sure that we can afford to maintain whatever is going to be ensuing next.

Finally, let me make an observation about my colleague from California, from Mendocino County, Mr. HUFFMAN. He was saying that his community was very in favor of that monument designation that is going to happen, I guess, later on this year.

□ 1545

I don't think the gentleman, however, mentioned that that precise piece of legislation, which was H.R. 1411, passed this House on a voice vote. In other words, there is no need to make a monument designation for that because this House had determined that it was the right thing to do.

The problem is the Senate hasn't moved on that piece of legislation; so, on the one hand, they say we haven't passed legislation, and when we do, the President steps in and, I think, overstates his authority on the Antiquities Act.

I am sorry. Before I close, I did have another speaker. I apologize to my friend. If the gentleman wants to take more time, I will give him more time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Washington for yielding and for bringing this bill forward.

We are seeing an abuse of the Antiquities Act where you have got a President using this law to shut off more areas of Federal land to things like energy exploration. That is not what this law was intended to do.

In fact, I think, if you look at the reforms that are included in this law, they are very good and responsible in ensuring that a President still has the ability to designate monuments where appropriate, one in each State for a Presidential term.

If there is some monument that warrants being designated a national monument, that opportunity is still there. You just have to come and talk to Congress.

I know this President has a hard time working with Congress, but we are right here. He talks about he has got a pen and a phone. Pick up the phone, Mr. President.

You can call us, and if it makes sense, we are going to work with you to get it done; but don't abuse the Antiquities Act to go and cordon off Federal land, so that we can't explore for energy and for other great resource needs.

I think it is important that we finally put the brakes on this Presidential land grab that we are seeing.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to, again, make the point there of my colleague from California (Mr. HUFFMAN). He had a bill that passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

There is no need for the President to go through this. All you have to do is pass the legislation which, by the way, had a hearing and was marked up properly in our committee.

This piece of legislation, I think, is a good piece of legislation. I think it corrects abuses that have happened by the way of Presidents in both parties over the years.

I ask my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1459.

Exactly one year ago yesterday, the President designated 970 acres of land in my district as the San Juan National Monument. This designation came after years of grassroots work and outreach to create a consensus plan to protect these critically important areas.

It came only because Congress failed to act on that consensus. I know, because I tried to get Congress to act and it didn't happen.

In both the 112th and 113th Congress, I introduced legislation that would have protected these lands in a nearly identical way to the National Monument designation. Unfortunately, those bills stalled because of ideological opposition to conservation.

In the part of the country I represent, people know that conservation isn't just good for the environment, it's good for business. The San Juans and the water around them are home to diverse wildlife from the Island Marble Butterfly to the Southern Resident Killer Whales.

Because of that diversity, they are an economic engine for Northwest Washington that attracts thousands of tourists each year. Every year, fishermen, hunters, tourists, boaters, hikers, snowboarders, and tourists spend millions throughout my state. They come for the natural beauty and abundant outdoor activities we have to offer.

If we do not protect those resources, we lose that business. For many rural areas, outdoor recreation is the driver of the economy.

Unfortunately, this Congress has handcuffed itself when it comes to protecting public lands. And this legislation would handcuff the President and prevent him from providing that protection. I suppose the idea is that the President should follow our bad example. I disagree with that.

Instead of stopping the President from doing his job, we should start doing ours.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1459

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 ''Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act''.

SEC. 2. NEPA APPLICABILITY TO NATIONAL MONUMENT DECLARATIONS.

Section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431; commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906'') is amended—

(1) by striking ''That the President'' and inserting the following:

''(a) That the President'';

(2) by striking ''discretion, to declare'' and inserting ''discretion, subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), to declare'';

(3) by inserting before the final period the following ''. No more than one declaration shall be made in a State during any presidential four-year term of office without an express Act of Congress''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) A declaration under this section shall—

''(1) not include private property without the informed written consent of the owner of the private property affected by the declaration;

''(2) be considered a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), if it affects more than 5,000 acres;

''(3) be categorically excluded under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and expire three years after the date of the declaration (unless specifically designated as a monument by Federal law), if it affects 5,000 acres or less; and

''(4) be followed by a feasibility study that includes an estimate of the costs associated with managing the monument in perpetuity, including any loss of Federal and State revenue, which shall be submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and made available on the website of the Department of the Interior not later than one year after the date of the declaration.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–385. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–385.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 6, strike ''if it affects more than 5,000 acres;'' and insert ''except if it affects 5,000 acres or less, in which case—

''(A) the declaration shall be categorically excluded from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

''(B) the declaration shall expire three years after the date of the declaration; and

''(C) the declaration may become permanent if—

''(i) specifically designated as a monument by Federal statute; or

''(ii) the President follows the review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; and

Page 4, strike lines 8 through 13.

Page 4, line 14, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(3)''.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.

This Act shall not be construed to increase the amount of funds that are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment tries to clarify the process for monument designations of 5,000 acres or less, providing that they can become permanent if the President follows the regular NEPA public involvement process.

There was a question on the clarity of the language in the underlying bill that is there.

It also ensures that new taxpayer dollars are spent by requiring the use of existing funds to conduct any study or analysis that is in the bill or may be added by an amendment.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

I think his amendment adds to this legislation, and I support his amendment.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, we are not really sure what this amendment is trying to achieve. If the underlying goal of the bill is to make sure that every national monument designation goes through a NEPA process or is approved by Congress, this amendment makes things more confusing.

The amendment states that all monuments established through the use of the Antiquities Act shall expire after 3 years. It goes on to say that they may become permanent if the President follows the review process under NEPA.

Does this mean the President could declare the designation a categorical exclusion? If so, what is the point of the amendment? Does that mean the administration has to file an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement? Can they just issue a finding of no significant impact?

Again, the amendment does nothing to fix or clarify the underlying bill. I oppose the legislation and the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, just to respond one more time, the purpose of this is to make sure that it was

very clear on those emergency situations that were 5,000 or less. If, indeed, the President uses the NEPA process, that 3-year clock does not tick on all those parcels of property. Anything that he does NEPA process, that is okay.

It was not clear in the underlying bill. This attempts to make it clear.

With that, I encourage adoption of the managers' amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BARBER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–385.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 17, after ''revenue,'' insert ''and the benefits associated with managing the monument in perpetuity, including jobs created and tourism dollars associated with managing the monument,''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act.

Under this bill, national monument declarations must include a feasibility study that assesses the costs to the Federal Government to manage the monument in perpetuity. However, costs of managing the monument are only one side of the equation.

As all Arizonans know well, national monuments, like Chiricahua and the Casa Grande Ruins, also bring significant benefits, such as tourism dollars, that create jobs and stimulate local economies. These benefits are real.

Travel and tourism is a major economic driver in Arizona, bringing in millions of dollars to the part of the State that I represent—southern Arizona—and billions of dollars in direct spending statewide.

The same is true for national monuments all across the country. Communities near national monuments would testify to the economic benefits of their national monuments.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. This amendment says that, in addition to assessing the costs associated with managing a monument, we should also look at the many benefits that result from the establishment of a national monument.

Doing so will ensure that Congress and the American people have a thorough and complete picture of how a monument will impact local communities.

This is a commonsense amendment that will not add additional costs to the bill.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think what the Barber amendment does is reemphasize the fundamental purpose of this bill, which is to ensure there is transparent public participation and input in making these types of designations.

I appreciate the addition he has made as to what should be studied and what should be encompassed. I think it an addition to the bill. I think it is a good amendment. I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–385.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any use of section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431; commonly known of as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906'') the purpose of which is the protection or conservation of historic or cultural resources related to American military history.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill presented before us today is problematic for many reasons, as my Democratic colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee have very clearly outlined on the floor this afternoon.

The Antiquities Act has served our country for well over 100 years and has been used by 16 Presidents to designate over 140 national monuments, many of them protecting American military heritage.

To date, Presidents and Congress have designated 22 military sites as national monuments. One of the many unintended consequences of this legislation is that it would prevent the President from protecting important military cultural and historical sites under the Antiquities Act.

As someone who grew up on military bases both across the country and overseas, I know firsthand the tremendous sacrifices that our servicemembers and their families make on behalf of our Nation.

My father was a survivor of the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument is just one example of a monument that was designated by Presidential authority under the Antiquities Act.

My amendment preserves the ability of the President to declare as national monuments those that provide for the ''protection or conservation of historic or cultural resources related to American military history,'' regardless of their size.

I urge adoption of this amendment to maintain the President's ability to honor our military and military families and fix one small piece of this misguided legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim opposition to the misguided amendment to the well-proportioned bill that is under there.

I appreciate what the gentlelady from Massachusetts is trying to do. I am an old history teacher, so these sites are important to me.

But as well-intended as this amendment may indeed be, it still undermines the intent of the legislation, which is to make sure that any designation that is at large has public transparency, and you allow the local people to do it, whether it is a military site or not.

This would create a very large loophole that is unnecessary because the provisions of the bill provide for that. If something is smaller than 5,000 and in immediate jeopardy, it can be handled.

If it is larger than that and goes through the NEPA process, it is handled. There is no problem that could develop from this particular piece of legislation.

I might also add that, in the Antiquities Act, any harm to anything that is an antiquity of element on a public property already is subject to fine and imprisonment.

This amendment was attempted in committee—I appreciate the sentiment—but it was also defeated in committee by a vote of 24–13. It is the same amendment here.

I would urge my colleagues to also defeat it, simply because it undermines the very purpose of this bill, and it does not lead to the public process.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his remarks, but I respectfully disagree.

As we know, yet again to reiterate, the Antiquities Act has served our

country well for over 100 years, has been used by Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, to designate over 150 national monuments.

It was created to allow swift action to conserve high priority public lands when Congress is unable to act. It was not the intention of the Antiquities Act to let Congress dictate which national monuments the President can and cannot create.

We have heard from our colleagues from Delaware and New Mexico the robust public input around designating the Antiquities Act. Presidential actions taken under the Antiquities Act are, like all other Presidential actions, exempt from the NEPA process.

It would be a radical departure from long practice to subject Presidential action to NEPA. A significant change like this should not be considered on the fly in a manager's amendment without prior debate in the House.

□ 1600

Again, the underlying intent of this amendment was to protect military monuments. I respectfully disagree with my colleague across the aisle.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–385 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 223, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—197

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

NOES—223

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

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei
Campbell
Cárdenas
Courtney
DelBene
Duckworth
Frankel (FL)
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Schwartz

□ 1628

Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin and LAMALFA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, HANNA, and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 524, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

□ 1630

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1459 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROVIDING A WAGE INCREASE FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS.

This Act shall not take effect until the hourly wage for the lowest 10th percentile of workers for all occupational codes reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics under the Occupational Employment Statistics survey is no less than $10.10 an hour.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If the amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is quite simple. It raises the minimum wage to $10.10. My amendment assures that, in America, if you work hard, you will not be forced to live in poverty.

In this era of stagnant and falling wages, of a widening gap in inequality between the haves and the have-nots, we must ensure that the promise of the American Dream remains a reality for all Americans, not just the wealthiest among us. We can't just say it. We have to act to make it possible.

Today, the minimum wage is 22 percent below its peak level in the 1960s. It has not increased since July 2009, when it reached $7.25 per hour. It has not been raised in five long years.

It has not increased since the near bottom of the Great Recession, when working Americans were walloped by the greed and reckless behavior of the privileged and the elite on Wall Street.

We like to think that, if you work hard, if you earn calloused hands, you can rise to the heights of success in America. The reality is that, by not raising the minimum wage, we are condoning—we are endorsing a pay cut for the very hardworking Americans that we speak about in such glowing terms whenever we talk about working our way—working your way up the ladder. Such doublespeak makes a mockery of the American Dream.

This is the House of the people, not the House of the 1 percent. Ours is a government of, for, and by the people and not a government of, for, and by the billionaires, at least not yet. Heaven help us.

As Representatives of the people, we have a constitutional obligation to look after the interests of all of our citizens, but more fundamentally, we have a moral obligation to ensure that opportunity is available to all and not reserved only for the most well-to-do among us.

Each and every year, minimum wage workers face a pay cut as inflation eats away at their earnings. Each and every year, this House, the people's House, sits inactive. It sits silent. It sits shamefully moot.

As the House of the people, we have a moral obligation to do what we can to help boost the paychecks of hardworking Americans. There should be outrage. There should be contempt for our inactivity on this issue.

I am talking about the 3.6 million American workers whose salaries are at or below the current minimum wage, more than three-quarters of whom are adults, nearly two-thirds of whom are female, more than one-third of whom are full-time workers, and nearly three-quarters of whom have graduated from high school.

These are real people—real people, Mr. Speaker, husbands, wives, fathers, mothers. Every day, they must make hard choices to provide for their families. Every day, they look to this body, this House of Representatives, the House of the people, they look to us for help; and every day, this body has nothing to say, nothing new to offer.

Introduced in 1938, the minimum wage has been increased 22 times, by both Republican and Democratic Congresses. It was even raised in the hyperpartisan Congress of the Gingrich impeachment era twice—twice; but it has not been raised in this Congress, nor the last. That is more than shameful. It is immoral.

In running against the do-nothing Republican-controlled House of Representatives in 1948, Harry Truman spoke of the gluttons of privilege, of cold men, of cunning men who were curiously deaf to the voice of the people, but who also were curiously able to hear even the slightest whisper from Big Business.

Here is a case where the government must be an advocate for the people and for the working men and women of this Nation and for the forgotten man, as another great President once said, those at the bottom of the economic pyramid upon which everything else is built.

Vague promises of hope are not sufficient. Economic excuses are not enough. We must act, and we must act now, and we can. Vote for this amendment to increase the minimum wage for the working men and women of this country.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am still having a difficult time trying to grasp the concept that my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, would be opposed to such a brilliant bill in its current form in the first place; but with that, I appreciate his efforts and his concept dealing with this MTR.

I just want to remind of you of one element. If you pass this motion, you don't raise the minimum wage, and you don't bring about any of the consequences CBO or other organizations talked about, that concept.

All this amendment does is delay the bill. It doesn't raise anything. It simply delays the bill.

This bill, the underlying bill, tries to take an act that is 108 years old and modernize it, so that the American people are given the right to be heard before the President takes his pen and signs his name to a piece of paper and a proclamation.

This bill simply says let Americans have the chance to talk about this before the President acts, like every other element of government has to do.

With that, I urge your rejection of this MTR. I urge you to favorably vote for passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1459, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 227, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

AYES—193

Barber	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barrow (GA)	Bonamici	Capps
Bass	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Cárdenas
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Carney
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Carson (IN)
Bishop (NY)	Bustos	Cartwright

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

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra
Campbell
DelBene
Graves (GA)
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Olson
Roe (TN)
Schwartz

□ 1647

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 201, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

AYES—222

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

NOES—201

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
DelBene
Duncan (SC)
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Schwartz

□ 1656

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147, I missed the vote on final passage of H.R. 1459, the Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. I supported this bill in the Natural Resources Committee and would have voted in favor of it on final passage. Unfortunately business on the Senate side of the Capitol prevented me from voting before the rollcall ended. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). 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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during a vote on H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act, on Lowenthal amendment No. 1. If I had been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

In addition, Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, I was unavoidably detained with my constituents in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted a resounding ''yes,'' for this legislation will bring much-needed relief to our constituents on the gulf coast.

□ 1700

CONGRATULATING THE PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY NITANNY LION FENCING TEAM FOR WINNING 13TH NATIONAL TITLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pennsylvania State University Nitanny Lion Fencing Team. On Sunday, the team won their 13th NCAA championship which took place in Columbus, Ohio. Beating out the second-place Princeton University team, which totaled 159 bout victories, the Nitanny Lions completed the competition with 180 bout victories.

On the individual level, Kaito Streets, a sophomore, claimed the men's sabre NCAA championship, becoming the 13th individual champion for the team. As a result of this title win, Penn State fencing is now the winningest fencing program in the NCAA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my praise to these student athletes, along with head coach Wes Glon, for their hard work and determination. The University and the Happy Valley community are extremely proud of your efforts, and we congratulate you on another amazing season.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 27th observance of the National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month and to add my respect and understanding that developmental disabilities may be visible or invisible and range from physical impairment that involves vision or mobility to those conditions that affect cognitive functions related to how the brain processes information and how someone learns. I am also actively involved in the Dyslexia Caucus in efforts to shine the light on dyslexia.

Developmental disabilities, which include autism, deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other developmental delays, have increased, requiring more health and education services.

I want to reemphasize the need for access to education services but also to work. It is not a respect of age. Sometimes it comes because of accident or of illness that people can become disabled, but they are still deserving of the opportunity to work, and they also deserve the opportunity to access the various assets that this country has.

It is important that we focus on language, focus on mobility, and we provide the resources necessary. My salute to those who are supporting the improvement of access for those suffering from developmental disabilities or experiencing it. We look forward to working together.

HONORING VEDNITA CARTER, CNN HERO

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly remarkable woman and my guest at this year's State of the Union address, Vednita Carter.

Vednita was recently recognized as a 2014 CNN Hero for her work combating sex trafficking and is truly deserving of this recognition. Her organization, Breaking Free, provides food, clothing, and support for women who are victims of sex trafficking to help them escape from their tragic situations. Breaking Free has helped over 6,000 women leave sex slavery.

Studies have shown, Mr. Speaker, that women who are trafficked often come from difficult home situations and are vulnerable to exploitation. For many of these victims, Vednita is the first person to reach out and try to help them.

With over 100,000 children estimated to be involved in the sex trade in the United States, Vednita's efforts should serve as a guide to how we can combat this trafficking problem on a wider scale.

Congratulations, Vednita Carter, and thank you for positively impacting so many exploited women's lives and for inspiring so many others.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WORKDAY INITIATIVE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the women who have shaped our Nation's history and those women who continue to make a difference in our communities. Women entrepreneurs are the fastest growing sector in the small business community.

This month, I launched a new initiative to help better understand the challenges that constituents face in their jobs and daily lives by spending the day working as a baking assistant at Del Norte Bakery, a successful women-owned-and-operated Hispanic business in Dallas.

As I rolled up my sleeves and I made pan dulce and other baked goods alongside owners and sisters Carolina Lopez and Gloria De Lira, I gained invaluable

insight on some of the challenges small minority-owned and women-owned businesses face and what I can do as a Member of Congress to help.

I also hope that by sharing their story, I can inspire other women to realize their dreams of running their own businesses. Let us all continue to work together to ensure that all women enjoy equal opportunity, because when women succeed, America succeeds.

COMMEMORATING THE OCCASION OF MR. HOUSTON WAGGONER'S 93RD BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to commemorate Mr. Houston Waggoner on the occasion of his 93rd birthday, which he and his loved ones celebrated, fishing, on March the 17th.

Mr. Waggoner is a proud World War II Navy veteran who has lived the American Dream. As a father of eight children, he worked for 30 years before retiring as a bag plant manager and starting his own small business, Chatham Automotive Parts and Supply, in 1972.

After owning his own business for 18 years, he retired for a second time in 1990. He now resides in Jackson Parish and enjoys hunting, fishing, and involvement with The National World War II Museum in New Orleans, where he is a member.

Mr. Waggoner exemplifies a strong character of leadership and dedication. As his family and friends continue to celebrate and honor him, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mr. Waggoner a very happy 93rd birthday.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY'S ANNIVERSARY MARCH 26, 2014

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding institution of higher education in Illinois. Southern Illinois University School of Law celebrates its 40th anniversary this month.

We spend our time here on the House floor discussing, debating, and voting on laws which impact American citizens while the faculty and staff of SIU Law develop the next generation of great legal minds.

With humble beginnings in 1973, that first year began with 90 students and eight faculty members. SIU Law today is a nationally recognized institution with alumni practicing in 49 States and 11 countries.

The school's 3,800 graduates include military general officers, over 90 State and Federal judges, and at least one United States Congressman.

Please join me in congratulating my alma mater, Southern Illinois University School of Law, for 40 years of serving students.

Go Dawgs.

SUPREME COURT COMMENTS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I went over and heard the audio as the argument before the Supreme Court was taking place. It was shocking to hear a Supreme Court Justice ask Paul Clement why his client didn't just pay the tax and then they could have their religious ideas and religious beliefs. Of course, he called it a penalty, as the statute called it.

She said: Well, the legislation called it a tax. She didn't even know that the majority opinion said on page 15 that it is a penalty because Congress called it a penalty. Forty pages later, the majority called it a tax so they could uphold it.

Outrageous. Pay your religion tax, and then you can have your religious beliefs in America. Where is it going to stop if we don't stop it now?

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for a vote on comprehensive immigration reform. We have bipartisan legislation that has the support of the American people and the votes needed to pass the House.

Our system has been broken for far too long. In my own district, there are heart-wrenching stories of families who came here for a chance at the American Dream only to have been torn apart and separated.

Not only is comprehensive immigration reform morally right, it is the right thing to do for our economy. Also, the Congressional Budget Office this week found that passing H.R. 15 would reduce the deficit by $900 billion over the next two decades. The economic benefits are clear.

Now is the time to pass a fair immigration plan which provides a pathway to citizenship, reunites families, and helps grow our economy. The Senate passed immigration reform last year. Now the House must act. We have the votes. Let's do it now.

OBAMACARE HAS BEEN A FAILURE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, so here we go again. Yet another change, another modification in ObamaCare, another deadline extended. I don't understand it. If there was such a clamor for socialized medicine, why aren't people standing in droves to sign up for ObamaCare?

I can tell you why. Because it has not decreased their premium, it has not increased their quality, and it has not increased access to health care. ObamaCare has been a failure.

We need to replace it with market-driven, patient-centered health care where the doctor and the patient are in charge of health care. We need to have health care that gives consumers options and health savings accounts so that they have more choices and they can pocket whatever savings they create. We need to allow consumers to buy health care across State lines so that there will be more competition. We need to allow small businesses to band together so that they can get the economies of scale that large businesses get. And we need to push back on frivolous lawsuits so that doctors aren't practicing defensive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, these are things we can do that will make health care increase in quality and go down in price.

NATIONAL JAZZ PRESERVATION, EDUCATION AND PROMULGATION ACT OF 2014

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I am introducing a Jazz Appreciation Month piece of legislation entitled the ''National Jazz Preservation, Education and Promulgation Act of 2014.''

In 1986, I introduced a bill in which simply sought to make a compelling statement about the importance of Jazz within American culture. Its final clause read:

> Now, therefore be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that jazz is hereby designated as a rare and valuable national American treasure to which we should devote our attention, support and resources to make certain it is preserved, understood and promulgated.

The jazz community came together in strong support of that legislation, and through many phone calls and letters generated enough cosponsorships to get House Concurrent Resolution 57 passed by the U.S. House of Representatives on September 23, 1987. The fact that the 23rd was John Coltrane's birthday made the accomplishment even more special for me and was able to secure approval of the bill by the U.S. Senate a little more than two months later, on December 4, 1987.

During my work on that bill, which has come to be known as the ''Jazz Resolution,'' I saw it inspire successful jazz-related political activity at the local governmental level in New York City, in Philadelphia and in Washington, DC. While each of these legislative victories were a milestone for the music, with each making profound statements about the importance of jazz in those communities, none of them directed financial resources toward its support.

So, a couple of years later, I began working through the Congressional appropriations process to do just that.

In the Fall of 1990, I secured funding for the creation of the Smithsonian Jazz Masterworks Orchestra. I was able to obtain additional funds for the Smithsonian's Jazz program on three subsequent occasions. The result has been the solidification of a comprehensive Jazz program that involves preservation, education and performance. I chose to focus my efforts on the Smithsonian Institution because it serves as the nation's treasure chest. It is where all things American that are historic and valued are kept. I wanted Jazz to have an appropriate and permanent place at the Smithsonian. It has that now.

I want to express my special thanks to Dr. John Hasse, the Smithsonian's Curator of American Music, for his leadership and strong support for Jazz. I also want to congratulate him on establishing Jazz Appreciation Month (JAM). Today, is the kick-off of the 13th JAM, which has grown to become a global celebration of Jazz as America's classical music. I am pleased that John Coltrane, one of our nation's greatest musibians and composers, was selected to be the focus of the 2014 JAM poster and today's JAM activities. The ''Acknowledgement'' of his recording ''A Love Supreme'' 50 years ago in December 1964 is a great way to honor John Coltrane. The fact that his original score of that iconic composition is a part of the Smithsonian's collections and is on display there today is much appreciated.

Jazz is now well over 100 years old. Scores of many remarkable compositions, artifacts, documents, and photographs are in private hands, at risk of getting damaged, lost, or being sold abroad. In addition, jazz education at the elementary and secondary school level is virtually impossible to find. As such, in order to ensure the continued prominence of Jazz as a part America's cultural heritage, I have just introduced H.R. 4280, the National Jazz Preservation, Education, and Promulgation Act of 2014. This legislation would enable the further implementation the mandate established in H. Con. Res. 57. It will help our nation preserve its jazz heritage, educate our youth about this national treasure, and encourage the promulgation of jazz by fostering opportunities for jazz artists to create and share their music with the public here and abroad.

H.R. 4280 would authorize funding to establish a National Jazz Preservation Program at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History. The Program would create oral and video histories of leading jazz artists, acquire, preserve and interpret artifacts, and conduct exhibitions and other educational activities that would enable generations of Americans to learn about and enjoy jazz. The Program would also work with local museums, educational institutions and community organizations to establish jazz collections and share artifacts between them.

In addition, the legislation promotes jazz education in several ways. It encourages the introduction of jazz to our youth by authorizing funding to establish a Jazz Artists in the Schools Program. This program should be modeled on the successful one previously operated by the National Endowment for the Arts. It also authorizes funding for the development of jazz education curriculum and materials and their dissemination to educators at all levels. The bill authorizes funding for a Jazz Ambassadors Program. This program should be modeled on the historic one that the U.S. State Department launched back in 1956. That program sent noted American jazz musicians abroad to perform. My bill would enable young jazz musicians and jazz ensembles from secondary schools to be sent abroad on missions of goodwill, education, and cultural exchange.

Finally, HR 4280 promotes the promulgation of jazz by authorizing funding to support a nationwide series of performances by jazz artists. This would be done through the establishment of a Jazz Appreciation Program at the Smithsonian Institution. This program would work through the network of Smithsonian Affiliates to host jazz concerts. The Affiliates network includes more than 180 museums, educational and cultural organizations in more than 40 states, Puerto Rico and Panama.

I encourage all of you to take a look at and consider supporting H.R. 4280. I also encourage you to share a copy of it with others that have an interest in America's jazz music.

□ 1715

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see the President sign H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act. This bill is an important first step in addressing affordability in the national flood insurance program, but we have a long way to go to put solvency back into the system.

We are working hard not only through the appropriations process, but also with leadership and other Members in coastal districts whose constituents have been victims of the rate increases brought about by Biggert-Waters. H.R. 3370 has some great provisions, including: removal of the dreaded ''sales trigger'' that would have devastated the housing and real estate markets in Florida and other states. Perhaps most importantly, we were able to reassure FEMA of the importance of the affordability study.

Mr. Speaker, the next step is to find new ways to stabilize NFIP and make flood insurance more affordable for homeowners and small businesses. I will continue working with my colleagues in Florida and across the country to put some stability back in this important system.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS DISCUSSES FRACKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and we are here today to talk about the issue of fracturing, also known as fracking, and the need to have more regulation on fracking to protect our environment, our groundwater, our air, and the families who live around the over half-million wells that are across the country, and also talk a little bit about global warming.

The Progressive Caucus has been at the forefront of talking about issues that are important to our environment. We have so much to do to stop the effects of global warming that are happening. Climate change is real. It is one of the greatest threats that we have to our country and to our planet. There are increasing CO_2 levels in our atmosphere, and if we continue to leave that unchecked, they carry very dire consequences for the future of the planet.

Rising sea levels, unpredictable and dangerous weather patterns, and drought are all examples of the consequences of failing to take action to address this threat. For generations, those who have come before us have held the ideal that they should leave their descendants with a better life. This is an integral part of our American story.

I joined the Safe Climate Caucus because I believe in leaving a safer environment for future generations of Americans. Stewardship of our environment, of the air we breathe and the water we drink, is essential to this commitment.

That is why I am here today to voice my support for commonsense legislation that will end unnecessary exemptions that protect the oil and gas industry from basic regulations and instead extend protections for our families and communities in all areas that effect global warming. But specifically tonight, we want to talk a little bit about fracturing.

I would like to first yield to a colleague, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a great poet. I think we are going to be entertained and informed through that entertainment.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. This is just a little short ditty because I am very concerned as a person who lives in an inner city environment, I have become intensely aware of how environmental injustice affects the health and safety of our communities.

So I just wanted to talk a little bit about fracking this evening.

As we frack, under intense pressure, we force a fissure through the delicate veins of our unbound Earth and a black hole forms, poisoning the valley and streams of our spirit.

Man, don't you fear it? Wrecking the ecosystem and trekking recklessly over pristine black loam.

Man, don't you hear it? The harsh acid rain as it drains into the vital marsh of our existence.

Oh, but, of course, the coarse priority of wealth strips our Earth's fertility and reservoir of life. Fracked and cracked, lost, perhaps for all eternity.

Alas, it is true, there is none so blind as he who will not see.

Mr. POCAN. I thank Representative MOORE for that. Your poetry is always much appreciated not only on this floor, but also in our State of Wisconsin. Thank you for sharing today.

Before I get to fracking, I want to talk about one part of global warming that recently got a little attention back home but serves as a debate when we talk on the floor of Congress. When I spoke before on the floor of Congress about the need to address global warming, one of the things I said, and this is about 6 weeks ago, was that in Wisconsin, ice fishermen are already noticing fewer days they can be out on our ice-covered lakes.

Now, the conservative right in Wisconsin, they decided to have a field day. There was a shock jock in Milwaukee who decided to play up on this. He said, can you imagine in Wisconsin, where this winter we had days that were minus 22 degrees, real temperature, minus 40 and 50 degrees with wind chill, how can we possibly be talking about fewer days of ice coverage. Based on that cold experience, clearly there is no global warming. Now I know that is not a scientist's statement, that is a shock jock, but they went with it and let it roll.

Here is the reality. We are a planet that is warming. And that statement, despite the polar vortex that we experienced in Wisconsin and other parts of the country that gave us some really cold weather, that is exactly what we are talking about, these intense swings in the weather that can produce that.

What was so interesting was when the conservative movement went so hard to say clearly there is no global warming—they are all climate change deniers that were out doing this attack—they decided to approach a group called PolitiFact. Now PolitiFact often takes things that politicians say and decides where the truth is. Sometimes it is in a TV commercial, sometimes it is in a speech. Specifically, they were asked to address that statement that I made, which was, ice fishermen are already noticing fewer days they can be out on our ice-covered lakes.

Here is what they said. First of all, they rated that statement as true, and here is why. They said it is not just about this winter; it is about what has happened over all in winters in Wisconsin. There is a site called climatewisconsin.org that is done by a number of professors and other professionals in the field in Wisconsin. They have been tracking ice coverage on the lakes in Madison, Lake Mendota, and Lake Monona, going back 150 years. And you know what they found?

Overall, the average number of days of ice cover on the Madison lakes has decreased by around 29 to 35 days over the past 150 years.

Not my words; these are scientists with knowledge, people who work specifically in the field who are measuring our lakes. So when people talk about climate change and they want to deny the facts, the science, that over 95 percent of scientists who work in this field clearly have said we have a climate that is changing because we have global warming because of human activity, well, this is just one example where a simple 1-minute speech on the floor talking about climate change became a shock jock's material for weeks to talk about why doesn't Congressman POCAN come home and see the weather.

Well, I get home every chance I can. Every single weekend, I am home in Wisconsin. When we are not here, I am in Wisconsin. Trust me, I would prefer to spend my time in the district talking to the people of the district that I represent. I get back there.

Yes, we had cold days. But to determine everything based on a few cold days, that is not science, that is just rhetoric. And that is exactly what PolitiFact found. That their charges were rhetoric, and we are seeing a serious climate change. And when you actually test 150 years of ice coverage in the State of Wisconsin, we now have 29 to 35 fewer days because of global warming.

So before we start talking about fracturing, I wanted to put that out there because it is all a part of why we are talking about this subject today.

At this point, I would yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. Congressman POCAN has been just a beacon, a voice for working Americans all over the country. Our States are next to each other, and we share a lot. I am honored to be here with you today.

We are going to talk about fracking, but I just want to set the stage for the conversation. You know, we are in the United States House of Representatives and we have had stagnant wages for 40 years, yet we can't see a way, a bill to raise the minimum wage on the House floor.

We see that unemployment insurance has been stalled since December 28, 2013. Mr. POCAN has made this point abundantly clear, and over 2 million people are now without that unemployment insurance support, and yet we still see no action on the House floor here.

We see our infrastructure crumbling across the United States. In Minnesota, we saw our I–35 bridge fall into the Mississippi River. We have seen water mains break and problems with grids, and yet we see no action here on the House floor.

We all thought we were going to get some action on immigration reform. In fact, even the Speaker, to his credit, said I have some principles out there, let's talk about how we move forward. The Senate already has moved forward. Yet no sooner than the Speaker said he had some principles he wanted to start working on did he come back and say he can't trust Obama so we can't have an immigration bill.

It is outrageous how little substantive work we have done on this floor of the House of Representatives: no to immigration reform; no to unemployment insurance; no to raising the minimum wage; and no to all these key things that Americans really, really need. What is the idea here? What is the idea when we won't do anything other than politically charged bills to sort of make a point? I mean, what is that all about?

Well, today we are going to talk a little bit about fracking, but I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: When are we going to get to some real work around here? We cannot be in this House of Representatives with a responsibility to discharge the duties of the American people, and we are completely unresponsive under this Republican leadership to what the American people want. People are unemployed. People need a raise. People need a better life, and we are not doing anything to help.

In fact, the only time we ever care about NEPA, which is environmental review, is if it is going to block monuments that the President may want to decide to establish. Every other time, it is a ''job-killing regulation.'' It is total lingo, total rhetoric, and it is just really a shame. I am getting to the point, Mr. Speaker, and I want to yield back to the gentleman so we can begin talking about fracking, but it is really getting frustrating.

We know we are here with different political points of view. I am a proud, progressive liberal, absolutely. Just like Hubert H. Humphrey, LBJ, Martin Luther King, I admired them all, and I am not apologizing to anybody for being as progressive liberal as I am. But that doesn't stop me from talking to a conservative Republican as long as we are both trying to solve the problem. But they are not trying to solve anything.

I am happy to talk to Republicans with their conservative views. We will haggle it out, and we will meet somewhere in the middle. It will not be everything I want, and it will not do everything they want, but we will do something.

Where are we at? No immigration, nothing. Where are we at with UI, people are suffering, 2 million strong? Nowhere. Where are we at on raising the minimum wage, which has been sliding as inflation goes up, and we have lower minimum wage than we did since the 1950s when you adjust it for inflation? Nothing. We are just not meeting the needs of the American people.

We have tried to repeal ObamaCare—I even hate that phrasing—the Affordable Care Act, 53 times. This is an outrage.

We shut down the government for 16 days for the one purpose of stopping people getting access to health care, and yet it feels like we are in ''Star Wars,'' Mr. Speaker.

I just had to share those views and just share my thoughts that it is time, high time, for us to get to work, to

stop this party of no business, to stop this obstructionism and bring our values, different though they are, to this debate and come up with something to meet the needs of the American people.

I thank the gentleman for letting me share my views on those matters.

□ 1730

Mr. POCAN. Thank you very much, Mr. ELLISON. I share your concern. I came to Congress as a new Member, thinking that we are going to get some important work done for the country.

I remember, in history class, I believe it was the Congress of 1948 that got so little done that they were dubbed the do-nothing Congress—well, because they did nothing, right? So they get the label. That do-nothing Congress passed 350 bills. That is it.

Our Congress last year passed 62 bills.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. If we were the do-nothing Congress of the 1940s, that would be more activity than we have right now. We are the do-nothing Congress. We are the do-nothing Congress. Our goal is to improve the lives of Americans. I would be surprised if it was even half of the 60 that we actually did pass.

It is hard to get a label, gentlemen, to what you would call worse than the do-nothing Congress. I don't know what the label would be to establish to us. It has been a highly unproductive Congress.

What was interesting, at the end of January, I got on the elevator with a Republican who I won't name, and I said: We have been here for two weeks again, and we haven't done anything.

The response I got is: Don't worry. It will get better in 3 or 4 years.

I don't know about you, gentleman, but I didn't come to Congress to wait 3 or 4 years. We have real work to do.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Mr. POCAN. Whether it be the fact that we have discharge petitions now on rasing the minimum wage, so that people can be lifted out of poverty who are working hard every single day, playing by the rules, and just trying to get by; by extending unemployment benefits to the millions of people in the country who have lost those extended benefits—including a gentleman from Mount Horeb, Wisconsin, who was my guest right here in this Chamber for the State of the Union.

He was my guest. He had lost his benefits at the end of December. He was a steamfitter, worked hard all of his life, played by the rules, and because of not extending the emergency benefits, they are in dire financial straits.

His wife wrote me an email. This is how we found out about them. Their daughter wanted to bring a friend over for dinner, and they said: I don't know if we can afford another plate at the table.

They have their home up for sale because they don't want to be foreclosed on. This is the reality of Congress not acting.

Today, we now have a discharge petition on immigration reform, something that will effect millions and millions of people across this country. This Congress is not acting.

What we are going to talk about in just a little bit are 5 bills that effect fracking—fracturing—to make sure that everyone can have cleaner air, cleaner water and that people can actually know what toxins are going in the ground when so many people live so close to these wells across the country.

There is more of an agenda that the Progressive Caucus is working on and that we are trying to put out there. Again, I think, gentlemen, we would be remiss if we didn't talk about, just very briefly, the Progressive Caucus' budget, the better-off budget, to make sure people are better actually investing in infrastructure, to actually invest in research and development, to actually invest in education, and to get people back to work now.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentleman would yield about the better-off budget?

All I want to say about the better-off budget is that it is going make Americans better off. That is what the better-off budget does.

The better-off budget toplines 8.8 million jobs—8.8 million jobs—in 3 years. That is what we do by making infrastructures in education and infrastructure, putting people back to work, making sure that public employees, teachers, police officers, people like that, stay on the job. This is what the better-off budget does.

Now, the Republicans are going to come in here with a budget, and they are going to brag about how much deficit reduction it does. We have already been reducing the deficit significantly, by the way; but they are going to talk about what they have cut.

They are going say: oh, we cut food stamps, we cut Head Start, we cut medical research, we cut research on Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, and things like that. They are going to brag about how many people they have left behind.

I think that the real thing is that, as we invested 8.8 million jobs, our better-off budget actually has deficit reductions to a tune of about $4 trillion in 10 years because, as people are working, they are paying taxes, and we are growing ourselves out of the debt and deficit picture.

That is why even some conservative groups have said that this is a good budget because we are being responsible about the debt, not because we are pointing straight at it, but because we are pointing straight at putting people back to work, people are working, people are paying taxes, and we are dealing with our fiscal picture. So the better-off budget is definitely worth people reading about. It is an awesome budget.

A few things I just want to mention about the better-off budget, and then we can talk about it another time. We also require in our budget that the amount of money going to our spy agencies, our intelligence agencies, the topline be revealed, not the nuts and bolts and the guts of it, but just in these days of NSA spying and things like that, I think it is important to have budget accountability, so that people really know.

This is something that we hope people will really look at and feel that Congress is actually exercising its proper role in doing oversight with this.

The other thing is there was a huge fight over chained CPI. This is that form of CPI, this measure of inflation, which literally cut benefits for people who are older Americans, people who are on disability benefits, and people who are on survivor benefits. It cuts their benefit over time.

CPI-E, another measure of inflation that actually enhances retirement benefit because it really reflects the real cost associated with making a living in the United States, so we put CPI-E in our budget, which we believe is a far better measure of what is really going on in days of retirement insecurity brought about because of decisions of the Republican Caucus.

It is important that we really invest in making sure that we have some retirement security.

So those are just a few lines on the better-off budget, but I do want to thank you for raising it.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON, for all your leadership and your cochairing the Progressive Caucus.

One other thing that is in that budget, in addition to growing us out of the economic problems we have had in this country that we have slowly been rebounding out of, we also take away the subsidies to oil and gas companies, which save this country money that we can invest in creating jobs, but also deals directly with the issue at hand, which is the issue of fracking.

What is fracking? It is hydraulic fracturing, or it is called fracking. Is a process of drilling by injecting a fluid, which is a chemical water-sand mix, into the ground, at a very high pressure, in order to fracture shale rocks to release natural gas inside. That is the basic concept behind fracking. There are about a half a million active natural gas wells in the United States right now.

Here is what is involved in the process that I think people don't really realize: Every single gas well requires an average of 400 tanker trucks to carry water and supplies to the site. It takes 1 to 8 million gallons of water to complete each fracturing job.

To run all the active wells in the U.S., that would be 72 trillion—trillion with a t-r—trillion gallons of water and 360 billion gallons of chemicals that are used in this process. The water is brought in, it is mixed with sand in a chemical mix to create a fracturing fluid.

Now, one of the things I think that people don't realize is we don't know what is in that fracturing fluid because the companies say that it is proprietary. If they gave up that information, it is a secret sauce that they put together that allows them to do this; and if they disclose that, somehow, a competitor could find out what it is.

The problem is that also means you and I don't know what those toxic chemicals are. We have an idea, in some cases, what is used, but the exact mix, you don't know in any specific well.

So you have 40,000 gallons of chemicals used per fracturing, with up to 600 chemicals in any fracking fluid, which has known carcinogens and toxins. This fracking fluid has been pressure injected into the ground through a drilled pipeline about 10,000 feet deep.

The mixture reaches the end of the well, where the high pressure causes the nearby shale rock to crack, creating fissures where the natural gas can flow into the wells. Only about 30 or 50 percent of the fracturing fluid is ever recovered. The rest of the toxic mix is left in the ground, and it is not biodegradable.

Also, during this process, methane gas and toxic chemicals leach out of the system and contaminate our nearby groundwater. Methane concentrations are 17 times higher in drinking water wells near fracturing sites than normal wells.

You may remember—I believe Time magazine had it, and I have seen it on TV—where people in Pennsylvania, in some cases, near wells, have turned on their drinking water and a match and lit the drinking water on fire from what has been released into the groundwater from fracking wells.

This contaminated well water is then used for drinking water, like I explained, in these nearby communities, and there have been over a thousand documented cases of water contamination next to areas of gas drilling, as well as cases of sensory, respiratory, and neurological damage due to ingested contaminated water.

In the end, the hydraulic fracking produces about 300,000 barrels of natural gas a day, but the price is numerous environmental, safety, and health hazards that we have to deal with.

I yield time to Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Certainly. I think it is really important for the gentleman to bring us to this conversation about fracking today. It is a lot of courage that you bring to this debate as well.

The interests that are really promoting fracking are powerful, wealthy, energy companies; and opposing them, you know, is something that, I believe, is something that not everybody would do. I think raising real questions about how this is affecting the health and the environment are critical.

I had the occasion of talking with a number of people in my office who came and told me really amazing stories about what their experiences with fracking were. One gentleman actually told me a story about the lighting of the fire coming out of the faucet in the sink.

Another told me a story about how his cows drank the water that was contaminated with the fracking fluid, and those cows died. Another individual told me how, when they made complaints about it, there was just a lack of responsiveness.

These are folks who—before they came to my office, I didn't know them—but they wanted to talk to me about a problem of common concern, so I said: Sure. Share with me what you know.

What they shared with me caused me to do my own research. I was particularly disturbed by the fact that the process, particularly the fluid that is used, is not something that we can know. I think you are talking about injecting a fluid into the ground that is causing the natural gas to come up, and yet, it has proprietary protections.

Now, how can we safeguard the public interest if we don't even know what is in that stuff? If nothing in there is harmful, why don't they want to share what is in that stuff?

At the end of day, there are stories of regular citizens, cropping up all over this country, about dead farm animals, toxic drinking water, fire coming out of the water faucet, and all sorts of things. It has happened to people who thought that they could lead a good life, trying to farm, trying to live in rural America, and yet, the answers just are not coming for them.

I remain very concerned. I believe that we do have a public interest in knowing much more about this process. A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, we were sort of sold that natural gas would be the answer to get off petroleum, but what we didn't know is all the health hazards that were involved with trying to make that conversion.

It is absolutely essential that we, as the American people, get to the bottom of the health risks associated with all of the ingredients of fracking. These same folks who came to my office, Mr. Speaker, made complaints about skin irritation, nasal irritation, eye problems, chronic issues; they talk about farm animals and other sorts of issues that they have lost. It is just something that I think is crying out for real answers.

If Congress does not stand up and say, look, we have got to figure out what the environmental health impacts on fracking are on our citizens, then who is now going to?

Europe has already asked some tough questions about how fracking works. Europe has already said: Well, wait a minute. We need to know a little bit more about this.

In some places, the practice has been banned. I really believe that this is an appalling situation, calling out for answers, and it is our public duty to get those answers.

I appreciate the time to talk about my exposure, my discussions with people who have experienced fracking firsthand.

I also need to mention one other thing that I forgot. One gentleman talked about the frequency of earthquakes near the fracking area. When he tried to figure out and when he asked questions about, well, is the fracking causing the earthquakes because, before you were fracking, there were no earthquakes, he really was stonewalled and didn't get any answers.

It makes sense—you are doing something to disrupt the ground, you are shooting a substance into the ground causing these sort of issues, like tremors in the Earth; and then this farmer who talked to me could not get any answers and could not get much responsiveness.

Again, this is something I remain concerned about and look forward to people Facebooking, Tweeting, and writing regular old emails and snail mails telling their stories about what they are going through, so that we can make a case. The true, real investigation needs to take place, and we can actually look out for the public interest.

□ 1745

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON.

It is not just members of the Progressive Caucus, Democrats, or concerned citizens who live near these wells who are talking about this. There actually was a recent investigation that was done by The Weather Channel, the Center for Public Integrity, and InsideClimate News that found numerous violations on current sites.

At one, they found, for example, that the State of Texas, that they know ''almost nothing'' about the pollution that one of these shale drilling wells causes. They said that thousands of Texas oil and gas facilities are allowed to self-audit their emissions, meaning they don't have to report them to the State. They go on to talk about pollution complaints. They also said in another study in the U.K. and Pennsylvania that they looked at multiple data sets of wells in Pennsylvania to determine the rate of well failures, and they found that one-third of a data set of 3,500 wells were reported for environmental violations between 2008 and 2011.

So, while we have special exemptions in clean water and in clean air laws for this process, we are finding severe violations by groups like The Weather Channel—hardly someone who is biased—who actually look at these facilities. Then when you actually look at the list of chemicals, at some of the known 600 chemicals that go into these mixes, and when you look at the actual effects—the colors—that are on here, you have got chemicals that lead to skin, eye, and sensory organ problems, problems with respiratory, in gastrointestinal, in the brain and nervous systems, the immune systems, with the kidney, cardiovascular and blood, with carcinogens, mutagens, developmental,

reproductive, and endocrine disrupters. These are the types of effects that can happen from the chemicals that we are not even allowed to know that are happening.

I think one of the most telling parts of this is that 15.3 million people in this country live within a mile of one of these wells that have been drilled since the year 2000. That is more than the entire State of Michigan. These are people who live near a well who don't have the public information that they need to know for their families' safety.

Members of this caucus, the Progressive Caucus, have worked on five bills that have been kind of called the ''frac pack,'' which address specific concerns that we have on the regulation of this. We are not saying that you are going to stop this completely, but we should know what we are doing, not proceed until you know what you are doing and make sure we provide the clean air, the clean water and the notification requirements so that we actually know what we are doing before we proceed. I would like to go over those bills if I could. I would like to just give you a little idea of some of the bills that are out there.

One bill by Representative DIANA DEGETTE, from the State of Colorado, is called the FRAC Act. That bill would close the so-called ''Halliburton loophole.'' That loophole protects the special sauce recipe of chemicals that they use for this fracturing process. It also protects the companies that drill for natural gas from disclosing those chemicals involved in the fracking operations, which would normally be required by our clean water laws that we have at the Federal level. It has three major provisions:

One, it repeals the exemptions granted to oil, gas, and geothermal fracking operations under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Let's make sure our water is safe as the Safe Drinking Water Act says;

Second, it would make sure that all fracking operations would be required to disclose to the State as well as the public the fracking chemical cocktail intended for use prior to the commencement of any operations—not after your water is set on fire, not after your cows are sick, not after your family has problems, but prior to the use of those chemicals;

Finally, if a medical emergency should arise, any fracking operation would be required to disclose the exact chemical formula of any compounds utilized.

It is a pretty basic set of ideas that would make sure that you have at least information to know.

There are four other bills.

Another bill that is part of the frac pack is the BREATHE Act, introduced by Representative CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania and Representative POLIS from Colorado. It would close the loopholes of the Clean Air Act that currently exempt the oil and gas industry from essential protections from toxic air pollution, as those studies have been proven from the wells they tested in Pennsylvania. The bill would also require that toxic emissions of multiple related smelt sources be aggregated to determine total emissions, just like other industries have to, so they are not exempted in other ways, and it makes sure, with all fracking operations that release pollutants, including benzene, that we have protections in these areas.

Another bill is the CLEANER Act, which has been introduced, again, by Representative CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania and Representative JARED HUFFMAN from California. This bill would specifically protect the environment and the public health by closing a loophole in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which currently prevents adequate, consistent regulation of harmful waste associated with oil and natural gas production and, particularly, with fracking, and it has a few other compounds specifically related to that.

The next bill is the FRESHER Act, introduced, again, by Representative CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania. This would close the loophole in the Clean Water Act, and it would require oil and gas producers to obtain the standard permits necessary for activities that increase storm water runoff and risk water pollution. Treat them like everybody else so that we know what is going on in the process. It also makes oil and gas companies play by the exact same rules that apply to other industries, and it conducts a basic study to further make sure that we understand what they are using.

The final bill that is part of the frac pack is a bill called the SHARED Act, introduced by JAN SCHAKOWSKY from the State of Illinois. This bill would provide further protection for public health by requiring water testing before fracking begins, and it would help document any drinking water contamination within a mile's radius of a site operation.

Now, none of these are crazy ideas, saying we are absolutely closing down every operation because we don't like it. It is saying let's make sure they follow the law like any other industry would follow the law when it comes to our clean water and our clean air and that we know what toxic compounds are being put into the groundwater since we know so much of it is left there, especially when you live nearby, like 15.3 million Americans do. Those are simple bills that we have put out there that we are hoping this body will take up, because it is important that we provide those safeguards for the people across the country.

Mr. ELLISON. I do appreciate the gentleman for going over all of those bills, which, I think, will bring about transparency, accountability, disclosure—all things that are just basic fairness issues.

In the United States, we pride ourselves on having due process and fairness and accountability, and I think every one of those bills has a lot of merit and should be carefully considered because they will allow Americans to make decisions about whether this practice of hydraulic fracking is something that we need to just continue to let happen as it happens now.

There is an idea in economics, which is, if you make the money, you need to pay the cost, right? If you are going to internalize the profits, you should internalize the costs of what you are doing. If you are going to make a lemonade stand, then you should buy the lemons; you should get the water; you should put in whatever sweetener you have; you should clean up after yourself after you make the lemonade; and you should deal with problems that you cause in the sale of your lemonade. Yet, when it comes to fracking, the profits are absolutely internalized, but the cost is forced on everyone else.

How is that good, free market economics to say that we are going to keep the money we make by getting this natural gas but that we are not going to clean up after ourselves and that we are not going to tell everybody what we are doing even though it affects them?

I mean, there is just something very unfair about the way fracking is being done right now. So I think that this set of bills, the frac pack, and this Special Order are really important.

Again, I really urge people, Mr. Speaker, to let their voices be heard because we were told that this is the clean energy future—fracking, natural gas—that it is much cleaner than petroleum. It is. Natural gas is cleaner. It is still a fossil fuel, though, and there are still social and economic and environmental and health costs as a result of the way we get this natural gas.

Unfortunately, I do have to go to another meeting, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are other ways to power our world. Let us have a real conversation about investing in renewable energy, in zero waste, in living in societies that have more transit options, that are more walkable so we use less, that we make our buildings much more fuel efficient.

One of the sad days in Washington was when President Ronald Reagan took down the solar panels that Jimmy Carter had put up on the White House. That was too bad. That was unfortunate that that decision was made. Think about if, in the seventies, we had been moving aggressively into renewables. Think about the world we would live in if we truly had recycling, composting, reuse. Right now, according to the scientists, we have put so much CO_2 up into the atmosphere that we are changing the climate. So who knows if the action that we take now will be enough. We had better take that action. We dare not avoid taking that action. I just think to myself that these things like fracking are not the only answer. Oil and gas exploration is not the only answer. There are other

things we can do to power our world, and I absolutely urge us to do it.

I just want to wrap up by saying, too, that, when we think about what we are going to use our tax dollars to subsidize, we are subsidizing the fossil fuel industry. BERNIE SANDERS and I worked on a bill called the End Polluter Welfare Act. We have documented up to about $110 billion worth of subsidies to the oil and gas industry, which is six times the subsidy that goes to renewable energy sources—solar, wind. It is high time we started investing in the wind and in the Sun and in the wave technology and in other forms of technology that can help us power our world that don't have these ugly, costly, expensive externalities.

I would ask the gentleman to excuse me now, but thank you for hosting this very important Special Order on raising questions around fracking.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Representative ELLISON, for all of the work you do with the Progressive Caucus.

This was a Special Order hour tonight to talk about why we need to have safer practices around hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, in this country. For the 15.3 million people who live within a mile of the wells, for everyone who has to eventually suffer the effects of the environment and the health pollutants that are put out by this, there are bills that are introduced in this body that can make sure that we regulate this better, that can make sure they are not exempt from clean air and clean water protections, and that disclose the toxins that are used so that we can make sure that this process is safer, healthier, and better for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add as a reminder to everyone, which is also important, that March 31 is the deadline for signing up for the Affordable Care Act. There are extensions. If you have tried to do it and if you can't get it done, there is a little bit of an extension at this time, but you need to do it by March 31. I think we have got some of my colleagues who are going to be talking about that in just a little bit, but I would like to encourage everyone to take advantage of that while they have time in the remaining week.

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to talk about the Affordable Care Act, about some of its milestones and the benefits to the people of the United States, also about some of the critiques that have come up over the last few years and in the last few months.

The Affordable Care Act has succeeded in doing a few things. The United States, for a long time, has been the wealthiest nation on Earth; however, millions and millions of Americans, despite our country's wealth, have been unable to get health care insurance. Many folks have suffered a very long time, either themselves or their family members, in not being able to see a doctor when they have needed to and in being kicked off of insurance because they have hit lifetime caps. College students have gone without insurance for years because they could no longer stay on their parents' plans.

There was, I know, a discussion earlier on the floor—I think during the lunch hour—and there was a question raised by one of the Republican Members. Essentially, his question was: What has the Affordable Care Act done?

□ 1800

Well, there are several concrete things that it has done for the United States. The first is that 3 million students have been able to stay on their parents' insurance plans, where they otherwise would have been kicked off before. The average age where students were kicked off before was about 19. Under the Affordable Care Act, millions of college students can now stay on until the age of 26.

We know this number—5 million people, so far, and growing—have signed up for health care through the exchanges. Five million people. That is very significant. That number continues to grow, as some of the busiest days for the health care Web site and for the call-in number have been over the last few weeks.

Also, 4.4 million Americans have signed up for health care through Medicaid. They have been covered through Medicaid expansion.

We can talk about the fact that some States have decided not to expand Medicaid. So millions of these people, including in my home State of Texas, low-income Americans, most of these people going to work every day, working hard to support themselves and their family members who are still low-income Americans, but because the State governments have not expanded Medicaid in many States, they have not been able to get covered. So we are going to talk about that.

Another issue I want to talk a little bit about is something that is very significant for millions and millions of Americans, and that is mental health parity with physical health.

For years, we tried in State legislatures—I know I tried in Texas, as well as people across the United States—to make sure that mental health issues are covered by insurance in the same way that you would cover a broken arm or broken leg or even cancer. Millions of Americans suffer from anxiety, depression, and a slew of mental health issues. Previously, they were unable to get covered.

So those are some of the issues that we are going to talk about this evening.

I now yield to my good friend Congressman, GENE GREEN from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. First of all, I thank my colleague from San Antonio. We are both Texans, and we know the problems. You served a lot of years in the State legislature. I did, too. Frankly, I think a lot of our problems could have been dealt with if Texas would have expanded Medicaid. We are actually giving back money to the Federal Government and not covering children and families in our community because of that.

Frankly, even with the problems with the rollout of the Affordable Care Act, I know some States have done a great job, like Kentucky and California. Some States haven't. But I would think that if Texas did their own exchange, we could be the ones making those decisions, I think particularly with the Medicaid expansion.

I appreciate you asking for the Special Order tonight because we are coming down up to the deadline of March 31. In fact, I have to do a commercial first.

A lot of us have done these events on how people can sign up for the Affordable Care Act. I have one that we are sponsoring this Saturday at the Harris County Department of Education building. It is at 6300 Irvington Boulevard in our district. I am partnering with some of your former colleagues: State Representative Armando Walle; State Representative Jessica Farrar; our relatively new State senator, Sylvia Garcia; and our city council member, Ed Gonzalez. We are doing that this Saturday from 9 to 1 so people can come in and sign up.

The success, though, is that the Web site was down for 2 months, but we have seen a huge number of people signing up—5 million as of last week. I hear on Monday of this week they had 1 million contacts, both by phone and to the Web site.

So there is a need out there for the Affordable Care Act. It is landmark health care reform.

I was on the subcommittee and the Committee of Energy and Commerce to help draft part of it. We did days and nights of drafting amendments. We had both bipartisan amendments adopted, including one on mental health that Congressman MURPHY from Pennsylvania and I had worked out to expand mental health coverage.

Of course, we live in a bicameral Congress and sometimes the Senate doesn't always do what we would like

to do on the House side. That is the nature of it. But the Affordable Care Act is expanding health care access.

You mentioned some of the successes that we have. I know as a State legislator I would have loved to have a State law that required insurance companies to pay 80 percent of their premiums they received back as benefits. I don't know of any State that does that. I would have loved to have that in Texas.

Somebody who pays an insurance premium, whether it is employer health care or an individual health policy, they can be guaranteed that 80 percent of their premium will come back in benefits. That is what the Federal law is.

We hear our Republican colleagues say they still haven't come up to an alternative to the Affordable Care Act—because they can't.

That is one of the successes in there, and there are a lot of successes. In fact, some of that law is actually Republican ideas that have been built up over the last 20 or 30 years, saying, How can we cover the uninsured in our country?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. That is right.

Congressman, once upon a time, these were the ideas of the Heritage Foundation. This was a conservative movement, conservative ideas, about how folks would take individual responsibility. Because, as you know, being in Harris County, our large hospitals systems end up with millions of dollars in uncompensated care every year.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Our Harris County Hospital district is our catchment. But not all counties in the State of Texas have that option to have a hospital district.

Even in our area, I have a district that is one of the highest in the country of people who work who don't get insurance through their employer. That is why the Affordable Care Act is important. In our district, we have an estimated 261,000 people who would have the opportunity to get health care through the Affordable Care Act. And we are hoping to sign them up. We started in November, and we have had these workshops literally all over our district, in partnership with lots of different groups.

The Affordable Care Act is particularly important in our districts because we have one of the highest rates in the country of people who are uninsured. It is essential people know that the financial assistance is available under the Affordable Care Act that can lower their health care costs. In fact, nearly 6 of the 10 uninsured people will find that they can find health coverage for $100 or less a month.

Like I said, this Saturday we are having a forum. This forum is a great opportunity for people to come and actually learn about health care options, because health care insurance is important.

After World War II, our country made a decision. The countries we rebuilt in Western Europe had government-run insurance. Canada has government-run insurance. Our country decided to go with employer-based insurance. And that worked well up until about 10 or 12 years ago, where we started seeing employers drop that coverage.

At one time in our country, 80 percent of the people who worked had insurance through their employer. Now it is below 60 percent, and it is getting worse. Although with the Affordable Care Act, we are actually seeing increases. Because even a small business can be eligible for subsidies to cover their employees under the Affordable Care Act.

Like I said, as a member the Energy and Commerce Committee, I am proud of us passing something. It is not perfect, but it is a step in the right direction. I would hope that this Congress and maybe a future Congress can say, Okay, let's see what is wrong with the Affordable Care Act. It is just like we had to go back and fix Medicare on a number of occasions.

Nobody wants to abolish Medicare. It is one of the greatest pieces of legislation that we have ever passed. I would hope that over the years we would not only build on the Affordable Care Act to make people—just like with Medicare—know that they don't have to worry about putting their families in bankruptcy because they have an illness. The Affordable Care Act will help us on the road to protect that.

I appreciate your leadership tonight on this. I know I have a colleague from California from my class who is up next. I thank you for your time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman.

A few things that you pointed out that I think are especially noteworthy. The first is that there is no perfect bill that we pass here. And especially, the larger the bill is, the more you are going to have to come back and change it and tweak it. That is what you have seen with the Affordable Care Act. So there is no surprise that we are going to have to have some changes to it. Quite frankly, there have been some changes in deadlines. There have been some other changes. Americans rightly ask, Well, why is the President or the administration doing that?

Well, it is very simple. Last year, for example, Congress passed the least amount of legislation of any year on record. The President is taking action to improve the law because the Congress will not or cannot. Somebody has got to be doing something here in Washington. Unfortunately, in the House of Representatives, we have hit a standstill. So the administration is making sure and listening to Americans and making the changes that are necessary.

No bill is ever going to be perfect. Social Security was deeply criticized when it was enacted. For several years, Medicare was deeply criticized when it was enacted.

So this is no surprise. Americans in previous generations have seen this before, have lived through this before, and this program has been a successful one. It will be even more successful as we go forward, and we will continue to talk a bit about some of the benefits to millions of Americans.

Before I yield to my colleague from California, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, I want to point out that there are a few ways people can get information and sign up. We have been talking a lot about the Web site and asking people to go online, but there is also the traditional method.

We have the online Web site at healthcare.gov, of course. Also, by mail. You can download an application and send it in by mail. You can go in person here. You can also call by phone at 1–800–318–2596. I know there has been a lot of emphasis on the Web site, but you can also enroll by these traditional methods. That means a lot to a lot of folks in different communities.

I was at an enrollment fair on Saturday, and there was a woman who looked to be somewhere between 55 and 60. Quite honestly, she was a bit baffled by having to get on the computer, even thought she was being assisted, and she asked, Is there another way I can do it where I don't have to use a computer? The answer to that is yes, there are traditional methods.

With that, I want to yield to Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD from the wonderful city of Los Angeles.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing tonight's Special Order on the Affordable Care Act, which is helping to make health care a reality for millions of Americans across our Nation.

Luckily, California is one of the States that has a plan. It has bought into the Affordable Care Act. As a result, thousands of California are now benefiting from what we in California call Covered California, which is the ACA plan there.

By enrolling in the Affordable Care Act, parents and their children no longer have to endure illnesses or painful injuries because they can't afford a doctor. Parent don't have to worry about their children getting a preventable illness because they can't afford to have them vaccinated or treated for a chronic preventable disease.

Why? Because under the ACA, many immunizations and preventative services are free.

Seniors and adults are also eligible for free preventive services, including annual checkups, annual mammograms, prostate cancer screenings, and immunizations. Young adults, including 435,000 young Californians, don't have to worry about being a burden on their family if they get sick or are in an accident because they can remain on their parents' insurance until age 26, and get affordable insurance after that.

Also critical is the fact that under the Affordable Care Act, no one can be

denied health care coverage because of a preexisting condition.

The ACA is a wonderful opportunity, as you have pointed out, for uninsured Americans to get the health care that they need to improve the quality of life for themselves and for that of their family. And I would like to just give one example of that.

A constituent of mine from the city of Bell by the name of Roberto Rivas is in his mid-twenties. On December 21, 2013, he arrived at 6 a.m. to enroll in a health insurance plan before going to work at KFC, where he is not offered any health insurance. He is also a full-time student at Trade Tech studying chemistry. He would like to use his education to study proteins and to research viruses such as hepatitis and other infectious diseases.

Until the age of 21, along with his 10-year-old sister, he was covered by his mother under Medi-Cal. When he turned 21, he was no longer eligible for Medi-Cal. He lost that insurance and was left completely without any health insurance whatsoever.

Shortly after, he began suffering from breathing problems. He went to a doctor and found out that he had pneumonia. Later, after being treated for that pneumonia, he received a medical bill for $4,663. He had no insurance to cover that. He even asked for charity care services to help cover his expenses, but was denied that request.

Robert said:

> As a minimum wage worker and a full-time student, it is hard to get health insurance.

Thanks to ObamaCare:

> Now I can go to school and not stress about getting sick and ending up in the hospital.
>
> I'm calling everybody in my family to tell them I'm enrolled in health care and that they need to come out and get covered, too.

□ 1815

Robert Rivas was also astounded by the service, the friendly faces, and the applause he received when he enrolled; and he says:

> To know so many people actually care about me getting health insurance is great.

This is just one example of the millions of Americans who are benefitting from what we call ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act.

I am hoping that more Californians who have not applied, and Americans across the country who are uninsured and can benefit greatly by enrolling in health care, that they don't miss out.

There are only 5 days left until the enrollment deadline of March 31. I hope that, today, they will visit healthcare.gov or use any services which you have already outlined to enroll in the Affordable Care Act for themselves and for their families.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congresswoman. And what a powerful story that you have told. I am glad to hear that California has done such an incredible job in making health care available to its constituents and to its residents. Thank you.

I would also point out, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD mentioned something that is very significant because Republicans have tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act now—I think it is about 51 times—50, 51 times.

We make no bones about it. There are a lot of Americans—a decent number of Americans who agree with that argument, who say repeal it; but let's understand, if your argument is repeal it, then understand exactly what you are repealing.

First, there is no plan that has been offered by the other side—no alternative. Also, if you repeal it, what you are saying now is you are going to, again, allow insurance companies to kick off cancer patients because they hit a lifetime limit, send them out of the hospital, send them home.

You are not going to allow recent college graduates to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26 years old.

Remember, health care problems and big hospital bills, for years now, have been the number one reason for personal bankruptcies. People would run out of insurance money.

They would have to take out all of their savings from their bank accounts to pay their hospital bills; and then, they could no longer make their mortgage payment, their car payment. They couldn't help their kids go to college. They essentially became broke.

If you are talking about repealing the Affordable Care Act, then you have to accept and be upfront about the kind of future that you are inviting, which is a travel back to the past.

I have been surprised in my time here that Republicans have tried to repeal this law 51 times, and what is more surprising is that there is no alternative plan to the Affordable Care Act.

That is why, in the surveys, you see over 60 percent of Americans that say: Yeah, I may have an issue with it. I didn't like the way the Web site was done. I disagree with some parts of it, but I don't want it repealed. I want it improved.

Unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle, the strategy has not been to improve this thing and work with us to make it better. Like I said, any big law—any big law—whether it is about health care or mortgages or financial services or anything, any big law is going to require some tweaks and some changes.

So I hope that they will listen to the voice of Americans and take a different tack.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank my good friend from San Antonio, Texas.

Congressman CASTRO, you are absolutely right. To go back away from the Affordable Care Act means to go back to the old system, and the old system is not the good old days.

When we are looking at families who are fortunate to even have insurance, their insurance is going up seven to 17 percent, year over year over year. That is unsustainable.

People's income does not go up that high, that fast. People's opportunity to find other ways to find that money somewhere else in their budget doesn't go up that fast, so those were not the good old days. Actually, the best days are yet to come.

What we have seen 52 times here is an opportunity—or a tried opportunity to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, and by calling it by another name doesn't make it bad.

Yes, the rollout could have happened better, but the bottom line is the good days are yet to come. They are here now. The past are not the good old days.

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak. I think it is important for us to understand that what we are talking about here is high quality affordable health care, which is something that was denied and out of reach for so many seniors and families in my district in the San Fernando Valley and across the country.

One in three people in my district were uninsured, but Covered California is giving those people the opportunity to purchase affordable plans that will give them the care they need when they get sick and the preventative services they will need to stay healthy.

While the rollout of the Affordable Care Act hasn't been perfect, Covered California has been very successful in providing a simple, straightforward way to enroll.

I feel really bad for those States where their State legislatures and their Republican Representatives have denied them the opportunity to experience good affordable health care. I hope that they can catch up.

Last week, Covered California announced that they had enrolled over 1 million people through the State-run exchange. That is in California alone. Their critical work has helped hundreds of thousands of California families, seniors, small businesses to gain access to high quality affordable health care that was once denied to them for too long.

My staff and I have been working alongside Covered California to help enroll residents in the San Fernando Valley. Over the last few months, I have been hosting a series of successful enrollment workshops for the Affordable Care Act; and as a matter of fact, we will reach 30 events by this weekend.

This is where families learn about the options available to them under the new health care law, including learning about insurance policies that can be purchased through the Covered California health insurance exchange, which has been successful in getting folks enrolled.

More than 500 families have taken advantage of these workshops just in my district alone.

Wow. Can you imagine, Congressman CASTRO, if every single one of the 435 Congressional Members rolled up their sleeves and helped people get enrolled?

That would be millions upon millions of more American families that would be enrolled in affordable health care.

In the last week before the deadline, every Representative should take this opportunity to do the same job that we have been able to do in my district. We must help families sign up for the Affordable Health Care Act.

The day will come very soon when the truth will overcome the lies that have scared so many people. Billions of dollars have been spent scaring people away from trying to even enroll in the Affordable Care Act.

Let me give you an example. I have met with parents who have come to workshops to sign up, and they have anxiety and fear in their eyes; but thank God, just moments later, their fears go away when they find out that they now have affordable, reliable health care.

People with mild asthma that were once denied health care can no longer be discriminated against. They are no longer denied health care, and they can breathe easy knowing that they can now see a doctor, and they can actually get the medicines that they need just to breathe.

I met with a gentleman who was sitting there with his wife and his daughter, the sole income earner for that family. I don't know how he does it, but with $9 an hour, he manages to feed a family of three; and he was worried that he couldn't afford maybe $30, $40, $50 a month.

When the person turned the computer around and showed him what his eligibility was, he almost came to tears, realizing that, once and for all, himself, his wife, and his teenage daughter can now have health care.

I will tell you what. This is serious business. America, it is time that you sign up for affordable health care. Just try it. Don't worry; be happy.

Sign up for the insurance that you deserve.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS. Thank you for all of your work.

You also raise a great point, which is folks will often see the sticker price of the insurance on the exchanges.

By the way, I, as well as many other Members of Congress, bought our insurance off of the exchanges. We were getting asked that question a lot. You know, are you going to buy ObamaCare?

The answer is yes. I bought my insurance off the exchanges, and I saved money.

Folks should make sure that they also check, besides the sticker price, what kind of subsidy they get because it is meant to make insurance affordable for middle class Americans and others.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Thank you very much, Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO.

Muchas gracias, al congresista JOAQUIN CASTRO.

Thank you so much for calling us together to talk about this critically important issue for our families.

Twenty years ago, when I was running the New Mexico Department on Aging, I remember an incredibly tragic call from a family of a 60-year-old woman who had fallen and broken her hip. She was in a hospital in Albuquerque.

Now, of course, hospitals are required to provide stabilizing emergency treatment and even surgery if that is required in that instance; but unfortunately, this 60-year-old woman didn't have insurance, and she was rolled out of the hospital in a wheelchair without the required surgery for her hip fracture.

If the Affordable Care Act was in place when this happened, this 60-year-old woman could have simply provided her health insurance card to someone at the hospital, and the hospital would have stabilized her hip, performed the surgery, and then provided follow-up rehabilitation care. This would allow this woman to walk again.

The required stabilization is critical for successful recovery of that particular hip injury, and the long-term consequences of not receiving the care, in addition to the pain and suffering of this woman, are significant. Quite frankly, she would never have walked again without that surgery.

Now, thankfully, in her case, the whole community came together to gather enough money to pay for her treatment; but if this were to happen today, she could have already purchased subsidized insurance in the health insurance marketplace or qualified for Medicaid, and she would have been able to receive treatment without the scare and the subsequent fundraising by her family in that instance.

People across the country face situations like this every single day. That is why it is critical that we tell our friends and neighbors that they only have 5 days left to enroll in health insurance through the marketplace—5 days. There is absolutely no time to waste.

Like many of my colleagues, I have been working with groups in my district and have been participating in enrollment events to help provide information and to assist New Mexicans to enroll.

Two of my constituents, Mark and Elizabeth Horst from Albuquerque, signed up for bronze plans through the exchange last fall. They make $24,000 a year between them and have qualified for $612 in subsidies, which covers the cost of the bronze plan.

Thousands more New Mexicans are still eligible. New Mexico had the third highest uninsured of any State before the Affordable Care Act went into effect this year. In the Hispanic community, more than 25 percent are uninsured, and more than that are underinsured.

Today, more than 360,000 in New Mexico are still eligible for enrollment. By enrolling in a plan, you don't have to risk injury or a lifetime of debt. You can get your family covered; and, by having access to primary care, your family can stay healthier longer.

I appreciate my colleague's effort today. I thank you very much.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congresswoman.

We only have a few minutes left, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I would just like to thank you for the work that you are doing on this, and I believe our real message is to the many people out there—some of whom may even think that this law has been repealed. They have tried so many times.

As you pointed out a little earlier, this is an opportunity that is there for the next 5 days. Get beyond all the political chatter. Turn to a group like the American Cancer Society or the American Diabetes Association. Look at the information that is there.

Then go to one of the many enrollment fairs we are having across San Antonio this weekend. There is one up in Austin that is going to go almost 24 hours straight. These are opportunities to get out and do this.

I know you had a very successful enrollment fair in San Antonio. I had one over at Progreso Hall. Our colleague, PETE GALLEGO, had one out at Palo Alto. These have been opportunities for a wide range of our neighbors to come out and participate. We just want to encourage them to do more.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman DOGGETT, and thank you for your work when this bill was being worked on and drafted. Thank you for helping to pass it and, since then, passionately making sure that people get on to the ACA.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think, if we keep working together, we can find ways to strengthen and improve this, but the main thing is for our families to get out there now.

I think, increasingly, most folks are realizing, as you pointed out, with so many efforts to repeal, that the only alternative that they offer is ''Nothing Care.''

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. DELBENE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in the district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4275. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5079. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-014, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5080. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-167, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5081. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-001, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5082. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-010, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5083. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-004, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-171, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-178, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5086. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-136, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5087. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter of determination and certification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the status of Data Mining Activities, pursuant to Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act, Section 804; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5089. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2013 through November 30, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5090. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Draft Fiscal Years 2014 — 2018 Strategic Plan [NRC-2013-0230] received March 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5091. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mansfield, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0842; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-27] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5092. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Macon, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0552; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASO-14] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5093. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Philip, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0916; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-30] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5094. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hamilton, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0593; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-22] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5095. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0174; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-10] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5096. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lawrenceville, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0590; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-20] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5097. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hampton, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0585; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ACE-7] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5098. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; St. Joseph, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0917; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ACE-16] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5099. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; St. Paul, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0954; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-35] received March 14, 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. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours; with an amendment (Rept. 113–386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 88. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 113—387). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 92. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Gurard and Pipe Band Exhibition (Rept. 113–388). 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. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure critical to the defense of the United States against cybersecurity, physical, and other threats and vulnerabilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4300. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to support non-Federal investments in water infrastructure improvements in the Sacramento Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 4301. A bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4302. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to extend Medicare payments to

physicians and other provisions of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 4303. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within U.S. Customs and Border Protection, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. SCALISE (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 4304. A bill to make certain repeals and revisions to Federal labor laws, to decrease the regulatory burdens on small businesses, to provide for comprehensive energy reform, and to amend the securities laws to streamline access to capital; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Small Business, Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Rules, Financial Services, Agriculture, and 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health assessment before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4306. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and for prevailing rate employees by 3.3 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 4307. A bill to authorize the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 4308. A bill to prohibit Federal interference with the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4309. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to make certain improvements to the administration of cooperative agreements for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4310. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue implementing regulations for drug testing under State unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act to include American Samoa in the employment services provided under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4312. A bill to establish an advisory committee to issue nonbinding government-wide guidelines on making public information available on the Internet, to require publicly available Government information held by the executive branch to be made available on the Internet, to express the sense of Congress that publicly available information held by the legislative and judicial branches should be available on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 4313. A bill to ensure fairness in premium rates for coverage for business properties and second homes under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a student loan repayment program for totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. BASS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 525. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states. . .''

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 4300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 4301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 4303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 4304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Additionally, Article I, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be made law; and therefore it implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

Furthermore, Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution grants Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4305.

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 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States of America, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 4307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 4308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4310.

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 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 4311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Labor Regulation

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nation, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The legislature power vested in Congress by Article I of the Constitution to conduct oversight of executive agencies, and the ''Necessary and Proper'' clause found in Article I, section 8, c1.18.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 4314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 75: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 104: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 139: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 141: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 142: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 155: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 171: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 279: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 285: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 385: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 440: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 460: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 494: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 532: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 543: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 597: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 630: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 647: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 702: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 713: Mr. KEATING, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 721: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 784: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 792: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 822: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 831: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 851: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 863: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 924: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 958: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1008: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1020: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1074: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1094: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1129: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 1141: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1148: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1201: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1263: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1318: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1339: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1386: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1429: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1518: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1566: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1593: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 1616: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1620: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1635: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1692: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1750: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1751: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1761: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1771: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1795: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1806: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1812: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1830: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1832: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1852: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1877: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1878: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1923: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2084: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2093: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2098: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2203: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2278: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2291: Reed, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2366: Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2387: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2424: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2499: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2502: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2536: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2548: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2560: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2607: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2672: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 2707: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2791: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2807: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2825: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2841: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2847: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2939: Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2957: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3116: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3138: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3179: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3306: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3331: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3335: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3344: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 3377: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3395: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3461: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3470: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3490: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. LOBIONDO
H.R. 3505: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 3516: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3529: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3530: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3544: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3583: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MENG, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3601: Mr. JONES and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3602: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3673: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3676: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3708: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3710: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3724: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3726: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3852: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3876: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3877: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3930: Mr. POCAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 3978: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3983: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3992: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 3996: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 4008: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4031: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4049: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4060: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4079: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4098: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4103: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4122: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4128: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4135: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4139: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4143: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4149: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4155: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4156: Mr. ENYART, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JONES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4158: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4190: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4217: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4221: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4225: Mr. LONG, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 4232: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4254: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4255: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4265: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 4278: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4285: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4286: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 26: Mr. SANFORD.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BARBER.
H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 19: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 30: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LANCE.
H. Res. 116: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 356: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H. Res. 365: Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 476: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 477: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 480: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 494: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. COOK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. PETRI.