United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2014 No. 91

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 12, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Ronnie Floyd, Cross Church, Springdale, Arkansas, offered the following prayer:

Our God, as Your prophet Daniel spoke to the king in his day with humility and honor as recorded in the Book of Daniel 4:37: ''The God of Heaven has given you sovereignty, power, strength, and glory.''

Lord, as these gifted men and women serve the people of the United States, may they know You have them here by divine appointment, giving to them the influence, strength, and recognition they receive.

As they make decisions that influence the entire world, I pray that You will fill them with supernatural insight, compassionate sensitivity, convictional kindness, and abounding wisdom.

The needs are many, and the tasks are overwhelming. They need You, and they need each other, in order to provide hope for the American people and the entire world. So use them today to change the world for Your glory and for Your Name, I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia 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 DR. RONNIE FLOYD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, it is a personal honor this morning to welcome to the House Chamber the Reverend Dr. Ronnie Floyd, elected this week president of the Southern Baptist Convention in Baltimore.

Dr. Floyd is the senior pastor of Cross Church in northwest Arkansas, a multicampus ministry in one of America's fastest growing regions. His commitment to evangelism, discipleship, and the advancement of the Gospel to America and the world is remarkable.

He has authored a number of books, founded and hosts a businessperson's luncheon called The Summit, and has been a strategic leader in the Southern Baptist Convention for decades.

His lovely wife, Jeana, joins us in the gallery today, as does his son, Nick, himself an associate pastor at Cross Church, and his beautiful wife, Meredith. His other son, Josh, is a championship football coach who just took the head coaching position with Hewitt-Trussville High School in Birmingham, Alabama.

He is a dynamic leader, a dynamic visionary, and minister. I am proud to call him president of the Southern Baptist Convention. But more than anything, Madam Speaker, I am proud to call him my pastor and friend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Dairy Month. As a means to promote increased milk sales and consumption, the dairy industry began National Milk Month in 1937.

Over the years, National Milk Month evolved into National Dairy Month in order to recognize the importance of all American-made milk and dairy products. The dairy industry has had great success with just promotions—particularly with the ''Got Milk?'' campaign over the years.

With over 8,300 dairy farms throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, dairy production remains the single-largest sector of Pennsylvania's agriculture industry—the number one industry in Pennsylvania. This makes Pennsylvania fourth in dairy production nationally.

The 2014 farm bill makes numerous positive changes to the former dairy

Printed on recycled paper.

programs. The new law repealed a number of outdated programs and replaced them with a free-market margin insurance program. Now, I was proud to support this new farm bill and the reforms that the law legislates.

Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to support our Nation's dairy industry and celebrate June as National Dairy Month.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, in the past 3 weeks, our Nation experienced three shootings in Isla Vista, California; Las Vegas, Nevada; and Troutdale, Oregon, for which we remembered the victims with a moment of silence. These shootings that resulted in 14 senseless deaths received national media coverage and sparked a national discussion on the need for better mental health policy. Mental health is a factor, but only one factor, in the gun violence epidemic.

In the same 3 weeks, 175 people were shot on the streets of Chicago, with a number of deaths. None of these shootings made national headlines, sparked a national debate, or received a congressional moment of silence. As a Nation, we have become unfazed by urban violence.

But I am not asking for more silence. We have been silent enough. We need action. I have introduced three bills that promote commonsense gun reform and that don't infringe on Second Amendment rights. These bills would highlight the public health risk associated with gun violence, help the Consumer Product Safety Commission set gun safety standards, and prohibit high-risk individuals from possessing guns.

I urge my colleagues to be a voice for American safety. Gun violence is more than mental, and Americans can no longer afford our silence. Lastly, I want to know just who and how many more must die or be shot before we take action?

CELEBRATING FATHER'S DAY

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, over a century ago, a Spokane woman named Sonora Smart Dodd thought up a way to honor her dad, a Civil War veteran who raised her and her five siblings after their mother passed away. Little did Sonora know that her thoughtful idea would one day become a national holiday honoring fathers from across the country.

A source of pride for Spokane and for all of eastern Washington, Sonora's vision for celebrating her dad—and all dads—will continue this Sunday as we take time to celebrate Father's Day.

As families in eastern Washington and all across our Nation recognize the role fathers play in our lives, I celebrate the impact my own dad has had in shaping who I am today. I celebrate him and all dads for their sacrifices, their guidance, and their support.

Our sons and daughters learn so much from their parents, and it is fitting that we honor all dads who have devoted time to be with their children.

Parenthood comes with its own unique set of challenges. My husband and I know this firsthand. But fathers play an essential role in making our families and our communities strong.

Today, I honor Sonora Smart Dodd for her vision, and I honor fathers from eastern Washington. From that first Father's Day in Spokane back in 1910 to the 104th one this Sunday, let's celebrate fathers.

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this is National Men's Health Week. Each year, for the last 20 years, we have used the week before Father's Day to encourage men of all ages to play an active role in living healthier lifestyles.

The important thing for men to remember, not just this week, but every day, is that many of the illnesses that affect us can be prevented or successfully treated. I am living proof of that. Thanks to early detection, I was able to beat prostate cancer, which used to be one of the worst diagnoses a guy could get.

This week, the members of the Congressional Men's Health Caucus are encouraging men, boys, and their families to develop positive habits, take preventive measures to combat illness, and do your best to lead healthy lifestyles.

I know all too well the importance of early prevention and early detection, and how they can mean the difference between life or death. As a leader of the Prostate Cancer Task Force, I encourage men of all ages to do the smart thing: know your number, know your condition, and stay healthy.

T-HUD

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, this week, the Republican-controlled House of Representatives approved their version of the fiscal year 2015 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill. Instead of investing in America's future, this legislation slashes investments in our Nation's transportation and housing infrastructure.

Funding for Amtrak is cut by $200 million. Funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund is cut below sequester levels, and funding for HOME investment partnership is cut to its lowest level in history.

Sadly, it gets worse. The bill practically eliminates the TIGER grant program that funds innovative highway, port, and rail projects.

At a time when America's infrastructure is crumbling, why on Earth would Congress slash funding for critical infrastructure investments that support jobs?

To compete in the 21st century economy, we must bet on America's future and dedicate resources to infrastructure projects that support jobs in the construction sector, grow our economy, and rebuild America. Our competitors are investing in infrastructure. It is time we do, too.

JOLIET PUBLIC LIBRARY STAR WARS DAY

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

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, as a scientist, it is not often that I come to the floor to speak out on works of science fiction, but I rise today to recognize the Fifth Annual Star Wars Day, hosted by the Joliet Public Library on Saturday, June 7, 2014.

The event not only brings the community together into the historic and welcoming streets of downtown Joliet, but also promotes literacy, science, technology, engineering, and math in a fun and exciting atmosphere that captivates young minds.

Thanks to the library's Star Wars Day, no Jedi mind tricks are needed to get children to read over the summer. In its 5 years, Star Wars Day has grown to over 7,000 attendees, thanks to the hard work of many people.

And as the Star Wars parade marched proudly down Ottawa Street, with Imperial Storm Troopers, Jedi Knights, and Ewoks in full costume, I would like to especially recognize the Sand People who, of course, march single file to hide their numbers.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the Joliet Public Library for their efforts to promote library services, literacy, and STEM education with their Fifth Annual Star Wars Day.

DEFENDING SERGEANT BOWE BERGDAHL

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I was a Navy psychiatrist during the Vietnam war. I treated men who believed they were doing the right thing, but who, having witnessed the obscenity of war, came home shaken, brutalized, and lost. These men were demonized for their experience. Today, we are making the same mistake with Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl.

Yesterday, I watched as members of the House Armed Services Committee attacked a U.S. citizen who volunteered to serve his country and who was held in the most deplorable of conditions for 5 years. In my time in Congress, I have never seen a more disgraceful, purely political attack on a U.S. soldier.

How many times have we heard from our generals and our admirals that we never leave a warrior behind? We sent Sergeant Bergdahl to war. We gave Sergeant Bergdahl his gun and his orders. We must bring Sergeant Bergdahl home and take care of him.

□ 0915

CONDEMNING ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY BOKO HARAM

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 12, 2014, to consider in the House, House Resolution 617, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or his designee; that the resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the preamble and the resolution to adoption without intervening motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 617) condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the terrorist group known as Boko Haram in northeastern provinces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 617

Whereas, on the night of April 14, 2014, 276 female students, most of them between 15 and 18 years old, were abducted by Boko Haram from the Government Girls Secondary School, a boarding school located in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria;

Whereas, all public secondary schools in Borno state were closed in March 2014 because of increasing attacks in the past year that have killed hundreds of students, but the young women at the Government Girls Secondary School were recalled to take their final exams;

Whereas, Boko Haram burned down several buildings before opening fire on soldiers and police who were guarding the Government Girls Secondary School and forcing the students into trucks;

Whereas, according to local officials in Borno state, 53 students were able to flee their captors, and the rest remain abducted;

Whereas, there are reports that the abducted girls have been sold as brides to Islamist militants for the equivalent of $12 each;

Whereas, the group popularly known as ''Boko Haram'', which loosely translates from the Hausa language to ''Western education is sin'', is known to oppose the education of girls;

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, hours before the kidnapping in Borno state, and on May 2, 2014, Boko Haram bombed bus stations in Abuja, Nigeria, killing at least 94 people and wounding over 160, making it the deadliest set of attacks ever in Nigeria's capital;

Whereas, Boko Haram has kidnapped girls in the past to use as cooks and sex slaves, and has claimed responsibility for the kidnapping in Borno state on April 14, 2014;

Whereas, late May 5, 2014, suspected Boko Haram gunmen kidnapped an additional 8 girls, ranging in age from 12 to 15, from a village in northeast Nigeria;

Whereas, on May 7, 2014, Boko Haram killed at least 336 people in Gamboru Ngala and burned hundreds of houses and cars;

Whereas, on June 5, 2014, Boko Haram kidnapped an additional 20 women from northeastern Nigeria, near the town of Chibok;

Whereas, reports estimate that more than 500 students and 100 teachers have been killed by Boko Haram and have destroyed roughly 500 schools in northern Nigeria, leaving more than 15,000 students without access to education;

Whereas, Boko Haram has targeted schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers, as well as government facilities, in an armed campaign to create an Islamic state in northern Nigeria, prompting the President of Nigeria to declare a state of emergency in three of the country's northeastern states in May 2013;

Whereas, human rights groups have indicated that the Nigerian state security forces should improve efforts to protect civilians during offensive operations against Boko Haram;

Whereas, according to nongovernmental organizations, more than 1,500 people have been killed in attacks by Boko Haram or reprisals by Nigerian security forces this year alone, and that almost 4,000 people have been killed in Boko Haram attacks since 2011;

Whereas, the enrollment, retention, and completion of education for girls in Nigeria remains a major challenge;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), some 4,700,000 children of primary school age are still not in school in Nigeria, with attendance rates lowest in the north;

Whereas, studies have found that school children in Nigeria, particularly those in the northern provinces, are at a disadvantage in their education, with 37 percent of primary-age girls in the rural northeast not attending school, and 30 percent of boys not attending school;

Whereas, women and girls must be allowed to go to school without fear of violence and unjust treatment so that they can take their rightful place as equal citizens of and contributors to society;

Whereas United States security assistance to Nigeria has emphasized military professionalization, peacekeeping support and training, and border and maritime security;

Whereas, the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group's large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against civilians, including women and children;

Whereas Boko Haram is one of a number of radical Islamist terrorist organizations and extremist groups that pose a growing threat to United States interests in the region as well as broader peace and security; and

Whereas these radical Islamist groups, which include Ansar al-Sharia, Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, the National Movement for Unity and Jihad in West Africa, and others have carried out deadly attacks in the region and constitute a growing threat to North and West Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram in Borno state, and calls for the immediate, safe return of the girls;

(2) condemns Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets, including schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers in Nigeria;

(3) encourages the Government of Nigeria to strengthen efforts to protect children seeking to obtain an education and to hold those who conduct such violent attacks accountable;

(4) commends efforts by the United States Government to hold terrorist organizations, such as Boko Haram, accountable;

(5) supports offers of United States assistance to the government of Nigeria in the search for these abducted girls and encourages the government of Nigeria to work with the United States and other concerned governments to resolve this tragic situation;

(6) recognizes that every individual, regardless of gender, should have the opportunity to pursue an education without fear of discrimination;

(7) encourages the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to continue their support for initiatives that promote the human rights of women and girls in Nigeria;

(8) urges the President to immediately strengthen United States security, law enforcement, and intelligence cooperation with appropriate Nigerian forces, including offering United States personnel to support operations to locate and rescue the more than 200 schoolgirls kidnapped by Boko Haram, and to support Nigerian efforts to counter this United States designated foreign terrorist organization; and

(9) calls on the President to provide to Congress a comprehensive strategy to counter the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups in West Africa, the Sahel, and North Africa.

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.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on a motion to recommit as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 616, I call up the bill (H.R. 4453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–46 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4453

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 ''S Corporation Permanent Tax Relief Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. REDUCED RECOGNITION PERIOD FOR BUILT-IN GAINS OF S CORPORATIONS MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (7) of section 1374(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(7) RECOGNITION PERIOD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'recognition period' means the 5-year period beginning with the 1st day of the 1st taxable year for which the corporation was an S corporation. For purposes of applying this section to any amount includible in income by reason of distributions to shareholders pursuant to section 593(e), the preceding sentence shall be applied without regard to the phrase '5-year'.

''(B) INSTALLMENT SALES.—If an S corporation sells an asset and reports the income from the sale using the installment method under section 453, the treatment of all payments received shall be governed by the provisions of this paragraph applicable to the taxable year in which such sale was made.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. PERMANENT RULE REGARDING BASIS ADJUSTMENT TO STOCK OF S CORPORATIONS MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1367(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4453.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge support for H.R. 4453, the S Corporation Permanent Tax Relief Act of 2014.

Since we started the tax reform process in January of 2011, one of the main themes coming up again and again is the need for certainty for individuals to plan and businesses to thrive. Nowhere is this more true than for small businesses.

Pass-through businesses, like S corporations, account for more than half of all jobs in the United States. In my home State of Washington, they are particularly important, providing 1.4 million jobs, with S corporations providing more than one in four private sector jobs.

Permanence in the tax law is especially important for these privately-held businesses because they can't go to the public markets every time they want to invest in new equipment or hire workers. They need certainty to plan how to most effectively deploy their capital.

A perfect example of an area of the Tax Code that is ripe for permanence, so that S corporation businesses can plan to access and redeploy their own capital, is the built-in gains, or BIG, relief provision that is before us today.

The BIG tax, as it is called, is a double tax on S corporations that want to sell their assets after converting from C corporation status. Currently, S corporations have to wait 10 years after converting before selling their assets to avoid the punitive double tax.

Traditional year-to-year tax extender legislation has reduced this holding period to 5 years, holding to the original antiabuse intent of the rule, yet providing significant relief for businesses nationwide. H.R. 4453 would permanently reduce that holding period to 5 years.

As we heard from Jim Redpath, a small business witness who is an accountant—he testified before one of our Ways and Means hearings several weeks ago—the BIG tax causes S corporations to hold on to unproductive or old assets that should be replaced.

He gave the example of a road contractor that is holding onto old equipment and trucks that are sitting in the junkyard that he can't sell. He can't even sell them for parts. Rather than selling them, if he did, they would be subject to the BIG tax, the double tax that I talked about earlier.

The other impact here is, if businesses are allowed to sell these assets and used equipment, it would benefit other small businesses, starting businesses, for example, that may not be able to afford the newest and the latest equipment and technology, but they can start their businesses with used equipment.

Instead of selling assets and using the proceeds to hire new workers or invest in new equipment, businessowners sit on the sidelines. This is a perfect example of Tax Code influencing business decisions, and this needs to stop.

According to the IRS, tens of thousands of corporations convert to C corporations each year. We can't continue to leave this capital locked up. We need to give it back to the small businesses that make this country thrive.

The second part of this bill is also a commonsense provision that will give S corporations certainty in the value of their charitable donations. The S corporation charitable basis adjustment provision simply ensures that S corporations get the same value for their deductions as all other small businesses.

These two commonsense provisions will give S corporations the certainty they need to create jobs and grow our economy in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the tax extenders being considered today are important to small businesses and have been supported by Democrats.

The first two bills impacting S corporations regard the gain on the sale or distribution of appreciated assets and how charitable contributions of an S corporation are taken into account by shareholders. Over the years, we have modified these provisions and extended them on a bipartisan basis.

The section 179 expensing provision which we will consider second has been in the Tax Code since 1958. It was expanded and nearly quadrupled to a maximum expensing allowance to nearly $100,000 in 2003.

In 2008, as another recession took hold, that allowance was increased to $250,000; and in 2010, we again expanded the provision, this time to $500,000, as we continued action to spur the economic recovery. This level was in effect through 2013, and this bill before us would make these significant expansions permanent—unpaid for.

When these expansions were first enacted in 2003, House Republicans noted that these expansions ''reflected the need for an economic stimulus and growth package.''

Republicans want to talk about certainty. Well, this much is certain: the expanded 179 provision will be extended

again. Our economy still needs it, and if Republicans had any interest in working on a bipartisan basis on comprehensive tax reform, we could discuss how best to make a stimulus effort a long-term part of the Tax Code.

The opposite is being done today. It is tax reform in reverse. The S corporation provisions surely also will be extended, but in reality, we are not here to make law. I think that is evidenced by the atmosphere about these provisions as we take them up today.

The President has indicated he will veto the approach—permanent, unpaid-for tax cuts—taken in the Republican bills before us today, and importantly, the Senate Finance Committee has approved, on a bipartisan basis, legislation to extend all tax extenders for 2 years.

The total inability of the House Republican majority to take action to help our recovery, to bolster small businesses, and to grow our economy has resulted in smoke-and-mirror votes, like the ones before us today. They want to signal that they support small business, but their action is so inconsistent with their past positions that it is rendered hypocritical.

Ways and Means Republicans put forth a comprehensive tax reform proposal and received accolades—the chairman did—for making it revenue neutral. Chairman CAMP included these extenders in his comprehensive tax reform proposal fully offset, the opposite of today.

The measures in front of us today add up to $75 billion in deficit increases—$75 billion more. When you add in the R&D credit that passed the House last month and the eight other provisions that have moved through Ways and Means Committee, it adds up to—everybody take notice—$614 billion, unpaid for and permanent.

There are still more than 40 tax provisions left unaccounted for. When all is said and done, Republicans are well on their way to increasing the deficit by $1 trillion, and we all know where it will lead—to future Republican demands to cut vital domestic priorities that have been on the chopping block for the GOP: funding for education, public health, and transportation—as we saw yesterday—to name a few.

Chairman RYAN put forth a Republican budget resolution, which the Republican majority passed through this House. That budget that you all here today on the Republican side voted for stipulates that any change in tax law must be offset. These bills today shred that principle. You are shredding it.

□ 0930

You are inconsistent. You moved in one direction with some praise and now you are essentially moving in the opposite.

And the final hypocrisy is one that hits home for 3 million unemployed Americans, I must say, for their families and for millions of Americans who care. The Republican majority insists that unemployment insurance be paid for, but when it comes to tax cuts, they can simply be added to the deficit. The bill before us today is seven times more expensive than the cost of extending Federal unemployment insurance for the remainder of the year. And I should note that we have simply already agreed to offset the cost of such unemployment extension.

Democrats stand ready—more than ready—to extend these provisions for small businesses. We stand ready—more than ready—to act on all of these expired tax provisions. We stand ready—more than ready—to act on comprehensive tax reform. And we certainly stand ready—more than ready—to extend unemployment insurance for 3 million job-seeking Americans and be paid for. But we will not be silent in the face of the Republican hypocrisy on display today. What they are doing today is reckless and irresponsible. Once again, here they go again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Michigan, yes, there is a Senate bill. It is a bipartisan bill that extends many tax policies. And guess what. It is not offset, because it has never been offset. And I would just remark that my good friend from Michigan has voted to extend this exact policy unoffset for 12 years.

So I know the gentleman referred to ''hypocrisy.'' Let's talk about honesty. Let's be honest about this. This policy will not be offset. Let's give some certainty to the small businesses in America.

Let me just say that I appreciated his comment that the economy needs help. With negative GDP growth in the last quarter, a contracting economy, certainly we do. With more kids living at home with their parents than ever before rather than pursuing careers, with median incomes declining, yes, we certainly do.

Let me just say, small businesses and their workers, they are hit hardest by the burdens and regulations of an overly complicated Tax Code. Tax compliance costs are 65 percent higher for small businesses than for large businesses, costing them $19 billion a year. We need small businesses doing the best they can, creating jobs and growing our local economies, not buried under mounds of paperwork.

The bill we have before us today is the right step forward to level the playing field between small businesses on Main Street and big businesses. If a small business chooses to operate as an S corporation for tax purposes, we should ensure that they have the ability to access certain capital without penalties.

Under current law, an S corporation is subject to an entity-level tax at the highest corporate rate on certain built-in gains of property that it held while operating as a C corporation. The tax applies to gain recognized within 10 years from the date that the C corporation elected to be an S corporation, and in the past, Congress has shortened this period to 5 years. This bill would make permanent the 5-year period, eliminating a significant deterrent that often discourages closely held C corporations from electing the S corporation status, thus subjecting them to a double tax.

Additionally, we should ensure that S corporations receive the same treatment as partnerships when it comes to charitable donations. By achieving parity between different businesses, we can encourage all small businesses to continue their generous support of charitable activities.

This legislation is supported by 35 groups representing thousands of small businesses and their workers, who wrote that this legislation will allow small businesses to ''make decisions based on what is best for the company rather than the dictates of the Tax Code. At a time when our economy badly needs increased investment, allowing more companies to access their own capital is an important step.'' Additionally, they write, this legislation would ''allow America's S corporations to be more active and supportive of much-needed charitable activities.''

This is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that will give small businesses some much-needed relief from the burdens of the Tax Code and allow them to make new investments and create new jobs, and I urge its support.

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

Let this be very clear to our distinguished chairman. These bills being brought up here unpaid for come to $75 billion. The total of the bills that have come through Ways and Means comes to $614 billion. So 75 today, we had 300-and-some a week or so ago. The train is on the track as you have positioned it, 614 just to start. To extend these provisions for 2 years is $3.4 billion. That is why it is irresponsible to simply go off into the wild deficit, irresponsible yonder. That is where you are.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional minute.

There is a tremendous difference between 3.4 and 75 in these bills and 614 when you add this together with more to come. It also means it gives us time to look to see whether they should be permanent under what conditions.

So that is why it is reckless, it is irresponsible, it is contrary to your tax reform bill where you lauded it and we applauded that aspect that you paid for it. You called it revenue neutral. We wanted something beyond that. We didn't want deficit wild.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), an active member of our committee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak for the citizens of Florida, Texas, Washington, Tennessee, Nevada, Alaska, South Dakota, Wyoming, and New Hampshire. These are States without an income tax. They do not have a State income tax. They are allowed to deduct their sales tax that they pay from their Federal income tax and receive a credit for it this year. Now, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee spent 3 years working on putting a bill together; and in that bill—it is called tax reform—it repealed, it didn't just sort of leave unmentioned or anything else, it directly repealed that provision in the law.

We are out here today—nobody denies that small business needs some help. We certainly think that is a good idea. But where are the priorities of the ordinary taxpayers in Florida, Texas, Washington, Tennessee, Nevada, Alaska, South Dakota, Wyoming, and New Hampshire? They are going to pay an extra thousand dollars next year in taxes. They are going to get a tax increase from the Republicans by failing to give them this deduction.

It costs $6.5 billion. We are going to spend 75 or 71—or whatever it is today—billion dollars. One-tenth of that would cover the tax exemption for the people in these States, the ordinary tax citizens that everybody says they are worried about, the middle class, the middle class who is struggling in this society. But this Congress says, no, we have to take care of business. That is all we have taken care of is business so far.

When the chairman had the possibility, he repealed this. Now, he is from Michigan. Why not? Who would care? They wouldn't affect his State.

What is hard for me to understand is how anybody can come out here and not defend the interest of their own citizens. If you represent Florida, Texas, Washington, Tennessee, Nevada, Alaska, South Dakota, Wyoming, and New Hampshire and you vote for these tax bills today and say to your people back home we don't care what happens to you, it ought to be an interesting experience to go on the stump running for election this year.

Everybody's talking about taxes, but we are taking away a tax deduction for the people of these States. And why? I guess we haven't got the money, or maybe the chairman doesn't live in one of those States, or I am not quite sure how all this works, but I'm here to say that people from the State of Washington need to have a tax deduction for the sales tax that they pay in lieu of an income tax.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), who is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, every dollar that Washington takes from small businesses is a dollar they don't have to invest in new equipment, expand operations, hire a new employee, or provide higher pay and better benefits. Particularly, in the Obama economy, businesses are already pinned down by uncertainty and need all the flexibility they can get to adapt and grow.

This legislation will strengthen our economy and spur greater investment by permanently giving small businesses organized as S corporations the ability to access capital without tax penalties. As noted at our committee hearing earlier this year, a permanent 5-year built-in gains period would provide greater flexibility in the day-to-day operations of S corporations that have built-in gain assets in order to make new investments and create jobs.

I urge support for H.R. 4453, the S Corporation Permanent Tax Relief Act, so we can create an America that works by fixing the Tax Code to provide permanent tax relief for small businesses.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am a longstanding supporter of S corporations, pass-throughs, and small businesses. In my State, as well as around the country, S corporations are a cornerstone of the business community. These corporations span a broad range of industries and employ a large percentage of our country's workforce. In my State alone, there are more than 235,000 S corporations providing more than 1.5 million jobs and bolstering the Illinois economy through their taxes paid.

In the name of fiscal responsibility, the Republican leadership has justified refusing to help 3 million Americans, including 116,000 Illinoisans, who were unemployed through no fault of their own.

□ 0945

Yet the Republican leadership abandoned its fiscal responsibility to balloon our deficit to $614 billion for permanent tax breaks for corporations while refusing to aid hardworking struggling Americans in the name of fiscal responsibility.

My track record is very clear on my strong support of small businesses. My track record is also very clear that I cannot and will not prioritize over half a trillion dollars in deficit spending for business tax breaks and tell struggling Americans that they are not worth the expense. I very much want the small businesses in my State to benefit from the tax benefits contained in H.R. 4457 and H.R. 4453. However, I cannot support the Republican approach of unpaid for, permanent cuts for businesses while the needs of our unemployed and working poor go ignored.

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

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter of support signed by 35 different organizations in support of this legislation. These signees include organizations as diverse as the National Grocers Association, the National Electrical Contractors Association, and the Association for Manufacturing Technology.

JUNE 11, 2014.

PASS THE S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

DEAR MEMBER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: As representatives of America's closely-held businesses, we ask that you support legislation (H.R. 4453) making permanent the 5-year recognition period for built-in gains, as well as the basis adjustment for charitable giving by S corporations.

Small businesses are the engine of America's economic growth and S corporations are the cornerstone of the small business community. There are more than 4.5 million of them nationwide. They are in every community and every industry and, according to Ernst & Young, they employ one out of every four private sector workers.

Unlike public corporations, these closely-held businesses have little or no access to the capital markets. Instead they rely on banks, relatives, and their own savings to fill their investment and working capital needs. An overly long built-in gains recognition period makes this disadvantage worse by preventing companies that have chosen to become S corporations from accessing their own capital and putting it to better use.

Locking up a company's capital for an entire decade is simply unreasonable. Past Congresses have recognized that a decade is too long and voted to reduce the recognition period on three separate occasions, but those temporary measures have expired and the 10-year rule is back in effect.

Enacting a permanent shorter recognition period would sustain the original intent of the rule while providing S corporations with much needed certainty. It would allow them to make decisions based on what is best for the company rather than the dictates of the tax code. At a time when our economy badly needs increased investment, allowing more companies to access their own, locked-up capital is an important step.

Furthermore, making permanent the basis adjustment to stock of S corporations that make charitable contributions of property would help bring consistent treatment among flow-through businesses, and would allow America's S corporations to be more active and supportive of much-needed charitable activities.

On behalf of America's Main Street business community, we respectfully ask that you vote in favor of the S Corporation Permanent Tax Relief Act of 2014.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aeronautical Repair Station Association, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, Agricultural Retailers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Institute of Architects, American Rental Association, American Supply Association, American Trucking Associations, Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Auto Care Association, Financial Executives International, Food Marketing Institute, Heating, Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Distributors International, Independent

Community Bankers of America, Independent Electrical Contractors.

Metals Service Center Institute, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Funeral Directors Association, National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Small Business Association, S Corporation Association, Small Business Council of America, Small Business Legislative Council, Subchapter S Bank Association, The Association For Manufacturing Technology, Truck Renting and Leasing Association, United States Business and Industry Council, Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of America.

Mr. REICHERT. Small businesses across the country recognize just how crucial it is to give access to capital to businesses in our struggling economy today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, for all his work on this.

The bills that we are seeing today on the floor of the House are part of a series of bills that have come out of the Ways and Means Committee from our Republican colleagues that run up our national debt by putting hundreds of billions of dollars on a credit card by permanently extending a number of business tax credits. In the process, they are actually violating their own budget that they had on the floor just a few months ago.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, this is not a serious attempt to help small businesses. By bringing these measures up one at a time in a rifle-shot fashion, our Republican colleagues are abandoning what they said we should do, which we agree we should do on a bipartisan basis, which is to tackle tax reform in a fiscally responsible way.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we are not helping small businesses by running up our national debt. It was just about a month ago when our Republican colleagues told us that the biggest threat to future economic growth in this country was projected deficits in the out years. We have said to our Republican colleagues we need to work together to reduce that long-term deficit. It is not a question about whether we should do it, it is a question of how we should do it.

But this bill, and these bills on the floor today, take us in the opposite direction. Together, they are going to add over $614 billion to our credit card if you add up all these rifle-shot bills that have come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to all the rhetoric about fiscal discipline, about getting our deficits in order? Out the window.

Just to put these numbers in perspective, that $640 billion on the credit card is 30 times what it would cost to extend emergency unemployment compensation to 3 million Americans who are out of work today through no fault of their own.

So contrasting these bills with the budget rhetoric we heard a few months ago about reducing our deficits is total doublespeak. Our Republican colleagues know it doesn't meet the laugh test.

When we had the debate on this very floor about the Republican budget, we pointed out that the claim that it balanced in 10 years was based on all sorts of Enron-like accounting gimmicks. For example, they assumed all the revenues that would come in over the next 10 years from the Affordable Care Act at the same time they said they were repealing the Affordable Care Act. Both things can't happen at the same time.

Yet today, even if you take the Republican budget gimmicks, as they would have us do, even if you do that, their budget no longer balances in 10 years, it no longer balances in 10 years. In fact, if you look carefully at the rules governing this debate, our Republican colleagues had to change their own rules to allow this bill to be on the floor today because otherwise it would have violated their claim of a balanced budget. So, that is the kind of gimmickry we have going on here.

If our Republican colleagues were really serious about reducing the long-term deficit, as they claimed to be a month ago, they would be willing to close some of those special interest tax breaks in order to help reduce the deficit, and yet their budget doesn't close a single special interest tax break. It keeps the big subsidies for Big Oil companies, it keeps tax breaks for hedge fund owners. The bills before us today are under a rule that doesn't allow us to pay for them by closing some of those tax breaks. Mr. LEVIN and I would have loved to have the opportunity to say: let's pay for this business expensing provision by shutting down some of the unproductive tax breaks, tax breaks that are there not because they have economic value but because a powerful political interest got that tax break in the Code. Yet our Republican colleagues have a rule that says we can't touch those.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend.

I really think this goes to the heart of the matter, because whether it was the R&D tax credit, the research and development tax credit, or the business expensing provision, I support those provisions, but I support doing them in a fiscally responsible way that doesn't add over $600 billion to our deficit and debt.

How can we do that in a fiscally responsible way? But shutting down some of the unproductive special interest tax breaks in the Tax Code. Yet, the rule before us says we are not allowed to do that. We can't even have a vote, Mr. Speaker, on shutting down some of those special interest tax breaks. That is how far our Republican colleagues are willing to go to keep those special interest tax breaks, not even allowing a vote to close one of them to pay for an R&D tax credit.

So what is this really all about? By running up our national credit card with these business tax provisions you add to the deficit. Then our Republican colleagues will be back here with their budget saying: do you know what, now that we have this big deficit you've got to cut funding for our kids' education, which is what they did in their budget; you have got to voucherize Medicare, which is what they did in their budget; we are not going to have enough funds for our national infrastructure and our highway program, which under their budget goes dry in September, people out of work.

So by providing permanent, unpaid for tax extenders in the business area and running up that deficit, they will come right back to us and say: Do you know what? Now we care again about the deficit, and here is what we want to do about it: cut early education, cut our investment infrastructure, cut the National Institutes of Health research into finding cures and treatments for diseases.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, this is not a serious effort. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made an honest effort at tax reform. I don't agree with a lot of what is in his tax reform bill, but it was an honest, professional effort. That is not coming to the floor today. In fact, this bill before us runs directly counter to the chairman's own tax reform effort, just as it violates the Republicans' own budget.

So, let's get serious, Mr. Speaker. Let's deal with these in a manner that provides the incentives we want to businesses. We can do that by extending these on a short-term basis while we work together to come up with a reasonable tax reform plan in a way that is responsible from a budget perspective. That is the way we should be doing the people's business here in the House. Because we are not doing it that way, I urge our colleagues to vote ''no'' on the provisions that are before us.

I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

The gentleman from Maryland spoke very eloquently on this topic. I just want to note that his past action shows something a little bit different. He has voted for this provision three times in the past.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REICHERT. No, I will not.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Because I am in favor of a short-term extension, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REICHERT. I will not yield my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My point of order is this:

The gentleman said that I had voted on this measure before. That is not true, and so I am asking what my recourse would be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a valid point of order. It is a matter for debate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Washington will yield, the gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My inquiry is this:

The gentleman from Washington, who is a friend, made a statement that is inaccurate. He stated that I had voted for the provision in this bill before. This bill provides a permanent unpaid for extension of business expensing. I have not done that.

So my question to you is: What recourse do I have to set the record straight?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously stated, that is a matter for debate.

The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I would still say that the gentleman from Maryland—to clarify my point—has voted for the extension of these policies three times for a total of 8 years, and that is a fact. That is part of the voting record.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. REICHERT. I do not yield.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I have a parliamentary inquiry on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is under recognition.

The Member having the floor needs to yield for a parliamentary inquiry to be entertained.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My point of order now is, I have asked for a parliamentary inquiry to make it absolutely clear that I have not voted for a permanent unpaid extension of the business expensing provisions in the past, which is what this bill does and which is the root of my objection to this bill, that it runs up the deficit in the way it does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman has not stated a point of order. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate that the gentleman has voted for this extension of this policy three separate times for a period lasting 8 years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, since you stated how many times I have voted to extend temporarily, I will now yield some time to Mr. VAN HOLLEN and then I will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). I don't think it will take very long to refute the statement made by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. LEVIN.

As the gentleman from Washington knows, these issues come up every year as to whether or not we should extend certain tax provisions, in this case the business tax provision, earlier the R&D tax provision. Those are provisions that we support, but we support doing them in a fiscally responsible way.

In fact, the motion to recommit we will have will also say we should extend them for one more year while we get our act together here, Mr. Speaker, and do it in a way that doesn't run up the credit card by $600 billion, which is what the Ways and Means Committee has done in a period of 2 weeks—2 weeks—after spending days on the floor of this house a few months ago saying that the biggest threat to economic growth in the future was our budget deficit.

□ 1000

They say that 2 months ago, and then they waive their own rules to bring up these bills that increase our credit card debt to the tune of $600 billion total from what came out of the Ways and Means Committee, in violation of your own budget.

That is what I object to.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CAMP. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, as the gentleman from Maryland said, we are probably going to do this again.

As the majority whip in the Senate has said—to paraphrase—when we do these policies over and over again, we ought to have an honest debate about what should be permanent.

If we do accept the motion to recommit—which I understand is going to be offered—that extends this one more time, that means we have extended this for a full budget window, unpaid for, so I understand why there is some defensiveness about the voting record over there, in terms of how many times they have voted to extend these policies unpaid for, but if we are going to do that, let's do this in a permanent way, so we can bring some certainty to small businesses.

We know that is where most of the jobs get created in any recovery. Let's give small business in America some certainty, so that the job creation can start and they can understand exactly what their tax obligations are.

This is something that, as I have said, many small business groups are behind and support.

I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. REICHERT. I am. I have no other speakers.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I am glad the chairman spoke because this back-and-forth really illustrates what this is all about.

The chairman made these three provisions permanent and paid for. This bill here doesn't pay one dime. We have voted to continue these programs on a short-term basis for a variety of reasons.

For example, on bonus depreciation, the notion to make it permanent was contrary to its purpose. The chairman left it out of his reform and then comes here to vote to make it permanent.

We need an honest debate about tax reform and what provisions should be made permanent. You have prevented any kind of an honest debate. You don't even allow us to bring up some way to pay for any of this.

I previously pointed out the difference. It is so striking. If you extend these provisions, as the Senate does, for 2 years, the cost is $3.4 billion. These two bills are $75 billion.

There could be no more dramatic example of irresponsibility and of recklessness, and the mystery is: Why in the world are you doing this?

As you can see, there aren't huge numbers of Members here for the debate. You are going through the motions. These are rifle shots, and you are shooting yourselves in the foot.

Don't bring up the number of times that someone has voted to continue these on a temporary basis as you argue to make them permanent. That is dishonesty.

I want to emphasize the path that is being followed here is not only contrary to the tax reform proposal, contrary to the Ryan budget. It is also

going to lead to the Republicans, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN said so eloquently, raising this huge amount of deficit—$614 billion, going towards a trillion—and then the Republicans are going to come back here and say: wow, look at how much the deficit has increased.

So you now need to cut these critical programs relating to the lifeline of all of the people in this country, the middle class and all who need some help.

So I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, just to be honest, I also might want to mention that Mr. LEVIN has voted five times to extend these policies, for a total of 12 years.

Congress—Democrats and Republicans—have repeatedly reauthorized these tax policies without paying for them. Democrats have agreed with the policy of these bills before us today. Making them permanent gives businesses certainty that they will always be a part of the Tax Code, and it is a more honest way of budgeting. Increasing taxes to pay for these policies makes no sense.

We all agree that small businesses impacted by my bill need more access to their capital, which my bill gives them. Making the policies in this bill permanent, while raising taxes in the area of the economy, defeats the purpose of freeing up capital in a way that encourages job creation and moves the economy ahead.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give businesses what they have been asking for since I came to Congress, and that is the certainty in the Tax Code, so that the Tax Code is working for them and they are not working for the Tax Code, so they can plan ahead, so they can grow their business, so they can hire more workers, and so that we can get this economy moving again and get people back to work.

In order to do that, Mr. Speaker, they need the ability to access their capital, so they can invest, again, in their businesses; reenergize their businesses; buy new equipment; sell new equipment; create jobs; and, again, grow the economy.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill before us today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 4453, The Permanent S Corporation Built-In Gains Relief Act of 2014.

Identical to a provision contained in the discussion draft of the ''Tax Reform Act of 2014'' released on February 26, 2014, the bill, H.R. 4453, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provides a permanent five-year recognition period for built-in gains of an S corporation.

I support sound tax policy which allows small businesses in Houston to grow and invest in their people—which is exactly what this bill would do.

And supporters of the bills argue that they would eliminate a significant deterrent that can discourage C-corporations from electing to be S-corporations and will provide additional flexibility for S-corporations to access capital by selling unproductive assets to finance expansion of their businesses.

Of course Democrats support permanent treatment of S-corporation taxes but we must again take our Republican friends to task for not offsetting the cost of the bill, noting again that permanently extending six tax provisions that GOP leaders want to act on would add $310 billion to the deficit. That's $310 billion which could go to Head Start, Student Loans, or feeding the needy.

Because we are the party of Small Business, Democrats understand that by making the provision permanent, businesses have more certainty and they can make better, more fluid decisions—but the process by which we are doing it is unseemly.

But the GOP has made paying for every bill a prerequisite—except in this case. Where is the consistency, I ask?

In moving forward with a permanent extension of a select group of tax extenders, the Majority is once again leaving to an increasingly uncertain fate critical provisions like the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, the American Opportunity Tax Credit, the New Markets Tax Credit, the Mortgage Relief Debt Forgiveness and the renewable energy tax credits, as well as the long-range status of the EITC and the Child Tax Credit.

The Democrat's Motion to Recommit would extend the S Corporation shorter Built-in Gains Recognition Period and Charitable Contribution Adjusted Basis for only two additional years, through the end of 2015, as opposed to the underlying bill's permanent extension. It would prevent these tax cut extensions from permanently adding to the deficit, undermining comprehensive tax reform, and putting further pressure on the United States' discretionary priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for a two-year extension but these bills must be paid for—because if they are not—future generations will suffer because of the unsustainable debt. Let us get back to being fiscally responsible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4453 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF REDUCED RECOGNITION PERIOD FOR BUILT-IN GAINS OF S CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 1374(d)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2012 or 2013'' and inserting ''2012, 2013, 2014, or 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Amend section 3 to read as follows:

SEC. 3. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF RULE REGARDING BASIS ADJUSTMENT TO STOCK OF S CORPORATION MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The last sentence of section 1367(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. CAMP (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading?

There was no objection.

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

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

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I think what I would like to offer to the chairman at this moment is to pose the following question: Are you going to surrender this morning, or are you going to surrender in November? Because, really, those are the two options that are before us today.

Let me retrace where we have been on tax reform. The chairman gets credit for a valiant effort at tax reform. Mr. LEVIN has acknowledged it; Mr. VAN HOLLEN has acknowledged it. For 3 years, we studiously and aggressively undertook a genuine effort to do tax reform.

Now, what is interesting about it is the Democratic response to the chairman's draft was fairly tepid. Let's continue the conversation. Republicans released letters to the media, the Speaker poured cold water on the initiative, and a pretty good effort was cast aside. So we are back here this morning.

Let me offer a couple of, I think, economic facts that might defy consideration around here because, sometimes, they don't square with opinion.

There has been little wage growth for the average American worker since

2002. Downward pressure on wages is what we should be discussing.

In addition, a company located not far from where I live submitted a tax form last year of 19,000 pages. They have 11 full-time Internal Revenue agents on site daily. If this isn't a reason to go back to the table and negotiate tax reform, I don't know what is.

The chairman kind of cleverly suggested here this morning that, if we were to accept what is being proposed by the Democratic minority, might that be a path forward? It is a path forward. We are offering a 2-year extension of these provisions.

I hope Mr. REICHERT or Mr. CAMP returns and says: indeed, Mr. NEAL has voted for these repeatedly. We are counting on you, Mr. Chairman, to point out how many times I voted for them.

Guess what? You are right, and we are going to vote for them again in November. This exercise in futility ill-serves the American people, other than to perhaps get to some messaging points.

I don't disagree with these. I disagree with the idea of breaking the budget to make them permanent this morning, but I, more importantly, disagree with the whole notion that we are giving up on tax reform if we make these permanent.

Some of the provisions in the Code need to be discarded. Mr. Chairman, I would remind you and the Republican staff that you removed 300 provisions, exclusions, deductions, and preferences from the Code. So we come back here this morning in this ill-conceived effort to embrace a couple of favorites?

The Tax Code in America has not been touched since 1986. I would remind you this morning, for all of you out here today, that was before the Internet was invented.

That is the question before us. A Tax Code for a modern economy, or do we go back to, well, Mr. NEAL voted for this 8 times? Yes, he did. In fact, Mr. NEAL has been on the Ways and Means Committee longer than the three previous speakers, so you can probably say Mr. NEAL has voted for them 11 times because I think many of them work, in the absence of fundamental reform.

The last point, the chairman said he was going to 25 percent. The Democrats said go to 28 percent on the corporate side. We could have done all of this, had we gone to 28 percent, but ideology reigns, so we go to 25 percent. Even President Obama was at 28 percent.

This is not the way this institution is supposed to function, Mr. Speaker. The Ways and Means Committee is a privileged perspective on complicated issues. You don't do them like this when it comes to items in the Code.

So accept the notion that everybody dislikes the Code. Specificity in terms of what we are going to wean out becomes the problem.

□ 1015

Here is our last position—a 2-year extension.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to seeing you after the elections. You and I are going to shake hands, and as much as we all like to say, ''I hate to say, 'I told you so,' '' I am going to say, ''As much as I hate telling you this, I told you so.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I seek time in opposition to the motion.

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

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, frankly, this motion to recommit is absurd. It is absurd in this economy to threaten small business with higher taxes.

The gentleman referred to favorites. Yes, I do have favorites. Those are the small businesses all across America that hire and to which people go to work every day. The margins are tight. You know the testimony we have had before the Ways and Means Committee. We need growth in this economy, certainty, and long-term tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that allows its tax policy to expire.

Instead of threatening small businesses with higher taxes, we should give confidence to small businesses—confidence to know what the tax policy is. Look, it has been extended so many times it may as well be permanent. This is the point—so that they will grow, so that they will invest, so that they will hire workers. People will have higher wages as a result of a stronger, growing economy because families and middle class Americans will have jobs.

Reject this threat of higher taxes, particularly on small businesses. Reject this motion to recommit.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 616, I call up the bill (H.R. 4457) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–472, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4457

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 ''America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXPENSING CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $500,000.''.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds—'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $2,000,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking '', to which section 167 applies, and which is placed in service in a taxable year beginning after 2002 and before 2014'' and inserting ''and to which section 167 applies''.

(c) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''may not be revoked'' and all that follows through ''and before 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''IRREVOCABLE'' in the heading thereof.

(d) AIR CONDITIONING AND HEATING UNITS.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''and shall not include air conditioning or heating units''.

(e) QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—Subsection (f) of section 179 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' in paragraph (1), and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(c)(2)(A) for such calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 2012' in clause (ii) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under subparagraph (A) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4457.

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

There was no objection.

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

The tax burden that small businesses, farmers, ranchers, and their workers face is too high. Every dollar Washington takes from small businesses is a dollar that they don't have to invest in equipment, to start a new production line, to hire a new employee, or to provide more in wages and benefits. Businesses aren't growing, and hardworking Americans are seeing stagnant wages and fewer work hours. This is unacceptable.

These days, it seems that Congress can rarely agree on much, so when we can find some common ground to help grow the economy and get businesses to invest and hire new workers, we should act immediately. The legislation we have before us today, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, would do just that by providing a permanent extension of section 179 expensing at a level of $500,000. Section 179 is a bipartisan provision that has been in place since the 1950s, but businesses, farmers, and ranchers cannot reap the full benefits when they have no idea if this provision is going to be around the next year or what it may look like. This hurts their ability to plan for the future and expand their businesses.

The Farm Bureau recently stated:

> This practice makes it very difficult for farmers and ranchers to plan, and it adds immense confusion and complexity to the Tax Code.

It is time to make section 179 permanent at an expensing level of $500,000 so American farmers, ranchers, and small businesses can invest in new equipment, grow their businesses, and plan for the future.

Sure, House Democrats, many who have sponsored this legislation before, are now demanding that we pay for an extension of these policies despite voting year after year to extend these job-creating policies without their being paid for. Frankly, the millions of Americans searching for jobs or for a few extra dollars in their paychecks know that pro-growth policies like this pay for themselves in the form of new investments, new jobs, and higher wages. I think we can all agree this is the right policy, and we should set the rhetoric aside so we can have an America that works, with a strong and vibrant economy.

By supporting permanent policies, Washington can promote certainty for American businesses and generate additional economic growth. We have become too accustomed to poor jobs reports, anemic growth, and just accepting things as they are. Small business expensing has been a bipartisan policy for decades, and it is time to make it a permanent part of the Tax Code. Washington needs to wake up, to start listening to the American people, and to act on real policies that strengthen the economy and help hardworking taxpayers. Today's legislation will do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Small business can have full confidence that this provision will be extended—period. Indeed, the fact that I have voted for it many times in the past, as pointed out, is confidence that it will be continued. As to the suggestion that we have made to continue it for 2 years, we are already well into the first year, and if we don't act until the end of the year and extend it for 2 years, that would be another one not even for another full year, but there would be a 2-year extension. So small business can be fully confident this will be extended. There is no threat to it. There is zero threat to its extension.

When it was said earlier by the chairman that small business can have no idea as to whether this will be extended next year, that simply is not correct. The Senate has before it a bill to extend it for 2 years. At some point, that will pass, and that is the bill that will be taken up in the House.

The chairman did extend permanently this provision—not many others. He paid for that. The chairman extolled the fact that he paid for it, and now they have gone in reverse and now suggest that we proceed unpaid for permanently. The cost of this is far different than a 2-year extension, as I have mentioned—far different. We are talking about over $70 billion compared to a few billion dollars.

Let me just say that everybody has to be mystified as to why in the world the Republicans are doing this when it violates their budget, when it violates the chairman's and the Republicans' Ways and Means tax proposal, and when, if this is done, it is going to be part of a ratcheting up of the deficit of $614 billion and will have major ramifications for so many programs.

Essentially, what they are doing is, on the one hand, increasing this deficit dramatically—through the ceiling. Then they are going to come back on the other hand and say, ah, the deficit went through the ceiling, so we need to take away, with the other, education programs, health programs—all kinds of programs that are necessary—transportation programs. They are going to say, well, we just don't have the money when, essentially, the reason is that they have tried to pass a bill that throws money out the window.

We are going to extend the small business tax cut. We are going to do that—Democrats will stand together to make sure that that happens—but not in a way that is part of a reckless, irresponsible approach. That is a major, major reason we simply have to say: extend it for 2 years. Then let's sit down and talk about what we are going to do with these provisions as part of a tax reform effort that is serious and is bipartisan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership on the Ways and Means Committee. It has been an honor and a privilege to work with you. You have been a great leader, and we look forward to allowing you to lead us the rest of this year on our committee as we continue the debate on the extenders and making some permanent.

H.R. 4457 would permanently extend the small business expensing for equipment and property outlined in section 179 of the Tax Code.

As many of you know, section 179 first came into existence in 1958. I wasn't yet born. My parents were not yet married. They got married in 1958, so they didn't see the debate here in Washington. It may not have been quite like the debate today, though, I would say, because, ladies and gentlemen, Members of Congress, this is a mystifying debate. This shouldn't be this difficult. No wonder Congress has a low approval rating.

Section 179 of our Tax Code is very simple, and as the chairman said, it has been very bipartisan over the years. It allows businessowners to immediately deduct the cost of the investments of property and computer software rather than depreciating such cost over time.

In fact, on January 1, what had been an extender that allowed for the maximum expensing of $500,000 and the deduction phased out of investments exceeding $2 million went back to what is current law today. That is why this is so important. It is the essence of this debate, and it is the essence of what my bill does because it went down. The limit went down to $25,000 and up to $200,000 of investments.

If you talk to Tom and Judy Price, who are from my district, they think that what we do here is just crazy and mystifying because they have to make real decisions in real time and with real money, not make-believe, not theory. They have to make decisions that impact real lives and real costs and real jobs. This is a jobs bill. That is what this is about. If you ask Tom and Judy Price, we have had expensing, and

we have had higher limits than $25,000. We don't today. We had them before, but they weren't paid for. We have had them for the 10 years since I have been here, and they haven't been paid for.

But do you know what? Here is the reality of life.

In Delaware County, Ohio, I talked to Tom Price this morning. He has a mulching business. He needs to buy a loader. Is Congress going to provide certainty? Oh, 2 years is fine. Retroactivity is fine. That is the narrative around here, Mr. Speaker. We've done it before. Let's do it again this way.

□ 1030

The Senate won't accept it. Let's surrender our card today. Let's surrender my voting card, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhere here. Let me give it to the Senate.

My daughter, going into sixth grade, understands there are two Houses. We shouldn't be surrendering this card, Mr. Speaker, to the Senate because, oh, the Senate is going to do it their way; have always done it that way.

Ladies and gentlemen, a bill becomes a law this way. The House passes a bill. That is what we are trying to do today, Mr. Speaker, add permanency.

Tom and Judy Price, in their mulching business, they would like certainty to plan, not oh, we will make it retroactive and we will go out a year. Oh, by the way, Mr. Price, we are going to do it in November. We are going to make it retroactive to January.

Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me?

You guys couldn't survive running a business in Washington, D.C. You couldn't survive.

That is what this debate is all about. It is about reality.

My daughter knows that the Senate has the right to do anything they want, but we have our right with our card. Guess what?

There is supposed to be a conference committee. There is supposed to be a real debate and oh, my God, compromise between the House and the Senate. That is what this is supposed to be about. That is what I tell my daughter who is going into sixth grade.

But no, let's surrender to the Senate right now. Let's just surrender. We have surrendered before.

And oh my goodness, these deficits. These businesses pay taxes. You all want to raise taxes on them.

When we had a debate on this floor, and I was here in 2009, we passed a $1 trillion stimulus bill. $1 trillion. Nobody cared about the deficit then.

But Mr. Price and Mrs. Price are trying to buy a loader for $200,000, and we are debating over the deficit and temporary Tax Code and retroactivity and surrendering to the Senate. That is what this debate is about. That is what this has come to.

And you wonder why, Mr. Speaker, Americans think Washington is broken; because we don't understand what real-life Americans who are trying to run a business and hire employees and raise their wages, they don't understand why we are having these mystical debates because they are living in the real world, the real world.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, but I am constrained to respond to the remarks, the emotional remarks, the perplexed remarks of the gentleman who preceded me.

I have a voting card too. And I don't know whether either Tom or Judy Price have been unemployed, or whether their brother or their sister have run out of unemployment insurance and have been left twisting in the wind. But this voting card could give them extended unemployment insurance.

I don't know whether Tom and Judy Price have employees who are making the minimum wage and living in poverty. This card could change that and up the minimum wage, but it hasn't been brought to the floor.

I tell my friend from Ohio, this card could fix what everybody agrees is a broken immigration system, but we are not using this card, I tell my friend from Ohio, because we are dabbling in the unrealistic.

This card, this card could pass export-import. He wants to grow jobs. Export-import is absolutely critical, and it phases out, and you will not bring it to this floor.

This card, and your card, joined together with 216 other cards, could pass all of those pieces of legislation. This card could make sure that Tom and Judy Price have an economy that is more resilient.

And this card—my friend from Ohio is distracted, but I tell my friend from Ohio, this card helped pass the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, without which Tom and Judy Price might not be in business today because your tax policies of 2001 and 2003, unpaid for, which were supposed to grow this economy, resulted in more loss of jobs than any policy since Herbert Hoover.

This card ought to be used today for fiscal responsibility. This card ought to be used to say to your chairman that you praised, DAVID CAMP, yes, we want to do comprehensive tax reform, not just little item by little item by little item, which destroys tax reform, which exacerbates our deficit, and will destroy investment in education, infrastructure, and growing our economy.

This card, I urge my colleagues to use responsibly this day.

All of us here support helping small businesses expand operations so they can hire more workers, all of us. Our Tax Code ought to encourage small businesses to do so.

But the Republican majority's approach to tax policy, evidenced by the two bills on the floor today, is simply the wrong path.

Do not use your card, given to you by the American people, trusting that you will do the responsible, commonsense thing, don't use this card irresponsibly today.

The bills we are considering today are the latest examples of Republican hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, hypocrisy on deficits, as their approach would raise deficits by hundreds of billions of dollars.

There is no free lunch. This pretends there is a free lunch.

Hypocrisy on tax policy is a representative rejection of the comprehensive approach to tax reform Republicans' own Ways and Means Chairman, DAVID CAMP, that the gentleman from Ohio just praised, put on this floor, or at least put on the table, not on the floor.

And the response of the Speaker of this House was, and I quote, ''Blah, blah, blah, blah.''

What a shame. How unserious.

While I have serious concerns about some of the policy changes that Chairman CAMP's proposal contains, it made the difficult choices and it was paid for. It was responsible.

Republicans and Democrats all say we want a comprehensive tax reform. This undermines tax reform. So if you say you are for comprehensive tax reform, don't do little, itty-bitty pieces that are unpaid for, exacerbate the deficit, and undermine tax reform.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. These bills today reject that approach and, instead, take the easy way out by irresponsibly adding their cost to the deficit, a deficit that my friends on the other side of the aisle, with whom I join, lament on a daily basis but, somehow, disconnect their policies from their lamentations.

In doing so, these bills will put even more pressure on a discretionary budget facing the return of sequester next year, undermining our ability to invest in critical priorities like veterans care, highways, education, bills to make sure that we grow our economy and create jobs.

Democrats are ready to make the hard choices so that we leave America a better country, not a poorer country, not a deeper in debt country, but a better country for our children and our grandchildren.

Rather than waste our time on these individual bills, Congress ought to debate and amend comprehensive tax reform, allowing us to face up to our responsibility to make the tough decisions the American people expect from their representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I don't live in a perfect Congress, none of us do, or in a country that always makes the right decisions. So I will vote for an MTR which says we are not going to permanently exacerbate our deficit, but we will make sure that business does have the opportunity to have these tax benefits, as we

have in a bipartisan basis done in the past.

So I will vote for the MTR. I will vote to make sure that we extend these for 2 years, as the Senate suggests. I don't think that is the best policy. It is not the policy I would choose. The policy I would choose is comprehensively giving permanent, long-term R&D, paid for so that we don't exacerbate the deficit, but we do give confidence so businesses can grow.

So I tell my friend from Ohio, we both have a card. The responsible step for us to take is to vote ''no'' on temporary and come with fiscally responsible legislation to this floor.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Hoosier State, Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a great member of the Ways and Means Committee and a member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee. He has provided great leadership on the subcommittee, and I appreciate his work.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act.

I want to thank my colleague, PAT TIBERI, for his hard work on this initiative, which is vital to the small businesses and farmers across my district.

I would be remiss if I didn't respond to the last speaker's comments, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland who, with a straight face, indicated that this card, his card, was a vehicle for fiscal responsibility when, consistently he has confused this card with this card, a credit card.

We have continued to rack up debts, over and over again, and we have not engaged in growth-oriented public policy, and that is what this bill is intended to do.

This bill increases the amount a small business taxpayer may immediately deduct when she buys operating materials for her business.

The ability of small businesses to immediately deduct the cost of qualified investment in the year purchased, rather than having to recover the cost through depreciation over several years, has been essential to the survival of thousands of firms over the past decade.

Higher expensing limits will encourage businesses to invest in new computers, tractors, and other types of business equipment and grow.

Such investment will have, of course, important second-order effects—economists tell us this—on the economy as these purchases are magnified throughout the nation.

The version of section 179 we are considering today expired at the end of 2012, and since then, back home I have heard from a parade of constituents, businessowners and workers alike, about the need to restore the provision.

I have heard from Indiana NFIB, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Manufacturers Association, Indiana Farm Bureau, and countless individual businesses and workers, and I am glad we are working in the House, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, to help unleash the ability of our Nation's small businesses to grow.

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

Mr. TIBERI. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. These small businesses are the engine of American job creation. They create roughly three out of five American jobs that have been created over recent years. And one critical means of supporting American small businesses and working Americans is through business tax incentives like section 179.

This is a proven success. It has proven itself over the last several years. And it is evident that these small businesses are one bright spot of job creation, personal opportunity, and upward mobility during these troubled times.

I support this commonsensical bill that is going to help small businesses grow and restore a measure of hope and opportunity to rank-and-file Americans during these troubled times.

I would like to thank Chairman TIBERI for his important work in offering this legislation.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their partisan reservations to supporting this measure.

□ 1045

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 1 minute and yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Indiana raised his credit card. He apparently is going to use his vote as you would use a credit card, to incur an additional $73 billion in unpaid for debt.

Mr. LEVIN. The whip is so correct.

The gentleman from Indiana is very confused. He is using his voting card as a credit card. $73 billion on this bill. Our voting card is not a credit card, but the Republicans are turning this into a credit card, with calamitous results.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Republicans would dig our country into another trillion dollars of debt, borrowing from the Chinese, the Saudis, whoever will lend it to us.

They have already approved borrowing $614 billion for business tax breaks, and they have told us that there are more on the way, more tax privileges, more tax exceptions, more tax advantages.

This bill today is just another chapter in their ledger of accounts payable for the American taxpayers. Such fiscal irresponsibility doesn't represent a plan for genuine tax relief for small businesses or for anyone else.

I will say that I agree with them, that small businesses have every reason to complain, as do individual taxpayers, because the Tax Code that they have done so much to write is riddled with special treatment for those who pay more to their lobbyists here in Washington than they do to the U.S. Treasury.

It has been a wise investment for them, but a pretty sorry outcome for small business and individual taxpayers. We have some multinational companies who have set up hundreds of offshore subsidiaries to shift their profits out of America and into a place where they don't pay a dime.

I can tell you that the cleaning crew at the headquarters of General Electric pays a higher tax rate than General Electric does. That is not fair. They pay a higher tax rate than Joe's Bakery or Patty's Taco House down in San Antonio.

That is not fair. It ought to be corrected; but instead, they have added almost another $100 billion in tax loopholes that they have proposed and have approved in committee to help those folks continue dodging their taxes.

At the same time, the proponents of today's bills tell us that America simply cannot afford more to educate its children. Only the day before yesterday, the Senate refused to address the problem of soaring student debt, now bigger than credit card debt, exceeded only by the giant debt they want to incur for more tax breaks.

They tell us: we can't afford to do the research necessary to cure Alzheimer's or to find new solutions to cancer and AIDS and other dreaded diseases.

This is not about borrowing to raise small business up. This is just an excuse to reduce the government investment that we need to grow our economy.

Apparently, to the Republicans, deficits only matter when asking seniors and students and others to sacrifice, but not when it comes to adding one tax break after another.

Now, how did we get to the situation that we are in today? Well, there has been a convenient amnesia about the history of tax reform in this Congress. Last January, the gentleman from Ohio—the Speaker—and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) came to this floor and they said: America, have we got a deal for you.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. We have got a great deal for you. This big old fat Tax Code that is bigger than the Bible many times over, that we helped expand to resolve the needs of our special interest supporters, we are going to put it on a diet. We are going to thin it down.

We are going to give you a simple Tax Code that is easy to comply with. In addition to that, we are going to lower your rate; and you know what, we are going to do all that, and we are not going to add a penny to the national debt, and we will keep the rates relatively the same for everybody.

They reserved H.R. 1. They said: it is so important, we are going to make it the number one priority here. Where are we on that bill, I would ask the gentleman today; and I can tell you it is still reserved for the Speaker.

They have never brought it out, put it on this table, and given the American people a chance to vote on it because what happened was they went through a long process, they produced their draft bill, and the lobby went wild against it. They could not stand up to the very people that helped them write the complex, unfair Tax Code that we have today.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. They couldn't stand up to those special interests, so that bill, 18 months later—not the result of anything the Democrats did, not the result of anything the President did—they couldn't agree among themselves about how to respond to all those special interest pressures.

So they are back today, going one little bill at a time to add a few hundred billion here, a few hundred billion dollars there, and not provide the comprehensive tax reform they told us, themselves, they would be providing, and that is why we find ourselves in the predicament we are in today.

I agree with the gentleman, people in Ohio, across America, in Texas, and elsewhere, that they have reason to question this Congress, because a promise is just like that.

Promises to bring reform, to work together in a bipartisan fashion left on the cutting room floor because special interests, the people that don't pay their fair share of taxes today, they want to keep it that way. They want to continue to disadvantage small business and individual taxpayers.

Today, we need to say ''no'' to this measure and ''no'' to their other temporary measures and demand real reform.

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

Just for the record, the gentleman from Texas has voted for the policy of either increasing or extending section 179, without offsets, six times on a temporary basis for a total of 8 years.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBERI. The gentleman from Michigan has time to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The motion to recommit that the minority keeps talking about today will add billions to the deficit as well, and as I explained earlier, the problem with the narrative of We have done it this way, we are going to do it again, and the problem with surrender, as was talked about by the gentleman from Massachusetts, who I have a great deal of respect for, is the fact that we are missing the point of what is happening in the real America.

Real Americans see that we, on this floor, get a stimulus bill by the other side, in 2009—and I was here—jammed down our throats that added $1 trillion to the deficit.

Today, the minority is concerned about the deficit, and I assume they want those same small business owners who are trying so hard to create jobs with additional regulations—like Tom and Judy Price face—and they want them to pay more taxes, that is the bottom line; but when they have increased the debt before—whether it is for temporary tax policy or additional spending—there was no concern about the deficit and the debt.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary Lew, in a speech at the Economic Club in New York, said, ''The U.S. could face a permanent downturn in economic growth without increased business investment.''

How timely—because if you go to my district and talk to Tom Price or talk to Gary Skinner, who owns a farm—and I had the privilege of being in his combine, that combine costs $250,000—guess what: it is about this provision today.

The reality with our unpermanent extender policy, with respect to the investments that Mr. Lew talked about yesterday, is that real job creators who are trying to grow their businesses, hire more people—so people like my dad, when I was in high school—wouldn't have to get unemployment, like he did or my dad—who was an immigrant, so I understand a little bit about immigration—despite the fact that the gentleman from Maryland might not think so—and mom, another immigrant—could get jobs. That is what this is all about.

All you have to do is go talk to these job creators who are looking at us with a whole lot of perplexed looks as to: Why can't we change the narrative? Why can't the House have a position to negotiate with the Senate? Why does it have to always be, well, this is the way we have done it retroactively for 2 years, this is the way we will do it again?

That gives no certainty to these job creators, to these farmers. That is what this debate is all about, ladies and gentlemen.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Ohio talk about his concern for small businesses and the economy. I am reflecting on the thousands of businesses that were represented here on Capitol Hill this week, calling on Congress to get its act together, dealing with transportation funding.

We are facing a crisis in transportation in this country. The majority, because they couldn't put together a transportation bill last year, drove the highway trust fund down to zero. They milked every single dime to be able to get a 27-month extension.

What has happened? Well, actually, what has happened is that it is not even going to last until October 1. All across the country, States are cutting back on funding contracts now because the Department of Transportation is going to run out of money late this summer.

These people were rallying on Capitol Hill, large business, small business, environment, unions, from all across America, saying: Congress, get your act together.

I will note, with some small amount of irony, that my friends on the Ways and Means Committee have approved over $600 billion of tax breaks added to the deficit that would have fully funded not one 6-year transportation bill, but two robust transportation bills.

Did you listen to those small businesses? Did you listen to the contractors? Did you listen to the equipment rental people, the asphalt, the gravel, the concrete? To those people, we have turned a deaf ear.

The Ways and Means Committee, in 42 months, has not had a single hearing on transportation finance. We had one misguided work session on a bill that had never had the benefit of a hearing that collapsed. They passed it out of committee, but they couldn't even bring it to the floor, so we got this 27-month extension.

We are facing, this summer, losing 700,000 construction jobs because Congress refuses to act. My friends on Ways and Means won't even have a hearing on transportation, will approve $600 billion worth of tax cuts; but we are not dealing with a crisis for your State, for my State, red States, blue States, union and nonunion, big business, small business, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the building trades. Let's get a grip.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If you care about small business, if you care about the health and welfare of your community, if you care about the future of the economy, read the Standard & Poor's report that pointed out that the investments we make will pay for themselves many times over.

It is not just saving those 700,000 jobs. It is an opportunity to grow the economy in the future in something that doesn't have to be conservative, liberal, red State, blue State. It is an opportunity to bring America together to rebuild and renew our economy.

That is what we should be focusing on, rather than this sideshow today that is going to make long-term tax reform harder, add to the deficit, and not deal with the fundamental problems that our constituents were asking us to deal with this week.

There were thousands of them here rallying before the Congress. We turned a deaf ear. Is this really the best we could come up with?

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter addressed to me and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative RON KIND, dated June 9, from many employers. In fact, it represents millions of job creators throughout America and their support for making permanent this provision of section 179 of our Tax Code.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
June 10, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, introduced by Reps. Pat Tiberi (R–OH) and Ron Kind (D–WI). This bipartisan legislation restores and makes permanent the enhanced Section 179 expensing provisions that expired at the end of 2013.

Enhanced Section 179 expensing allows small and medium-sized manufacturers to immediately write off up to $500,000 of investments in new property and equipment in the year purchased, rather than depreciating the cost of the investment overtime. Making this provision a permanent part of the tax code will provide these job creators with the certainty needed for effective business planning. In reducing the after-tax cost of investments, the legislation will help spur much-needed investments in new property and sales of capital equipment. Since 2003, Congress has steadily increased the amount of investment that small businesses can expense, from $25,000 to $500,000.

Capital investment is key to economic growth, job creation and competitiveness. Thus, NAM members strongly support H.R. 4457 and urge Congress to pass this important legislation.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on H.R. 4457 may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 113th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

JUNE 9, 2014.

Hon. PAT TIBERI,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON KIND,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TIBERI AND KIND: The undersigned organizations, representing millions of businesses from every state and from every industry sector, are writing in strong support of H.R. 4457, the America's Small Business Tar Relief Act of 2014. This vital legislation would restore the small business expensing—sometimes called Section 179 expensing—level to $500,000, including limited improvements to real property and permanently index the level to inflation.

Small business expensing allows business owners to immediately deduct the cost of a qualified investment in the year that it is purchased, rather than being forced to depreciate the cost of the investment over time. Since 2003, Congress has steadily increased the amount of investment that small businesses can expense from $25,000 to $500,000. Support for this expansion has been longstanding, bipartisan and widespread. Legislation expanding and/or extending small business expensing has been enacted eight times, across two Presidential Administrations and six Congresses, under both Democratic and Republican leadership. These higher expensing limits were temporary, however, and beginning in 2014 they reverted to $25,000 and will remain there unless Congress acts.

While expensing provides important relief to small business owners, it is not a ''tax cut'' or a ''tax loophole.'' Small business expensing simply gives companies the ability to recover the cost of investing in their own businesses more quickly than if they use depreciation. Expensing does not lead to a loss of revenue to the government over the lifetime of an investment—it is not a matter of if revenue is collected, but when. Additionally, small business expensing is available to all small businesses that purchase less than a specified amount of equipment each year.

Small business expensing gives business owners the ability to maximize investment in their companies during years when they have positive cash flow. This provides an incentive for small business owners to reinvest in their businesses, which fuels expansion, growth and jobs. This is particularly important for small businesses because they are more sensitive than larger firms to problems related to cash flow and are more reliant on earnings to finance new investment.

Additionally, small business expensing simplifies record-keeping and paperwork. Under standard depreciation, small business owners must keep records of, and file tax paperwork associated with, eligible investments for up to 39 years. According to a 2007 Internal Revenue Service (IRS) study, each small business devotes, on average, about 240 hours complying with the tax code, and spends over $2,000 in tax compliance costs each year. An overwhelming share of the time burden is due to record-keeping. Furthermore, high tax compliance costs consistently rank as a top concern of small business owners, and act as a drag on investment, growth and innovation. Small business expensing, as the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) notes, reduces the compliance burden for many taxpayers, freeing up time and resources to better devote to their businesses.

The roller-coaster, ad-hoc changes in the level of small business expensing, which have often been enacted retroactively in recent years, has greatly contributed to uncertainty and prevented long-term planning. Making the higher small business expensing limits permanent and predictable would greatly reduce uncertainty and reduce the incidence of tax policy driving business decisions.

Passage of legislation permanently maintaining small business expensing at $500,000 will increase investment and jobs, reduce complexity and paperwork and alleviate uncertainty. These are critical issues for small businesses, which continue to experience a challenging business climate in the face of a stagnant economic recovery. We thank you for introducing H.R. 4457, the America's Small Business Tar Relief Act of 2014 and urge all Members of Congress to support this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Academy of General Dentistry, Advanced Medical Technology Association's Emerging Growth Company Council, Aeronautical Repair Station Association, Agricultural Retailers Association, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, American Apparel & Footwear Association, American Association of Small Property Owners, American Composites Manufacturers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Dental Association, American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Foundry Society, American Loggers Council, American Moving & Storage Association, American Rental Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Travel Agents, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Supply Association, American Truck Dealers, Americans for Tax Reform, AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology, Arizona Small Business Association.

Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Builders and Contractors—Greater Tennessee Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors Florida East Coast Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors, Rocky Mountain Chapter, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors, Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc., Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Pool & Spa Professionals, Association of the Wall and Ceiling Industry.

Auto Care Association, Aviation Suppliers Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, Carolinas Food Industry Council, CCIM Institute, Chamber of Commerce Southern, New Jersey, Clean Water Construction Coalition, Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Marketers Association, Construction Industry Round Table, Cotton Warehouse Association of America, Delaware Retail Council.

Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, Foodservice Equipment Distributors Association, Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association, Hearth, Patio & Barbecue Association, Heating, Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Independent Electrical Contractors, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Manufacturers Association, Industrial Supply Association, Inland Pacific Chapter Associated Builders & Contractors, Institute of Real Estate Management.

International Association of Plastics Distribution (IAPD), International Cemetery, Cremation and Funeral Association, International Council of Shopping Centers, International Dairy Foods Association, International Franchise Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Irrigation Association, ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Louisiana Logging Council, Metals Service Center Institute, Michigan Association of Timbermen, Michigan Grocers Association.

Missouri Forest Products Association, Modification and Replacement Parts Association, Montana Equipment Dealers Association, Montana Restaurant Association, Montana Retail Association, Montana Tire Dealers Association, National Apartment Association, National Association of Chemical Distributers, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders.

National Association of REALTORS°, National Association of Shell Marketers, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Automobile Dealers Association, National Beer Wholesalers Association (NBWA), National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Confectioners Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council.

National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Manufacturers Representatives Association, National Fastener Distributors Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Funeral Directors Association, National Golf Course Owners Association, National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Distributors Association, National Multifamily Housing Council.

National Pork Producers Council, National Potato Council, National Propane Gas Association, National Restaurant Association,

National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Small Business Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, National Utility Contractors Association (NUCA), NATSO, Representing America's Truckstops and Travel Plazas, New Jersey Business & Industry Association.

Non-Ferrous Founders' Society, North Carolina Retail Merchants Association, North Country Chamber of Commerce, North-American Association of Uniform Manufacturers & Distributors, Northern Arizona Loggers Association, NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Converting Technologies, NTEA—The Association for the Work Truck Industry, Ohio Grocers Association, Outdoor Power Equipment and Engine Service Association, Pacific-West Fastener Association, Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry.

Petroleum Marketers & Convenience Stores of Iowa, Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association of Kansas, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors' National Association, Printing Industries of America, Professional Logging Contractors of Maine, S Corporation Association, SC Timber Producers Association, Selected Independent Funeral Homes, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council.

Small Business Legislative Counsel, Society of American Florists, South Carolina Retail Association, SouthWestern Association, Specialty Equipment Market Association, SP1: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Tennessee Hospitality & Tourism Association, Textile Care Allied Trades Association.

The Outdoor Power Equipment and Engine Service Association (OPEESA), Tire Industry Association, Truck Renting and Leasing Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United Egg Producers, United Producers, Inc., USA Rice Federation.

Utility & Transportation Contractors Association of New Jersey, Western Growers Association, Western United Dairymen, Wichita Independent Business Association, Wisconsin Grocers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce, Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Woodworking Machinery Industry Association.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the letter that I received from the National Association of Manufacturers. Having certainty over the tax treatment of critical investments will make planning for future investments significantly easier.

Capital investment is key to economic growth, job creation, and competitiveness.

Consequently, enactment of this policy would amount to a major step towards a Tax Code that will promote investment.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, again, this is all about jobs. Whether it is on a family farm, whether it is in a mulch business, whether it is a small manufacturer, this is about increasing jobs. Even Mr. Lew said we have a significant problem that we are facing about capital investments. This is, over the last 50 years, a tried-and-true provision that we know creates jobs. And to provide certainty is so critical. If we talk to those job creators—I have talked to them, Mr. Speaker. This is so important to give them certainty over time, not retroactivity like the narrative that we fall into.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished gentleman of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I was proud earlier this year to introduce the America's Small Business Tax Relief Act with my good friend and colleague from the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. TIBERI, the small business expensing provision that is before us.

I get the feeling that during today's debate we are talking past each other because I fully support the policy goals behind the small business expensing bill. It is important that we find a way to get this done. It is important that we establish permanency in the Tax Code, just as I was supportive of introducing legislation on the S Corporation Modernization bill earlier this year with my friend, DAVE REICHERT, on the committee. Many of those provisions were addressed earlier this morning.

But the difference in today's debate, and really the difference in our party's approach to this policy change, comes down to one simple idea: whether we are going to have the fiscal discipline to pay for these permanent changes in the Tax Code or whether we are going to continue to wrack up the debt and leave a legacy of debt for these children, our children and grandchildren, throughout the country.

That is the only difference that we have in today's debate, not about the policy behind it and the permanent nature and the importance to small businesses and family farmers, but whether we are going to exercise the fiscal discipline to do this the right way rather than continuing to dig this deficit hole deeper and leaving this for future generations to contend with. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' and continue focusing on comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I give the chairman of our committee, DAVE CAMP, credit for introducing a draft discussion proposal on comprehensive reform because we have been guided in the last few years under a simple rule of proposition that if we are going to reduce tax rates, if we are going to broaden the base, and if we are going to simplify the Code and make it more competitive, then we have to find offsets in it so we are not blowing holes in the deficit in the future. And Chairman CAMP stayed true to that discipline.

What is ironic is that now, just a few short weeks after the introduction of that, we are right back into these old bad habits of introducing tax cuts with no pay-fors—with no offsets—just to increase the debt for future generations. And what is especially ironic today is this comes just a few short weeks after they passed their own Republican budget resolution that has specifically stated in it that if we are going to do permanent change to the Tax Code, they have to be offset. They have to be paid for.

So which is it? A few weeks ago when you were singing the praises of fiscal discipline supporting that budget resolution and talking about how you are going to make the tough choices? Or today, with permanently changing with no offsets? And there is a difference, I tell my friend from Ohio, between some of the short-term extensions that are meant to keep the pressure on permanent changes versus what is being attempted today.

Because he knows, as I do, and as everyone else knows, that the number of times that this Congress has taken a vote for a permanent change in the Tax Code with no pay-for and no offset has been zero. It has been zero.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KIND. But what we also know around here is what does work. And what does work is pay-as-you-go budgetary rules. That was something that was in place during the 1990s with the support of President George H. W. Bush at the time and President Clinton at the time. And because of a strong, growing, robust economy that created 24 million jobs during that time, and along with pay-as-you-go budgeting discipline, we ended up with 4 years of budget surpluses that we were paying down the national debt rather than adding to it. And that soon was replaced by the next administration and a Republican Congress that supported two wars with no pay-fors, supported two large tax cuts with no pay-fors, and supported the largest increase in Medicare spending—the part D prescription drug bill—without a nickel of it being paid for and supported the largest increase in discretionary spending since the Great Society without paying for any of it.

So when President Obama took office, he inherited—he inherited—a $1.5 trillion budget deficit. And if the people are wondering how we dig a hole like that, they need only look at bills that are on the floor today. We are talking about permanent changes to the Tax Code with no pay-fors.

We can do better. I know it is hard work to do comprehensive tax reform. It means our having to stand up and saying no to a lot of powerful special interests in this town, but it is exactly what we have to have the courage to do to do it the right way so we are not leaving this legacy of debt to these children and to future generations to wrestle with.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. TIBERI. I have no further speakers, sir, and I am prepared to close.

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

The fact of the matter is that this provision is going to be extended. And

you can vote for Mr. NEAL's motion to recommit. I guess it is against your creed to vote for it, so you can vote ''no.'' But you will vote later. And it may be a few months from now, it may not be until after the election. I think it would be better to do it now, if not now then in the next month.

So don't scare, Mr. TIBERI, the small business people in your district. Tell them what the reality is. We are going to extend this. But we are not going to make it permanent unpaid for. It hasn't been done before for good reason, including the need to review it now and then, and also to take into account the cost. I think what the Republicans are doing, to kind of use an old slogan, an old way of saying it, you are giving hypocrisy a bad name.

This is contrary to your budget that you voted for. It is contrary to the Republican Ways and Means tax provisions put together under the leadership of Mr. DAVE CAMP. What is going to happen is, when you add all this together, you have an astronomical addition to the debt—$614 billion, climbing, if you follow this path, to $1 trillion.

So, I think there is no choice here to avoid hypocrisy, or if you want to continue the hypocrisy on your side, vote for this. We are not going to do that. This is a bad idea to proceed this way. We support continuation of this provision, in a responsible, not an irresponsible way, and in a way that isn't reckless.

So I strongly urge all the Democrats to look at the full picture here, the hypocrisy on their side and the ramifications, if we continue on this path, for the programs that we believe in, the programs that have helped to make the middle class of America and the programs that need to be continued and not snuffed out because the Republicans, on the one hand, essentially skyrocketed the debt, and then they come back to us and say, we are sorry that we are so in debt that we have to keep cutting the programs that middle America counts on for their livelihood, for their jobs, for their education, and their health.

So I strongly urge a ''no'' vote, and I look forward to the motion to recommit by Mr. NEAL.

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

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

I will tell the gentleman from Michigan my constituents don't have to be scared. They watch us. I don't have to tell them anything. And I am certainly not going to tell Mr. Skinner or Mr. Price, trust us, we will retroactively, we will, ladies and gentlemen, we will retroactively—because we are going to surrender today—we are going to retroactively pass a policy in November or December to allow you to expense something that you bought in June, because today Mr. Price needs to buy a loader for his mulch business.

And he scratches his head; retroactively? Retroactively? You guys don't know what operating businesses are all about if you are talking about retroactively, because that has been the narrative here. The other narrative is that the Senate is not going to do it. Well, with all due respect, after the R&D tax credit debate on this floor when the same argument was used, Senator BARBARA BOXER—not someone who I agree with a lot on things—said that maybe we should look at making that permanent. Senator DICK DURBIN from Illinois, a member of the Democrat leadership, opened up the possibility of maybe we should make some of these permanent. Tom and Judy Price would be proud of Mr. DURBIN. I don't know if Mr. DURBIN has run a business or not, but Mr. Price does with his wife.

Ladies and gentlemen, this should be about common sense. Nobody is pure here. We have all added to the deficit. I would argue that the deficit was much higher when the other side was in control. Those are numbers. Less today, less last year, a lot more than 2009, I think we would all agree, the deficit, yearly deficit, the debt is certainly higher. The MTR will create debt. According to the Joint Tax, my bill will as well.

But this is about job creators, about allowing them to invest, invest to grow their businesses, to hire more employees, the American Dream that my mom and dad came here to believe and live in, ladies and gentlemen. In a House that my daughter—my daughter in sixth grade understands that we have a right as a House to pass a bill and have a position that might be different than the Senate's. God forgive us for having a different position than the Senate. But just because the Senate wants to do 2 years doesn't mean we have to do 2 years.

I don't understand that narrative. Even some of my colleagues say, well, why are we doing this because the Senate doesn't agree? Give me a break, ladies and gentlemen. Let's have a conference committee for once. Wouldn't that be great? That would be grand. And we can fight it out in conference committee just like the Founders told us we should.

Ladies and gentlemen, with respect to tax policy, there has been no Member of the House, the Senate, and the administration that has provided leadership to get to comprehensive tax reform like DAVID CAMP. He has been bipartisan, he has been open, and he has provided incredible leadership. But as all of us know in looking at history, one House can't provide leadership. You need an executive at the White House who is going to provide leadership. And, quite frankly, we have had none.

I credit RON WYDEN, the chairman of the Senate, he has got a bill at least. He has got a draft. I might not agree with his draft, but he has a right to have a draft, and the Senate has a right to have a position. And do you know what? Maybe one day we will get there soon, Mr. NEAL. I know you are for that. I am for that. But we should have a House position. We should not surrender to the Senate.

But to get comprehensive tax reform done, ladies and gentlemen, we have to have leadership in the White House. We can't do it alone.

I thank Mr. CAMP for his service. He has moved the ball on comprehensive tax reform greater than anybody has here since I have been here. But today is not about comprehensive tax reform, unfortunately. It is about providing certainty to small businessowners—our job creators in America. This is what they want. This is what they need. This is what has been proven to be successful to allow them to expand their businesses. And today, if Tom Price buys a loader for $200,000, he has to expense it over 7 years. His cash flow is killed, and I am not going to go tell him, ''don't worry. Trust me. We will do it in December retroactively.'' I will not do that.

□ 1115

We need to have a position. We need to do it today. We need to do it right. This is about policy. This shouldn't be about politics. This should be about the House's position.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to put the politics aside, quite frankly, and support this bill, have the House have a position, and let's challenge the Senate, and let's do it before November, before December. Let's do it now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act Of 2014.

H.R. 4457 permanently sets the IRC Section 179 small business expensing maximum limit at $500,000. In order to remain profitable and be competitive, small business like limousine owners as represented by the National Limousine Association, farmers and ranchers, and others must continually upgrade and replace equipment, buildings, and storage facilities.

A This is a very important provision due to its immediacy for small business owners.

With provisions like Section 179, businesses are able to reduce maintenance costs, take advantage of labor-saving advances, become more energy-efficient and adopt technology that is environmentally friendly.

Section 179 allows a taxpayer to deduct the cost of new or used business property rather than depreciating the cost over a longer period of time. The immediate expensing provided by Section 179 allows these businesses increased cash flow for purchases that might otherwise be delayed or that would require them to incur debt expense.

The bill would make permanent rules that allow small businesses to expense capital investments in new equipment and property, making permanent provisions that provide that the maximum amount that a taxpayer may expense is $500,000.

Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, this bill is estimated to cost $73.1 billion over 10 years and it is not paid for, which means that the deficit will necessarily go up as a result.

The Congressional Research Service has reviewed quantitative analyses of the tax

break and found that, ". . . accelerated depreciation in general is a relatively ineffective tool for stimulating the economy."

Mr. Speaker, I understand the point that supporters of the bill argue: that it is necessary to ensure that small businesses can continue to make new investments in property and equipment even as costs rise, affecting more than 10 percent of small-business tax returns.

They say it lowers the cost of capital for tangible property used in business, eliminates depreciation record-keeping requirements with respect to expensed property and removes a disincentive to buying more efficient cooling and heating equipment.

Democrats generally support increased expensing under Section 179 but we cannot sit idly by while the party which has made deficit reduction their rallying cry—refuses to offset the cost of the bill.

It must be noted that permanently extending six tax provisions that GOP leaders want to act on would add $310 billion to the deficit.

With the bills on the floor today, Republicans are continuing their gross double standard of adding billions to the deficit to fund permanent tax breaks for businesses, while insisting on fully offsetting the cost of initiatives for middle class and working Americans, including veterans benefits, student loans, and unemployment insurance.

The Democratic Motions to Recommit would put the brakes on Republicans' deficit-busting spending spree, and shorten these tax extensions. Democrats have always strongly supported expanded "Section 179" expensing for small businesses and tax relief for S-Corporations, but permanent extensions of tax breaks that cost hundreds of billions are hypocritical and irresponsible.

We need comprehensive tax reform that addresses the tax needs of middle class families as well as businesses. In the meantime, Republicans shouldn't be punching hundred billion dollar holes in the deficit.

It is time for Republicans to stop ignoring hard working American families, and work with Democrats to create jobs, invest in innovation, and build an economy that works for everyone not just the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for a two-year extension but these bills must be paid for—because if they are not—future generations will suffer because of the unsustainable debt.

Let us get back to being fiscally responsible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NEAL. In its current form, I am opposed to this legislation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4457 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF EXPENSING LIMITATION.

(a) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''or 2013'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''after 2013'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''after 2015''.

(b) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''or 2013'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''after 2013'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''after 2015''.

(c) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''before 2014'' and inserting ''before 2016''.

(d) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended by striking ''before 2014'' and inserting ''before 2016''.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking ''or 2013'' and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015''.

(2) CARRYOVER.—Paragraph (4) of section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking ''2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''2015''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the reading of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

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

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit must be pretty powerful with that confab that had to take place on the other side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. TIBERI—and he is my friend—and I am going to remind all that Mr. CAMP did a pretty good job with the draft that he put out. That is not what this is about today.

This is about short-circuiting a long tradition in the Ways and Means Committee as to how tax reform ought to be handled. A reminder, again, 1986 was the last time that we spoke of tax reform in an earnest manner. Mr. TIBERI was, indeed, very animated. I understand the point that he is making.

The problem is, if you do a piecemeal approach to tax reform, you will never do fundamental tax reform. It is like the temptation of repatriation. If you repatriate those dollars, you will never do tax reform. People will just wait for another tax holiday. That is the weakness of the argument that we just heard. A 2-year extension makes a good deal of sense—let some of this economic morass clear up.

Now, Mr. TIBERI was correct when he quoted Jack Lew, an old friend. Economic growth is very weak. The number of people working is the real issue; 200,000 jobs a month won't do it. So why can't we find common purpose and expand the runway in terms of economic growth for all members of the American family? Are you telling me that this austerity package has worked?

By the way, Mr. TIBERI's comment when Mr. TIBERI said the investing class in America and the business class, they are looking for stability, they look at this institution every day and think that they are finding stability, with the arguments that take place here?

There are enough men and women in this institution and on the Ways and Means Committee of good will to continue the conversation that Mr. CAMP has begun on tax reform. This is piecemeal. It is an ill-conceived manner and way to do tax reform.

Again, a reminder, the last time we did tax reform, the Internet had not been invented. That ought to tell us the story.

Here is what tax reform might look like: acknowledging that fossil fuel is not going away in the near future, we can still build a path to the renewables by using the Tax Code.

Let's expand the earned income tax credit. Let's embrace new markets tax credits. They have worked in every nook and cranny of this country. Let's take a look and embrace, again, build America bonds.

In reference to Mr. TIBERI's commentary, let me say this as well: yes, we need a permanent R&D credit, but let's make it even more robust. We heard a presentation yesterday in Massachusetts that, in Cambridge and Boston today, you have the greatest concentration of R&D in the world. Do you think I am not for a more robust research and development credit?

Again, good minds ought to be able to find this path forward, and I challenge the Republicans today: let's get on with renewing the Export-Import Bank. That makes a good deal of sense as well, and you know why—because it is sound economic policy.

This idea that theology takes over all in tax debate is a mistake. Embrace what works, not just the rigid ideology of the intransigence that keeps us from finding a common path.

We started out 3 years ago with Mr. CAMP's work. For 3 years, we sat together, talked, took substantive testimony, and listened to what people had to say. Come in and defend your preference, come in and defend this deduction. Actually, the conversation was very good.

I can't understand the logic of that very sound conversation bringing us to this intersection of public debate. Are we to throw all of that good will over the side? In this simple moment, are

we going to cast aside a deliberative process that really was much of the better that I have had a chance to witness in almost 25 years on the Ways and Means Committee?

That is what you are doing today. You adopt these piecemeal approaches to tax reform, you will never get tax reform.

Think of these numbers: there is more than $2 trillion sitting offshore in cash and tangible assets. The bottom lines of corporate America are stronger than they have been in years.

My last point, downward pressure on wages since 2002 ought to be what motivates us to do tax reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, you know what I hear from the other side? They are happy with the way things are. They are happy with a contracting economy, negative 1 percent growth in the last quarter. They are happy with fewer people in the workforce than the Carter years.

They are happy with more young people living at home than ever before. They are happy with declining incomes for the middle class because they are saying just keep doing what we have been doing.

In fact, as I think about it, my friend from Massachusetts said:

> Let's just wait and let the economic morass clear up.

That is a direct quote.

> Let's just wait.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. No, I will not yield. The gentleman has had his time. I have very limited time here.

Let me just say: if we just sit and wait, nothing is going to change. This policy has been extended many, many times for more than the budget window, unpaid for, with large bipartisan votes. Clearly, at the end of the year, this policy will be extended, unpaid for.

So why not do something good for America? Why not do something good for those employers and those workers who are looking for an economy that starts to recover?

We are the only nation in the world that has temporary tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that lets significant policies that help people invest and create jobs expire. At the end of the year, this will have been expired for a year, and then we will retroactively put it in place, but what we really need is permanent policy.

So let's stop threatening small businesses with higher costs. That absolutely makes no sense. Let's get people back to work. Let's get people earning higher paychecks. Let's do something right for America. Vote against this motion to recommit and vote for the bill.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 4457 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4457, if ordered; the motion to recommit on H.R. 4453; passage of H.R. 4453, if ordered; and adoption of House Resolution 617.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 232, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—180

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

NAYS—232

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
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)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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—19

Bachmann
Cantor
Crowley
Engel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
McHenry
Meng
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Speier

□ 1149

Messrs. HUDSON, KELLY of Pennsylvania, STIVERS, ADERHOLT, MARINO, YOUNG of Alaska, BILIRAKIS, HUELSKAMP, SCALISE, and

PERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CLYBURN, CARSON of Indiana, BECERRA, and HIMES changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 12, 2014 I missed a recorded vote, rollcall No. 308, the motion to recommit H.R. 4457. I would have voted ''yes'' on this measure.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2014, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act (rollcall No. 308). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 144, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—272

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

NAYS—144

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
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
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Coble
Granger
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Stutzman
Webster (FL)

□ 1157

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 229, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—188

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

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
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
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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—14

Bucshon
Coble
Granger
Harper
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Terry

□ 1203

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 155, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—263

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

NAYS—155

Bass
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
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
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Coble
Duffy
Granger
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
Lummis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)

□ 1209

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY BOKO HARAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 617) condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the terrorist group known as Boko Haram in northeastern provinces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—411

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
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
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
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
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
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
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.
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
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
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
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
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Jones
Massie

NOT VOTING—18

Braley (IA)
Coble
Granger
Grijalva
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Rogers (MI)
Ryan (OH)
Smith (MO)
Waters
Whitfield

□ 1215

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 308 and 310 I was not available to cast my vote in person. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 309, 311, and 312 I was not available to cast my vote in person. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1681. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL 5 PM FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 2014, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until 5 p.m. on Friday, June 13, 2014, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, one, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and, two, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 17, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

A JOB WELL DONE

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

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a recent display of distinguished heroism by the brave men of the fire department of New York.

On the morning of June 5, 2014, a massive five-alarm fire erupted in the Rosebank section of Staten Island. The firefighters from Engine 161/Ladder 81 quickly arrived on the scene and set to work battling the blaze. With choking smoke and rising flames, firefighters Ed Morri, Billy Calderon, and Thomas Verderosa ascended to the second-floor bedroom of the Rivera Family's burning home and carried the couple to safety just in the nick of time. A mere two more gasps of smoke would have proven fatal for Mrs. Rivera, who was unconscious when fireman Billy Calderon saved her life.

Engine 161's daring rescue is yet another testament to the enormous dangers faced by our firefighters. It also

demonstrates the importance of ensuring that the FDNY continues to receive the proper resources and training and that crucial engine companies like 161 are spared from the budget chopping block.

On behalf of all of the residents of Staten Island, I am proud to recognize and commend Engine 161/Ladder 81—and all of the firefighters who assisted—for a job well done.

RECIPROCAL ACCESS TO TIBET ACT

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act, H.R. 4851. This bipartisan bill promotes access to Tibetan areas of China for U.S. officials, journalists, and average citizens. Currently, travel restrictions on Tibet are more severe than for any other provincial-level entity of China.

These restrictions have negative consequences for both U.S. citizens and Tibetans. After an October 2013 bus crash with Americans on board, U.S. consular officers faced prolonged delays in obtaining access to Tibet, hindering their ability to serve Americans in distress; and restricted access to Tibet leaves Tibetans in virtual isolation from the world community, limiting international exchange and the ability to objectively assess the human rights situation there.

These restrictions are not reciprocal to the access that Chinese visitors generally enjoy in the U.S. As reciprocity is the basis for diplomacy, this bill renders inadmissible to the U.S. Chinese officials who design and implement these restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to join Congressman PITTS and me in promoting freer access to Tibet.

RECIPROCAL ACCESS TO TIBET ACT OF 2014

Purpose: To promote the freedom to travel by U.S. diplomats, journalists, and citizens in Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China.

What it does: Prohibits visa access to the United States to Chinese officials in 'senior leadership positions' from provinces with Tibetan populations, and others, if the Chinese government allows less U.S. access to Tibetan areas than it gives to non-Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China (PRC).

How it works:

1. Report on access and leaders. The State Department is required to give Congress a report on (a) the level of access granted by Chinese authorities to U.S. diplomats, journalists, and tourists to Tibetan areas in the PRC, including a comparison with non-Tibetan areas, and (b) a list of 'senior leadership positions' in Tibetan areas, including at the provincial level and some at the national level.

2. Visa ban. Chinese officials are not eligible for visa entry to the U.S., as follows—

'Senior leaders' from the Tibet Autonomous Region, if the Tibet Tourism Bureau permit has not been revoked;

'Senior leaders' from Sichuan, Qinghai, Yunnan and Gansu, if level of U.S. access to Tibetan areas in these provinces is more restricted than U.S. access to non-Tibetan areas;

'Senior leaders' at the regional and national level, if Tibet Tourism Bureau permit has not been revoked and if U.S. access to Tibetan areas in the four provinces is more restricted than U.S. access to non-Tibetan areas.

National interest waiver. The bill allows the Secretary of State to waive the prohibition if determined to be in the national interest.

Definitions. The report defines Tibetan areas as the Tibet Autonomous Region and the jurisdictions within the provinces of Sichuan, Qinghai, Yunnan and Gansu designated as autonomous for Tibetans. It provides definitions for 'senior leadership positions' at the county, prefecture, provincial, and national level.

Non-binding language on visa reciprocity. Expresses Sense of the House that the Secretary should take into account the level of access granted to Tibetan areas when granting visas to people from the PRC to come to the U.S.

[Prepared by the International Campaign on Tibet June 12, 2014]

FACT SHEET: ACCESS TO TIBET BY AMERICANS

WHAT CHINA SAYS: TIBET IS OPEN TO FOREIGNERS

The government of China sees tourism as a pillar of Tibet's economy. Chinese officials have said that Tibet is open to foreign visitors:

''[I]f a foreign official, reporter or scholar wants to go to Tibet as an individual to increase his or her understanding of the Tibetan people and their culture, we will welcome them.''—Zhu Weiqun, executive vice minister of the United Front Work Department, 2012.[1]

''Many foreigners, including reporters, have traveled to Tibet for work, tours and interviews. I believe we'll see more foreigners coming to Tibet as the region develops and conditions improve constantly.''—Padma Trinley, chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Region legislature, 2013.[2]

''We hope that (people) from all fields within the country and outside go to Tibet often to look around, study and travel, but as to some other aspects, we are not that welcoming.''—Qiangba Puncog, former chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Region legislature.[3]

WHAT CHINA DOES: RESTRICT ACCESS TO TIBET BY FOREIGNERS

In reality, American tourists, diplomats and journalists still face many barriers to get into Tibet. All foreigners are required to get a special permit to enter the Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR)—a permit that is not required for any other provincial-level entity of the People's Republic of China. Travel to Tibetan areas outside the TAR is also tightly controlled.

Restrictions on U.S. tourists

American tourists are required to obtain the 'Tibetan Tourist Permit' to enter the TAR. The permits can only be obtained through a Chinese government-run or -approved travel agency. In some cases, and depending on the area in Tibet one wants to visit, additional permits such as the ''Tibet Group Visa'', ''Alien's Travel Permit'' and ''Military Permit'' are required.[4]

The State Department advises American travelers that ''permits are not always granted'' and that at ''certain times the PRC may not allow foreigners to enter an area it deems restricted.''[5] It adds that the ''TAR remains a sensitive area for travel, and even when travel to Tibet is allowed, usually only Lhasa and part of Shan Nan are open to foreigners.''[6]

During certain times, the Chinese government closes off the entire TAR to foreign tourists for months, often with no warning.[7] Usually such closures coincide with what the Chinese government claims are ''sensitive periods'' such as during March, the anniversary of the Tibetan uprising in 1959,[8] or during the time of the Communist Party sessions in Beijing.[9] The Chinese government also imposes arbitrary rules on obtaining the Tibet travel permit. For example in 2012 and 2013 only groups of no less than five people could apply.[10] In 2014, this rule was then said to be no longer in effect, but it was reported that tours to Mount Kailash (a holy mountain and pilgrimage site for Hindus, Jains and Buddhists) and far western Tibet were not permitted at all after May 23, 2014.[11]

Restrictions on U.S. journalists

American journalists have difficulty reporting from Tibet, and are subject to many of the same restrictions faced by tourists. The Washington Post reported that ''[T]here are more foreign journalists in North Korea than there are in Tibet.''[12]

The State Department has reported that ''[t]he Chinese government severely restricted travel by foreign journalists to Tibetan areas. Additionally, the Chinese government subjected Tibetans who spoke to foreign reporters, attempted to provide information to persons outside the country, . . . to harassment or detention.''[13] In 2013 a few foreign journalists could get into Tibet only because they accepted a government-sponsored tour which made any independent reporting difficult. The State Department quotes Australian Journalist Rowan Callick saying, ''I had accepted an invitation from the State Council Information Office—the media arm of China's cabinet—to visit Tibet, since there is no other way in which journalists can enter without subterfuge.''[14] During a February 2014 visit to China, Secretary of State John Kerry urged China's leaders to allow journalists, diplomats, and other observers unrestricted access to China's Tibetan areas.[15]

Restrictions on U.S. diplomats

Diplomats face similar restrictions on access to Tibetan areas, limiting their ability to do reporting, monitoring and consular work. The State Department reported that its officials submitted more than 16 requests for diplomatic access to the TAR between May 2011 and November 2013, but only two were granted. Its report added, ''The Chinese government . . . repeatedly prevented foreign diplomatic personnel from visiting Tibetan areas outside the TAR for which permission was not officially required.''[16]

The Department also reported ''foreign diplomats who legally traveled in Tibetan areas outside the TAR . . . were repeatedly approached by local police and sometimes forced to leave without reasonable explanation.''[17]

The Chinese government has permitted two visits by two U.S. Ambassadors to Lhasa in recent years—by Ambassador Gary Locke in 2013 and Ambassador Jon Huntsman in 2010. Each was a three-day, government-organized trip, which was highly controlled,[18] and they did not visit areas in the TAR outside of Lhasa. On his visit, Ambassador Locke urged Beijing to open up Tibet to foreign diplomats, journalists and tourists.[19]

ENDNOTES

[1] ''Chinese official talks with EU representatives on Tibet issue,'' *China Tibet Online*, February 8, 2012, http://

www.china embassy.ee/eng/ztlm/ zgxz/ t903102.htm

[2] ''Tibet welcomes more visitors from abroad,'' *China Daily Europe*, March 13, 2013, http://ca.china-embassy.org/ eng/kxz/ t1022572.htm

[3] ''China says no to foreign rights monitors for Tibet,'' *Reuters*, November 9, 2012, *http:// www.reuters.com/article/ 2012/11/09/us-china-congress-tibet-idUSBRE8A80 QP20121109*

[4] ''Disneyfication of Tibet,'' *Washington Monthly*, January/February 2014, *www.washington monthly.com/magazine*

[5] State Department travel advisory for China, travel.state.gov/content/ passports/ English/country/china.html

[6] Ibid

[7] ''Tibet again off limits to tourists,'' *Travel Weekly*, September 2012, *http://www.travel weekly.com/ Asia-Travel/Tibet-again-off-limits-to-foreign-tourists/*

[8] ''China closes Tibet to tourists for anniversary of riots,'' *The Guardian*, March 7, 2011 *http://www.the guardian.com/ world/2011/mar/07/ china-closes- tibet-tourist-visas*

[9] ''China says no to foreign rights monitors for Tibet,'' *Reuters*, November 9, 2012, *http:// www.reuters.com/article/ 2012/11/09/us-china-congress-tibet- idUSBRE8A8 0QP20121109*

[10] Ibid

[11] ''Explore Tibet, a travel agency based in Lhasa, *http://www.exploretibet.com/Essential-Info/Tibet-Visa-Permits/*

[12] ''North Korea is more accessible to foreign journalists than Tibet is,'' *Washington Post*, December 17, 2013 *http://www.washington post.com/blogs/world views/wp/2013/ 12/17/north-korea-is-more-accessible- to-foreign-journalists-than-tibet-is/*

[13] State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013, *http:// www.state.gov/i/drl /rls/hrrpt/human rights report/index.htm? dynamic_load_id= 220187&year= 2013#wrapper*

[14] Ibid

[15] State Department Daily Press Briefing, February 25, 2014 *http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ dpb/2014/02/222442.htm#CHINA2*

[16] State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013, *http:// www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/ hrrpt/ humanrightsreport/ index.htm? dynamic_load_ id=220187&year=2013 #wrapper*

[17] State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2011, *http:// www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/ hrrpt/2011/eap/187481.htm*

[18] ''Ambassador to China makes rare visit to Tibet,'' *CBSNews.com*, June 27, 2013, *http:// www.cbsnews.com/news/us-ambassador-to-china- gary-locke-makes-rare-visit- to-tibet-urges-beijing-to- open-region-up/*

[19] Ibid

U.S. MILITARY CODE OF CONDUCT

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the military Code of Conduct reads:

I am an American, fighting in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense.

I will never surrender of my own free will. If in command, I will never surrender the members of my command while they still have the means to resist.

If I am captured, I will continue to resist by all means available. I will make every effort to escape and aid others to escape. I will accept neither parole nor special favors from the enemy.

If I become a prisoner of war, I will keep faith with my fellow prisoners. I will give no information or take part in any action which might be harmful to my comrades. If I am senior, I will take command. If not, I will obey the lawful orders of those appointed over me and will back them up in every way.

When questioned, should I become a prisoner of war, I am required to give name, rank, service number, and date of birth. I will evade answering further questions to the utmost of my ability. I will make no oral or written statements disloyal to my country and its allies or harmful to their cause.

I will never forget that I am an American, fighting for freedom, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America.

PUYALLUP HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in Washington State, 67 schools compete in the 4A high school sports division—67 schools, nine spring sports teams and one dream.

For three spring teams representing the Puyallup purple and gold, that dream came true.

This spring, Puyallup High School, located in the 10th Congressional District, captured State titles in baseball, fastpitch softball, and boys golf.

The Vikings baseball team finished their season undefeated, and for the first time in the history of our State, both the baseball and the fastpitch softball teams won their State championships. Boys golf joined them, and three of the top five players were from Puyallup High School.

When I was in high school, it was a thrill beyond measure just to get to the State playoffs. It is inconceivable to win not one, not two, but three State championships. The 10th District is proud of the Vikes, and we congratulate all of the student athletes who made these dreams come true.

FATHER'S DAY

(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 and honor our fathers—fathers of this country—who have provided the stable, loving atmosphere for children all over the Nation.

I thank, in particular, my late father, the first African American comic cartoonist, Ezra Jackson, who provided me with such stability and love and inspiration; my father-in-law, a Tuskegee Airman, who served in World War II; certainly, my own husband, Dr. Elwyn C. Lee, who integrated the faculty of the University of Houston and its administration.

But the real tribute is to the many fathers across America who have taken children and treated them with love and dignity and who have given them, even if they did not have it, some semblance of comfort—fathers who have adopted, fathers who have foster cared, fathers who are incarcerated but who still try to maintain the love and connection with their children, poor fathers, working fathers—those who have found their way to claim Sunday as the day when we say, ''Happy Father's Day.''

We honor the fathers of America. We thank you for the foundation that you have given to this Nation.

CLIMATE CHANGE DENIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend a few moments this afternoon reflecting on the recent order that is being promulgated by President Obama and the EPA dealing with the goals for carbon emission.

Now, even before the President's announcement of the carbon goals last week, the spin machine was in full battle mode. There was a full-throated expression of outrage for the apologists for pollution. Those who are profiting from what we are doing now and who are investing the least amount of change are making dire predictions that sound eerily familiar.

The reason they sound familiar is that we have, in fact, heard them before. There was similar gloom and doom that greeted the Federal Government during the first Bush administration that was, if you will forgive the phrase—hold onto your hats—a cap-and-trade program to deal with acid rain. There were claims that it was unworkable, that it would be expensive, that it would create far more problems than it would solve; frankly, we just couldn't afford to move ahead, that we should instead continue the same approach we had for years, the same approach that resulted in minimal progress and contributed to acid rain damage to our waterways, to our forests, and to the health of our people. But the Bush administration argued against the naysayers in that by setting a framework requiring limits to be met and giving flexibility to the States' utilities on how it would be achieved, we would make progress for relatively minor costs, and it would be worth it.

Almost 25 years later, the verdict is in. It has been a remarkable success. The program didn't require massive bureaucracy or a huge, unmanageable cost. We have, in fact, dramatically reduced acid rain. We have promoted investment in new technology. Our lakes and forests are healthier, and so are our people. The cleanup was achieved in the regular course of business, changing the incentives and the signals that were sent.

This success, with bipartisan support, may be one of the reasons that, as we moved into the new century, the

2000s, there was initially broad, bipartisan interest in reducing carbon pollution. In fact, the situation we faced in the United States then was much like the situation I encountered in meeting with British members of Parliament 6 years ago on their approach to climate change.

Now, they acknowledged that there were differences between the three parties in Parliament about the details of what they were planning, about the best approach going forward. Some favored a more command and control, and others were dealing with incentives or taxation or a combination, but they were engaged in a debate about the details of how to achieve the objective of reducing carbon emissions, not the wisdom of doing it, not challenging the climate science.

Maybe this was because Great Britain is an island nation that really couldn't afford to be indifferent to shifting weather patterns, rising sea levels, the impacts of storm, disaster, and crop patterns.

□ 1230

Maybe it was that the British parliamentary system made it harder for the leaders of government and the parties in opposition to insulate themselves from day-to-day debate, debate that is largely unknown here in this Chamber on an ongoing basis.

Maybe it was because the British Government itself had been involved in such sweeping research and planning. Remember, Sir Nicholas Stern had a seminal report on climate that was widely acknowledged and respected, that served as a prod for action.

During the 2000 election, President Bush, then-Governor Bush, said he would move to limit carbon pollution. During a period shortly thereafter, then-Governor Romney of Massachusetts was one of the leaders in the regional greenhouse gas initiative of the Northeast States that started the limited cap-and-trade program, that put a price on carbon, and used those monies to improve energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

It has been relatively successful, despite the massive recession and the Tea Party heat that caused Presidential candidate Romney to repudiate what he helped put in place, and New Jersey Governor Chris Christie pulled back.

In 2008, the Presidential nominee for the Republicans was Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who had been involved, on a bipartisan basis, with legislation to restrict greenhouse gases. And at this point, Senator MCCAIN was not a climate-denier; he was a believer that our government and our economy were not helpless in the face of threats from human impact on climate change and weather instability, let alone spreading doubt about the scientific consensus.

We are coming to the floor this afternoon debating, discussing impacts on climate, the need for modest steps proposed by the administration, restating some facts, and broadening the conversation.

I would like to turn, if I could, to my colleague from Maryland, Congressman SARBANES, to add his voice. The Congressman has been deeply concerned with the environment, with climate, with energy, playing a key role on the Commerce Committee. I welcome him to this conversation.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for pulling us together this afternoon to talk about this important development that the EPA has taken to address climate change, to reduce pollution across the country.

I want to start by thanking the EPA. I mean, a lot of people are piling on right now, critics of this action, and saying this is going to cost jobs and it is too disruptive and so forth. I have a completely different perspective, and I wanted to mention a couple of things along those lines.

First of all, this is an important step to take, just from a health perspective. In other words, there are many ways you can come at it. You can look at it in terms of climate change, which is kind of a slow-moving crisis, and I will speak to that in a minute, but it is accelerating.

But if you just look at it in terms of protecting the health of the American people, frankly, and beyond, but let's talk about America's interests here. If you cut down on these carbon emissions, particularly from coal plants, you are going to be promoting clean air. You are going to be promoting clean water.

The Chesapeake Bay, which I hold very dear, representing the Third District in Maryland, and having parts of the Third District which touch the Bay, and many tributaries and rivers and waterways that lead into the Bay from across the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the Chesapeake Bay, the pollution that comes into the water often is from air deposits that come into the water because of this carbon pollution that we have.

So whether you are talking about breathing clean air, which we all want for ourselves and for our children and for our grandchildren, or drinking clean water and having clean water and high water quality, this is a very, very important step to take, this notion of now setting a goal to cut by 30 percent the carbon emissions from power plants across the country.

But let's look at it through the lens of climate change, which my colleague has already raised. We are seeing the effects of climate change, as I mentioned, accelerating every single day.

So, obviously, there is a warming going on of the planet, generally speaking, and the scientific support for that being connected to the activities of humankind is pretty incontrovertible. We have the opportunity in the Energy and Commerce Committee to get a lot of testimony on that front.

We are seeing violent weather events across the country which are having a tremendous impact on communities, damaging those communities, harming, actually producing harm to individuals, but also having a terrific impact on economic productivity across the country.

So the average American out there, I mean, everyday citizens, when they look at this issue, the great majority of them are saying, we need to do something about this. We can't just sit on our hands. In fact, there is recent polling that indicates that 70 percent of Americans favor stronger limits on the amount of carbon that is emitted by power plants.

Well, okay. That is exactly what the EPA is doing here. It is taking action to reduce the carbon emissions from power plants. The EPA is listening to the American people. The Obama administration is listening to what the American people are saying, day in and day out, about the action that we need to take.

Unfortunately, this Congress, the leadership in this House, in particular, has not, apparently, heard the cry of the American people when it comes to doing something about climate change.

So I congratulate the EPA for taking these measures because this is what the American people want to see, and it is going to have a tremendous positive impact.

On climate change per se, 80 percent of Americans think the U.S. should take action to address climate disruption, 80 percent of Americans. So those are like commonsense people getting up in the morning, going outside, getting their newspaper, opening the newspaper and seeing that there have been violent storms here, or that there is a drought happening here, or that the water supply is in danger there, all connected back to what is happening with the climate and affecting their communities.

So they are saying, okay, the commonsense thing for us to do is to take some considered and reasonable and rational steps to try to address one clear cause of climate change and pollution, and that is the carbon emissions from power plants.

Thank you to the EPA for taking this initiative and responding to what the American people are saying.

Before I hand it back, I do want to touch, though, on what I think is part of the problem here, why it is that the EPA is the one that is having to step up here and take the initiative, and why we are not taking more initiative right here in Congress.

I think it is because the machinery here has sort of gotten gummed up by the influence that some of these polluters have. There was a report recently issued that indicated or estimated, I guess, that the fossil fuel industry is getting a 5,900 percent return on the investment it is making here in Washington through campaign contributions and lobbying expenditures.

That estimate comes from looking at some of the taxpayer subsidies that continue to flow to that industry, even

though this is an industry that makes over $100 billion in profits every year. But the influence is also found, not just in sort of that corporate welfare that that industry is taking out of this Congress, but it is seen in the way in which our efforts to try to address climate change, to try to address the issues of promoting clean air and clean water, keep getting stopped by certain industries. So we need to look at reforms on that front.

What do we do to lift up the voices of everyday Americans in a world where money is speech? How do everyday people and people of modest means have speech in that environment and push back on those influences so that we can actually process their will here in Congress?

Then let me just close with this observation, because it goes to the argument that is made that somehow this is going to harm us economically as a country, to put those goals in place and begin to cut these emissions.

My colleague pointed to the sky is falling narrative at the time when we were going to do something about acid rain. And people said, industries aren't going to be able to handle this. It is going to cause parts of the industry to shut down. Americans are going to lose their jobs.

What happened?

The country, America, stepped up to the challenge and found its way to new opportunities. And I hear a lot of times from industry who say, well, you know, putting these measures in place, particularly when maybe peer nations aren't doing as much on that front as they could, it is going to put us at a competitive disadvantage. We need to have a level playing field and so forth.

I get that, but sometimes it makes sense to push us to go find a new playing field. And I think that is what the EPA is helping us do. It is expressing what the American people want to see. Go innovate, go figure out a way to do these things differently. Find, create a new energy portfolio that makes sense from a health and safety standpoint, makes sense in terms of combating climate change, but also will create tremendous new economic opportunities and generate millions of new jobs across the country.

So these things are not mutually exclusive. Economic productivity and innovation are not mutually exclusive with doing the right thing with the environment. In fact, if you look back with a clear eye, historically, you will see that when we push ourselves to do the right thing for the environmental reasons, for the health and safety reasons, we often get ourselves to a place of increased economic productivity and innovation.

In closing, and I thank my colleague for giving me a few minutes here today to talk on the topic, I want to thank the EPA for carrying out—listening to what the American people are saying about the steps we need to take to address climate change, to address our health and the environment out there, and taking this very, very important step that I think is going to be productive and positive for the American people. Thank you.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman joining us and his observations, in particular, the thought that the sky is falling rhetoric is not necessarily born out.

I am reminded that 3 years ago one of the operators of perhaps the dirtiest coal-powered plant in the country, in Homer City, Pennsylvania, warned that there would be immediate and devastating consequences from the Obama administration's push to clean up pollution from coal.

It was facing the requirement to cut sulfur dioxide pollution by 80 percent in less than a year, and it sought to block the rule. They were unsuccessful. In fact, it was the recent regulation that the EPA's—excuse me—the Supreme Court upholding the EPA's rule in this case was initiated by the Homer City generating station that precipitated all of this.

But today, the Homer City power plant is now a model. It hasn't been shut down. There haven't been devastating consequences for that community. It has been able to adopt new regulations, set them in place. It has dramatically reduced its emissions, and it is operating successfully.

The EPA estimates that about 30 percent of the coal-powered units in the United States are operating without scrubbers. Remember, our friend from Maryland talked about the immediate health benefits, not just environmental. The pollution control equipment is not only for sulfur dioxide but mercury.

□ 1245

It is inexcusable that there are plants still operating without these minimal protections.

Mr. Speaker, we are joined by one of my colleagues who is also from Maryland, Congressman JOHN DELANEY. One of the things I appreciate about the perspective that Mr. DELANEY brings to Congress—being a relatively new Member, but having pursued a successful business career—is that he is often taking an approach from an economic perspective that deals with some of these elements.

One of the reasons I am pleased that the EPA is moving forward is that this is an economic solution that can have a huge difference, not just improving the environment, but new technologies and doing so in a cost-effective way.

So we are pleased to have Mr. DELANEY here, and I yield to him for any comments that he may have about the situation.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue, for organizing our discussion here today, and for his leadership on so many other important issues here in the Congress, and I like the way he introduced this next segment of our discussions around economic policy because I will spend a little bit of time on that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to start by talking about probabilities and severities—because I think it is important to think about that when we are thinking about climate change—and then move into some market-based solutions that I think work very well with some of the EPA's recent guidance, which I am very supportive of.

Let's start with the view of what experts think of this issue. It is estimated that 97 percent of the serious climate scientists in the world believe that climate change is occurring and that human behavior is contributing to this.

A friend of mine had a very good analogy for this when he said: If you took your child to 100 physicians and 97 of those physicians said that your child had a condition that needed to be treated, would you wait to get the last three? Or would you act on the advice of 97 percent of the physicians?

That is effectively what we have with respect to the advice that serious climate scientists have with respect to the two questions as to whether is climate change happening and is human behavior contributing to it.

Secondly, there is a body of work around what are the consequences if climate change were to continue, and it is similarly overwhelming in terms of the view that, if it were to occur, the costs, both moral—right, in terms of the stewardship of our planet, but we will put that aside for a second—and financial, are very significant.

If you look at the United States, if you look at costs associated with weather—extreme weather along our coasts, extreme weather in the Midwest, droughts in the west, fires that are being caused from that, disruption in people's lives, costs to the Federal Government, these are very, very significant costs.

That is not even counting the geopolitical costs associated with continued climate change. A very large percentage of the poor people in the world live at or below sea level. The effect that rising tides will have in disrupting their lives, we should understand will have a very significant geopolitical implication.

So let's think about the probabilities and severities. There is some chance—I view it very small, but some chance—that 97 percent of climate scientists are wrong, that, in fact, nothing is happening. I view that as a 10 percent probability.

So whatever we do, the changes in our behavior have to be measured against the 10 percent of the probability. There is an overwhelming likelihood that the scientists are right. That is why 97 percent of them agree.

The fact that they are in accord on this issue would make me think, from a probability-weighted basis, that there is an 80 percent probability that they are right.

Then there is probably a 10 percent probability that they are wrong the

other way, that they are seriously underestimating the effects of climate change, and it could accelerate, and the consequences are actually much greater than we had believed.

So if you add up all of those probabilities and multiply them by the severities, you come to a view that this could be one of the central generational challenges of this era, in terms of addressing this issue from a both moral and economic perspective.

I think my colleague from Maryland framed it well when he talked about the economic opportunities because I think we have been presented with a false choice. The choice has been act on this issue, act against the advice of 97 percent of the climate scientists, or, you know, ruin our economy if we do that; and that is the choice we have been presented with.

That is fundamentally not the right choice because, if you have a view that the evidence will continue to mount, you have to assume that, ultimately, humans—both in the United States and around the world—will react to this issue. That is the logical assumption.

If that logical assumption turns out to be true, then we should assume that, in 25 to 50 years, the way this world—and this country in particular—but the way this world produces energy, distributes energy, utilizes energy, and conserves energy will be very, very different than it is today.

As a businessperson, I look at that, and I say big, big opportunity. It is a big opportunity to be the leader in energy production, energy distribution, energy conservation, and energy utilization.

So there is a concept in business known as the first mover advantage. The person who reacts first gets the best technology, gets the best experts, gets the best insights, and that is what I believe, as a matter of economics, this Nation should be doing.

As someone who believes the power of markets is very significant to change behavior—in fact, I believe there are only two things that really change human behavior: one is their faith, and the other is financial incentives.

We have an opportunity, I believe, as it relates to climate change to not only get the faith community behind this issue—which I believe they will, the faith community cares deeply about the stewardship of the planet, God's greatest gift to us. I believe in the future, we will see the faith community—and it is already there, to a very significant extent—getting behind this more.

I also think there are things that we can do in terms of creating the right financial incentives to change the behavior. I believe things like a carbon tax, where you create a market-based solution and you tax something that we fundamentally shouldn't like—carbon—in exchange for taxing things we should like—like human beings and profits—is a better scenario for our country going forward, which is why, in combination with the new EPA regulations, we are introducing something called the State's Choice Act.

What the State's Choice Act does is require the Federal Government to give every State in this country another option. It is not a requirement. It is an option, and if the State decides to put in place a carbon tax, where they tax something we shouldn't like today—and I am sure we definitely will not like in the future, which is carbon emissions—and they can take the revenues from that carbon tax and deploy them against any priority they have, including lowering other taxes in their State, if a State puts in place a carbon tax, then they are deemed in compliance with the EPA regulations.

So it is providing States with an option—not a requirement, an option—to put in place a mechanism—a market-based mechanism in lieu of a regulatory framework.

Environmentalists believe a carbon tax is the best solution because they understand that financial incentives change behavior most significantly. Business broadly believes this is the right solution because it is a market-based approach.

In fact, the largest energy company in the world, ExxonMobil Corporation, disclosed something last year that I viewed as very consequential, that they will begin, in their financial assumptions—so in other words, when ExxonMobil projects the future and their business against those projections, they are assuming that, at some point, there will be a social cost of carbon imposed through some form of taxing system.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that ExxonMobil is, today, making business decisions based on the fact that that will happen. Most major corporations, most of the Fortune 500 is doing the same thing. They see where this is going.

I believe that, when government and the private sector work well together, we get the best outcomes. So when you see policymakers and people who care about climate change saying their carbon tax approach is the right answer and when you see the overwhelming majority of the Fortune 500 believing a carbon tax is the right answer, I think we should be embracing market-based solutions, which is what we are trying to do with this State's Choice Act.

We applaud the actions of the EPA. This is a serious problem for the reasons I discussed earlier, and I think their actions, particularly in the absence of other actions coming out of Congress, are the right answer.

We believe this is a great opportunity to also start the conversation around market-based solutions, which is why we would like to give every State in this country the option to pursue a market-based solution in exchange for a regulatory solution.

This is an incredibly important topic. Again, I want to thank my colleague for organizing us here today and giving me the opportunity to comment on my views on this.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Congressman.

I must say, I appreciated your observations. I personally am intrigued with your State's Choice Act. I look forward to exploring that further with you. I am absolutely convinced that, in the course of the next decade, this country will be moving to a broader carbon tax.

It is a key to ultimately controlling emissions. It is a way to reform our tax system. It is a way to simplify the equation, and what you proposed, I think, is an intriguing way to accelerate that conversation. I look forward to continuing it with you.

Mr. Speaker, there have been certain concerns that have been raised in terms of some of the horror stories. People feel it is just too much hard work, too much risk with being able to move forward with reducing carbon emissions.

I must reflect on my own personal experience on this, and then I will turn to my colleague from Virginia, Congressman MORAN. From his perspective, he has a great deal to offer on this, and I appreciate his environmental leadership.

Over 20 years ago, I was a member of the Portland City Council, and we were involved then with work to deal with carbon pollution. In fact, Portland became the first city in the United States to make a commitment to reduce its carbon emissions. Our plan was to reduce these emissions. We had committed to making a reduction of 40 percent by 2030 and 80 percent by 2050.

It was fascinating to watch as we moved forward with aggressive work, with energy efficiency, with transportation, bicycles, light rail, streetcar, building design and planning, having a comprehensive effort to tie these pieces together, to change how we did business to meet the carbon objective.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that it is working. As of 2012, our greenhouse gas emissions are 11 percent below the 1990 levels, even though our population has grown 30 percent over that time. It means, on a per-person basis, it has been reduced by a third. Emissions from homes are down 13 percent and are down 16 percent in commercial, industrial, and multifamily sectors.

Now, Portland—anybody who has visited it in the last 20 years—is not impoverished. It is not a place that people are fleeing. Indeed, we are finding that the cohort of well-educated, young professionals—the 20-to 34-year-olds are actually increasing in the city of Portland, while the quality of life has been maintained.

During that same period of time, jobs are up 18 percent, and some of the best-paying jobs are in those areas that deal with innovation, with energy efficiency, with design, with transportation.

So this, from my experience in my hometown, having been involved with

it now for a quarter of a century, it is not only within our capacity, but doing it can actually improve the economy and the quality of life.

There is another critical area that we need to address, and that is why I am so pleased that Congressman MORAN is here. He is a senior Member, the dean of the Virginia delegation—who, sadly, has decided that he may move on and retire after this Congress, after a long and distinguished career.

One of the areas in which Congressman MORAN is a powerful and respected voice is in the area of national security, and I am pleased that he is with us here this afternoon and perhaps can have some observations about what this means to the future security of our country, not just in terms of the environment.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for giving me the opportunity to join my distinguished colleagues, but particularly you, my very good friend, Mr. BLUMENAUER. I just cannot thank you enough on behalf of this country for your leadership on this issue.

This is an important opportunity to discuss the President's proposed standard to limit carbon pollution because, just last week, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy announced proposed regulations that would reduce carbon pollution by 30 percent, below 2005 levels, basically below what they were a decade ago.

So that is going to help many States who have already made substantial progress, such as Oregon, toward that objective. That is a baseline that most scientists believe is absolutely necessary to prevent irreversible climate change.

□ 1300

The new standard relies heavily on the existing State and Federal Clean Air Act partnership that already exists which enables States to develop their own paths to reduce carbon emissions.

States are going to have the flexibility to cut emissions based on what makes the most sense for their unique situation, including options like reducing demand to encourage production of cleaner sources of electricity, cap-and-trade programs, and a menu of other energy efficiency ideas. States can work collectively with other States to develop multi-State carbon reduction plans. But without this major course correction, our present trajectory on climate change threatens the future of this planet.

As each day passes without action, the more we are destined to harm our environment, our country, and our loved ones. So while this plan may not be perfect, the current public comment period does provide an opportunity to improve on it. And given the inability of Congress to enact meaningful legislation on this or almost any of the other pressing issues our country confronts, I fully support the President's decision directing the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a standard for carbon emissions because it has become clear that this Congress will not do so.

It is no secret that the majority who control this Chamber are in climate change denial. Just 2 weeks ago, the House passed an amendment offered by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia to the National Defense Authorization bill that prevents the Pentagon from using funds to implement climate change assessments. This is a head-in-the-sand amendment, essentially a way to ensure that the realities of climate change are ignored by our national security policymakers.

It is an absurd notion that our military leaders should not react to the unequivocal fact that the planet is warming and that human activities are responsible. The McKinley amendment, and those who voted for it, remind me of the 16th century Catholic Church, Mr. BLUMENAUER, that condemned the work of a scientist by the name of Galileo who dared to claim that the Earth was not the center of the universe but that it, along with the planets, revolved around the Sun.

Now, those who voted for the amendment—and I hate to say the number, it was embarrassingly large—but those who voted for the amendment were telling our military to irresponsibly disregard the findings of the scientific community that our planet is warming. But our military leaders, fortunately, do get it. They do understand that the climate is changing, and they are doing their best with limited resources to be prepared to respond to that changing environment.

Climate change is a national security concern for a number of reasons. First and foremost, it is a catalyst for instability and conflict around the world. The U.S. Department of Defense's own Quadrennial Defense Review—this is the document that defines the Department's strategic objectives and potential military threats—declared the threat of climate change is a serious national security vulnerability that could enable terrorist activity. The Quadrennial Defense Review specifically states:

> The pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.

The results will be a higher demand for American troops abroad, even as we struggle to deal with the devastating impacts caused by flooding and extreme weather events here at home.

Climate change is also a new form of stress on our military readiness. The Navy, for example, estimates that 128 of its installations just at the Norfolk, Virginia, Naval Shipyard alone would be affected by a 1-meter rise in sea level which we have to anticipate. It recently had to spend $240 million to double-deck four of its piers down at the Norfolk Naval Base so that they could harden utility lines and make the structures more resilient to sea level rise and more extreme and more frequent weather events.

Now, as an appropriator, I and my colleagues on the committee are dealing with the reality of climate change in Federal agency budgets. The effects of climate change are ratcheting up Federal expenditures. The 10-year average for wildland fire costs, the basis on which we attempt to budget for fighting wildland fires, is going up every year. We spent more than $800 million on wildfires just last year.

So, our military gets it, the vast majority of the American public gets it, and the executive branch gets it. It seems that almost everyone—almost everyone—gets the fact that climate change is happening; that is, everyone but a majority here in the House and a filibuster-sufficient minority in the Senate. Perhaps they are in denial because their political base either chooses to be ignorant or is profiting from inaction.

Perhaps it is a generational issue. I have seen a poll that a majority of all self-defined Republicans under the age of 34 think politicians who deny that climate change are either—and I am just quoting now, of course, these are not my words.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Of course.

Mr. MORAN. These are the words of the majority of Republicans under the age of 34 that they are either ''ignorant, out of touch, or crazy.'' Ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. Now, we wouldn't use those words, but the majority of Republicans under the age of 34 do use those words towards those who deny that we should do something about climate change.

We, along with the rest of the world, have a duty to protect our children and future generation from the effects of climate change. So I stand here with my colleagues to ensure that the Obama administration's effort to limit carbon pollution is not diminished or blocked by the Congress. For the sake of our national security, and the sake of a better future, the Obama administration's proposal to limit carbon emissions must be allowed to go forward.

I thank you very much, my friend, and I thank you for your leadership. Let's hope things get better.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, I appreciate very much your being here, Congressman MORAN, and your voice makes me think that maybe you have been giving diction lessons to Gina McCarthy, but it is not so much how she talks but what she says.

Mr. MORAN. You are making fun of our New England accent, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I am talking about the distinctive way in which you communicate as well as the power of the words, both of the administrator and of you. I deeply appreciate your putting numbers around some of these threats. The notion that we have the largest naval base in the world, and

you are saying we had to invest almost one-quarter of a billion dollars because it has had the greatest increase in sea level on the entire eastern seaboard.

Mr. MORAN. Absolutely. We just were shown a map by naval executives, and I hesitate to say this because it is so scary, but the reality is that the entire Naval Shipyard and the Norfolk shipbuilding base which builds our nuclear carriers within a relatively short period of time, a few decades, is liable to be underwater. So we can't afford to continue to deny climate change, literally.

So I appreciate your leadership, again, on this, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and we have got to continue the fight.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It was interesting. There was a recent article in The Washington Post about a church on the waterfront in Norfolk. And they are having to vacate because this rising sea level is making it—the pastor of the church was quoted as saying that people shouldn't have to consult a tide table to figure out whether or not they can go to service.

I deeply appreciate your focusing on this, the reference you make to the Defense Department needing to have the best information possible and the outrage that an amendment was approved to the defense authorization that would have, in effect, locked climate denial into that authorization.

Mr. MORAN. Absolutely. And the executives, the folks who have been involved with the Navy who showed me this map of our naval shipyards, within my son's lifetime are going to be under water. They did say, well, if it is any consolation, Florida is in worse shape. Of course, it is no consolation that Florida is in worse shape than Virginia, but the reality is it is obviously not confined to Virginia; it is all along the low-lying coast. Unfortunately, by the time that some people wake up and accept it, it may very well be too late.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I just had my first two grandchildren, and I would like some day for these two little boys to be able to see Miami and not have to be snorkeling.

Now, your reference to the defense amendment that was passed makes me think of what happened in North Carolina, where the legislature tried to mandate that the State agencies could not use the best science to make choices, the best information to protect the coastline.

Well, I deeply appreciate your joining us this afternoon. I appreciate your leadership and look forward to continuing with you this conversation.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there are some who claim, well, we really don't need to move forward with this because maybe or maybe not the administration's plan will work as they say. Maybe it is affordable, maybe it will create those jobs, it will improve air quality, and reduce carbon emissions. But they say that it really doesn't matter what the United States does. It is ironic, because some of the same people who are denying climate science are then turning around and saying, but it won't matter what we do because the Indians and the Chinese are building a coal emissions plant every week or two, and so anything that the United States does will really be drowned out, will lose its effect because of other events.

Well, this argument is wrong on all counts. It is not as much as we need to do. I am absolutely convinced, as I stand here on the floor of the House today, I am absolutely convinced that over the course of the next 20 years we will not only implement the requirements of this carbon emission rule, but we will go beyond it. We will go beyond it, and we will find it is not only manageable, but it is the right thing to do.

Even though this modest step will have some short-term pain and some difficulty in changing current patterns of business and politics, it is something we can and should do. Being able to make this pivot to start changing how we do business is in and of itself significant because it is these first steps that are going to make it possible for us to take other, more important, longer-term steps that will be even more significant.

But it is also critical to demonstrate American leadership. Our failure to lead on reducing carbon emissions will encourage other countries that are poorer and are heavier carbon emitters on a per capita basis to just sit back and wait. Some of them will say, hey, you in the United States are the people who have created most of this problem. The United States has now been passed by China in terms of annual current carbon emissions. But in terms of total carbon in the atmosphere, the United States is the all-time leader and will be for some time.

On a per capita basis, we are still far and away number one. Americans can emit three times as much carbon per person as the Chinese and six times more carbon per person than the Indians. So the United States is the greatest historic carbon emitter, and we are still emitting far more carbon per person. If we don't step up, being rich, powerful, and more technologically advanced, how is it that we are going to expect poorer countries where people are struggling with existential challenges for food and sanitation, how do we expect them to ever follow suit if we are afraid to lead?

Well, I think this rule that is being promulgated is an expression that we are not afraid to lead. As I say, it is an important interim step, it sends an important signal, and it starts a broader conversation internationally.

I was in Copenhagen 4 years ago and watched as the United States shuttled back and forth, the President trying to get people aligned, and dealing with the European Union. But, frankly, we are never going to be able to have one, large multinational organization that is going to put all of these pieces together. It is going to require leadership. It is going to require leadership from the United States, showing the way that we are willing to do this, and then working with not just the Chinese and the Indians, but the Brazilians and the Indonesians. In this political and economic climate, it is wildly unrealistic to expect that the United States is going to assume the entire burden itself, but it is important for us to send the signal that we are moving in the right direction.

□ 1315

The United States, over the course of the next 50 years, is going to be challenged to deal with all that we need to do; plus, as my friend from Virginia mentioned, we are facing serious problems in terms of climate change that is already underway.

If we, in some way, could be able to drop global carbon emissions below the 400 parts per million that we are at now back to 350 parts per million, we are still going to watch the climate effects unfold. We are still going to watch Florida sink, with oceans rising and problems for its water supply.

We are going to watch large chunks of the Arctic ice sheet collapse. We are going to watch parts of Greenland disappear. Ocean levels are going to continue to rise. This means that the United States is in a race to be able to deal with things to help people adapt with climate change and, for heaven's sake, not to give up because it is going to be a problem. We don't want it to accelerate. We don't want to make it worse.

If we are going to be able to deal with the challenges 50 years from now, it is what we do in the next 5 years in communities all across America that is going to make a difference.

Acting with cleaner technology, cleaner energy, and greater efficiency will save American families money over the next 20 years, compared to the current wasteful patterns. It is an opportunity for us to realign our economy for the economy of the future. It is an opportunity for us to be able to minimize the consequences of climate change.

Frankly, every single use of energy has some negative consequences—every one, but being able to use that energy for efficiently, more effectively, and do it sooner minimizes those negative consequences while we harness the economic power to change the economy.

I want to conclude with just one observation about the way that the administration has proceeded. They have signaled the approach that they are taking going forward. They have taken goals and adjusted those carbon goals based on where States are now, what their energy mix is, and what they can do in a reasonable way in the years ahead.

They have taken those goals and given great flexibility to the individual States. This is not a one-size-fits-all

solution. To the contrary, giving them realistic goals and giving them flexibility on how they are going to achieve it is a terrific way to harness market-based solutions and the ingenuity of the individual States.

The administration, I have heard from a number of people in the industry, has reached out, talking to people with electric utilities, gas, and working in terms of large industrial users. Having those conversations with States, red State and blue, regardless of their energy mix, they have made it clear that they are encouraging people to take advantage of the flexibility that has been given to them.

I think this is an ideal model for going forward, not denying the problem, not trying to solve it all overnight, not trying to have one size fits all, but to deal with a minimal standard going forward that sets the base, giving people a range of options to meet it, and inviting their ingenuity and their activity.

Mr. Speaker, there is no issue that is more important that this Congress should be addressing. Sadly, you know we have not done much to deal with it on the floor of the House, but the administration is at least stepping forward to not deny climate change, but to be able to give people choices to meet our objectives.

I commend the administration for the steps they have taken, and I hope that all Members will take the time to familiarize themselves with it and what their States can and should do to be able to meet that objective for America to exercise leadership at home and abroad—meet these minimal objectives and to exceed them in the years ahead.

As we did with acid rain, we can do with carbon emission. I urge my colleagues to focus on how we can do this, so we can make it a great success story to preserve the future of our children and grandchildren. I appreciate the opportunity to share this discussion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 USC 6431) and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term ending May 14, 2016:

Ms. Hannah Rosenthal, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

ONGOING STRUGGLE AGAINST BOKO HARAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week, I spent four days in Nigeria, and while in Abuja, I met with one of the Chibok girls who escaped after the infamous mid-April Chibok school abduction.

This brave young woman has suffered much, was clearly traumatized, and in deep emotional pain. You could hear it in her voice. You could see it in her eyes, as she sat motionless, recounting her tragic story, yet she spoke of concern not for herself, but for her friends and classmates who remain in captivity. She pleaded for their rescue and for their protection.

In Nigeria last week, I met with a Muslim father of two girls abducted from the Chibok school. Fighting back tears, he said the agony was unbearable. The story of his daughters underscored the fact that Boko Haram brutalizes Muslims as well.

Last week, I also met with several other Boko Haram victims, including a Christian mother whose two daughters were abducted in February of 2012.

For the past 2 years, this mom has had no idea where her two girls are or whether or not those two daughters are dead or alive. She told me that her husband was shot on the spot when they raided her home, simply for being a Christian.

Three months later, Boko Haram returned and asked if her son had converted to Islam. When she said no, he was shot and killed.

Mr. Speaker, on another trip to Nigeria, last September, I traveled to the city of Jos and visited churches that were firebombed by Boko Haram and met with survivors, those who lost loved ones and those who have been wounded in those terrorist attacks.

In an internally displaced camp, I met with a man named Habila Adamu. Habila Adamu lived in the north, had fled to Jos, but here was a situation where Boko Haram broke into his home, put an AK–47 to his face and said: If you convert to Islam, I will spare your life. If you don't, I will shoot you.

He told the terrorists: I am ready to meet my Lord.

He was shot immediately, with his wife pleading with the terrorists not to do so. It blew away much of his face. When I met with him, I was so moved by his story, I invited him to a hearing.

When he testified, he told that story to members of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and you could have heard a pin drop—what courage, what tenacity, what love. I was struck by the fact that he had absolutely no malice for the man who pulled the trigger, who almost turned him into a martyr.

In Jos, I also met with Archbishop Kaigama and Muslim leaders in that city who told me how Christian and Muslims were working together to assist the victims and to try to mitigate the threat, but, Mr. Speaker, the violence has gotten demonstrably worse and shows absolutely no signs of abating.

After the May 20 Boko Haram bombings in Jos that killed 118 innocent people—that is less than a month ago—and wounded at least 56, Catholic Archbishop Kaigama, an extraordinarily brave and compassionate religious leader, reminded the world that Boko Haram is faithful to its target of eliminating and destroying Christianity from parts of the country.

They only difference is that we are not just seeing Christians dying and being abducted, we are seeing attacks on Muslims, as well, who Boko Haram considers not Muslim enough.

The Archbishop said:

> The international community can help in a number of important ways. The sale of arms is of grave concern. In short, the government needs help in cutting the supply lines of Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, Emmanuel Ogebe, special counsel for the Justice for Jos Project and also a leader in the Jubilee Campaign testified yesterday:

> Boko Haram continues to ravage northern Nigeria, killing over 1,000 people in 8 weeks. The terrorists are bolder and more diabolical than ever and have completely overrun several borderline rural communities. Prior to the Chibok schoolgirl abductions, much of the international response was inattention and inaction. Now, it is attention, but inadequate action.

Mr. Ogebe also testified that it took the United States 25 months after the first two Americans were attacked and 1 year after the third and fourth Americans were targeted before Boko Haram was designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the Obama administration.

I would note, for the record, that during the last 2 years, I have pushed hard—and I am not the only one in this Congress who has done so—to designate Boko Haram as a foreign terrorist organization, or FTO. I introduced legislation, H.R. 3209, the Boko Haram Terrorist Designation Act of 2013, in an attempt to make it so.

On December 13 of last year, I chaired yet another congressional hearing on Boko Haram and was prepared to advance the legislation. However, on the day before the hearing, the Obama administration finally announced FTO designation—late, but welcomed—which is designed, in part, to slow or help interdict the flow of arms and terror financing.

Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's hearing, we also heard from the former American Ambassador to Nigeria, Robin Renee Sanders, an experienced and very distinguished diplomat, who told my committee:

> Nigeria is at the beginning of a long war, and they have to realize this. This is no longer a localized conflict or insurgency. There is no easy fix, and every attack and response to Boko Haram cannot be viewed as a death knell blow to it. A long-range security framework to the terrorist threat is what is needed.

Ambassador Sanders said:

The security services need to regroup, reapproach, and readdress it as such, in order to begin to get off their heels on the defensive and get on an aggressive offense. This has not happened yet, and Boko Haram has not only succeeded in terrorizing 60,000 square miles of territory, but it is also evident that, with the late April 2014 attacks, that they have the ability to reach locations just 15 kilometers outside of Abuja, either with sleeper cells or with bombs getting past checkpoints.

Current Nigerian security services have never experienced anything like this, like what it is facing with Boko Haram. Boko Haram is executing asymmetrical warfare, and for the most part, this is outside of the framework of the security forces and their capability to effectively respond.

Among Ambassador Sanders' recommendations were additional material, especially mobile communications equipment, vehicles, technologically-based bomb detection equipment; improved control over their very porous borders; improved military planning, logistics, equipment and supplies, including sufficient spare parts and fuel; expanded small Special Forces units and a 24–7 counterterrorism center; establishing a satellite CT center closer to the northeast region, so information doesn't take so long to react to or to be analyzed; and more rapid response forces, or what we call mobile units, and probably more outposts.

Another expert at yesterday's hearing, Dr. Peter Pham, director, Africa Center, Atlantic Council, testified:

A comprehensive strategy is required to respond to the burgeoning threat posed by Boko Haram, including the promotion of specialized training for Nigerian security forces. Undoubtedly, the Nigerian security forces, both military and police, need that assistance in the fight. However, the need is less a matter of personnel and equipment than training, especially in intelligence and investigations.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, while some training has begun—and U.S. military personnel deserve high praise and thanks for their professionalism, skill, and commitment—much more needs to be done. Human rights vetting must be improved so that eligible soldiers are not wrongfully excluded and intelligence cooperation needs to be expanded.

Let me also express my gratitude to our Embassy personnel for also working overtime in trying to mitigate this threat and to do the work that the Embassy does so selflessly. They are doing a wonderful job, and I appreciate their work in hosting and helping with my trip there.

Finally, just let me say, nothing has galvanized global opinion and a sense of extreme urgency more than the abduction of the Chibok schoolgirls, and now other girls since. Some 20 more girls were just abducted by Boko Haram.

Despite escalating threats of terrorism, however, many Nigerians, including and especially the faith community—Catholics, Evangelicals, Muslims—have responded with extraordinary courage, resiliency, resolve, and empathy for the victims, and they hope and they are working to ensure that Boko Haram—the whole country—is stopped.

Counterinsurgency training and intelligence capacity are among the highest priorities, and my hope is that more, not less, will be done going forward in order to mitigate this threat and to end the reign of terror that is being promoted by Boko Haram.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TERRORIST ACTIVITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, how much time is that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are approximately 53 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, CHRIS SMITH. It turns out that he and I were in Nigeria around the same time. And I am so grateful for his work. He cares so deeply about life, about freedom, about religious liberty, as much as or more than anybody I know in all of Congress. I am so grateful to him for his great work.

It is heartbreaking to see people killed, terrorized, kidnapped, sexually abused, abused in all kinds of other ways simply because of their faith. That is going on in Nigeria and all over the world right now.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. GOHMERT, thank you for your trip there and your concern, which has been throughout your entire career for human rights in general, but also for religious freedom.

This is a serious assault on religious freedom, forced Islamization. Again, those Muslims who do not agree with the extremism are also targeted, but Christians by and large.

At yesterday's hearing, Mr. Ogebe said that, of the 60 churches that have been destroyed, three mosques have been destroyed during that same time period. This is an attack on the Christian faith and it is a slaughter of Christians.

I want to thank you for your leadership on this.

Mr. GOHMERT. My friend brings up an interesting point. When I was there last week, a couple of the Christian pastors from Nigeria that were working with the victims, one of them pointed out to me that one of his groomsmen was a Muslim and they are still very, very close friends. Another, who is a Nigerian woman who has done extraordinary work in trying to help victims, particularly Christian victims, one of her sisters that she loves very much is Muslim.

The point that they were making is that Christians and moderate Muslims have been able to live together for hundreds of years, even in Nigeria, but this radical Islam that has come in, especially in the north, is an abomination. It is antithetical to everything that Christians believe. As a result, they don't care how peace loving Christians may be; you either convert or they kill you.

Having visited with a couple of the three girls who escaped—there were a number of girls who were able to get off the truck during the night, and some others who escaped the school that night and were able to run into the woods in the dark. There were only five or six who actually were in captivity and were able to escape. I have met with three of them. A couple of them were talking about it, and apparently they were telling the girls, you either convert to Islam or your problems get worse—repeated sexual abuse, all kinds of other abuse. They would say: Just convert to Islam and your problems were over.

The trouble is, even when some of these girls at the threat of their very lives converted, which in and of itself is an abomination, their problems were not over. They were still being chided as potential sex slaves for the rest of their lives.

So it is something that ought to concern all peace-loving people everywhere. I have talked to Democrats, friends across the aisle. Republicans, I know, were upset with what is happening.

As I mentioned, these victims, I am not sure about the people my friend Mr. SMITH met with in Nigeria, but the people I met with had no idea that the U.S. Government cared at all because they don't follow Twitter. And if you don't follow Twitter, you don't know that they have been doing #bringbackourgirls and making themselves feel very good. It didn't help the victims one iota. They didn't know. As we are told in Christian churches all our lives, they won't care what you know until they know that you care, and Twitter doesn't seem to convey that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Again, the great urgent needs for the Nigerian military are actionable intelligence and the capacity to know what is going on where, when, in real-time, and training. There needs to be a reevaluation of the vetting process, the Leahy amendment which I absolutely agree with; but when good troops and good soldiers and, especially, good officers are unnecessarily excluded because of a taint that may be ascribed to their unit rather than their individual performance, that needs to be relooked at so that we can train. There is a battalion that is being trained by the U.S., but there needs to be far more training in counterinsurgency.

I would say to my friend, I remember a trip to Darfur. The Nigeria military has been very robust in their peacekeeping. I remember I met with Major

Ajumbo in Darfur who had also been deployed to Sarajevo. I was very active in the terrible Balkan war. I went several times to places, including with FRANK WOLF, to Vukovar and other places that were under siege. When the peacekeepers got there, among them were the Nigerians. So peacekeeping is something they had been very generous in deploying their troops to try to help other countries deal with civil wars or wars of aggression and, of course, terrorist activity as we have seen in Darfur, but now that kind of training is not applicable to a counterinsurgency effort. That takes a very specialized type of skill set, and that needs to be ramped up exponentially if this horrific threat is to be mitigated and then eventually done away with.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think my friend and I both agree, we are not asking the United States to go to war in Nigeria.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not at all.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is not necessary.

When you go back to Afghanistan, within 4 or 5 months, the Taliban was totally defeated without one American losing his or her life; and we helped them with the kind of thing the gentleman is talking about: training, aerial reconnoissance—we would drop a bomb every now and then where it was directed by our intelligence—all done without a single American life being lost.

Now, after the Taliban were routed, there were some CIA agents who were killed in one of the confinement areas, but that was after, basically, the Taliban had been routed.

So, as the gentleman points out, some training, but the first thing the gentleman named, actionable intelligence that they can act on. I notice that my friend didn't mention that we have got to provide more tweets in order to overcome Boko Haram. Actionable intelligence, give them training to help them do this.

We have done that in the Philippines. We have trained the Philippines to protect themselves; and they have come along so well, fighting radical Islam in the southern parts of the Philippines which, really, most people are not aware has been a real hotbed for this kind of radical Islamic activity. I think Khalid Sheikh Mohammed had been to the southern Philippines before 9/11. There are just these hotbeds, and the last thing we need is an area like Nigeria where they have been peace-loving and peacekeeping people, and now they are suffering from the abuses and the horrors of radical Islam.

We don't need to lose friends like that. And nothing breaks my heart more, traveling abroad, than to be constantly asked: Why do you appear to be helping our enemies and not helping your allies?

I don't know if the gentleman has heard that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There are so many very excellent points from my friend from Texas.

They don't want boots on the ground. The Nigerian military, Goodluck Jonathan, the President, what they need is this kind of specialized training, and they need it fast.

As we have seen in Baghdad—and the threat being posed now to Baghdad—and Fallujah, of course, several months ago and now in Mosul, a highly motivated and capable group of terrorists can do extraordinary damage unless you have people facing them down who have the kind of training and motivation that can meet and stop it.

Let me just say, too, Africa is now, you know, the Wahhabi sect and others, extremist elements, are trying to influence Africa to the detriment of moderate Muslims, as you have pointed out, who have gotten along and have been best of friends with the Christian community. Even in Nigeria, there have been bishops and imams who have traveled throughout the country. The country is roughly divided in half. It is the most populous country in all of Africa, about 180 million people, and a very, very important friend and ally of democracy and us. They are at risk because of these extremist elements.

We saw it in Somalia with al-Shabaab and the pain that that terrible organization has inflicted on Somalia. Then as they were being defeated—they are not defeated yet, but as their numbers were lessened, they went over to Nairobi and went into a market and killed large numbers of people and terrorized.

These people eat, sleep, and drink brutality and impose it on innocent people. They blow up children and women and men. As a matter of fact, one of the untold stories is how many of the schoolboys are just being summarily executed, particularly in the three northern states. They kidnap the girls, as you pointed out, sexually abuse them and do horrific things to them and kill some of them, but they just summarily execute the young men.

So there is a reign of terror that is underappreciated around the world with regard to Boko Haram. You and I and others have been raising this for years.

Our Ambassador Sanders yesterday talked about she was Ambassador in 2007–2010, U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria, how she had raised so many issues.

In 2011, the U.N. headquarters in Abuja was firebombed by Boko Haram—in Abuja. There was an American there, and yet the Obama administration refused to designate Boko Haram a foreign terrorist organization.

I asked Assistant Secretary for African Affairs Johnnie Carson at a hearing in 2012 and then again a year later, why. This organization meets the test of a foreign terrorist organization, and why not, especially with the tools that are available through an FTO designation, trying to track the terror money and the means and financing for guns and the procurement of weapons, IEDs and the rest, and they just refused. They named three individuals, but they would not do the FTO for the entire organization. A missed opportunity.

Again, like I said, on the day before my hearing in December, the administration announced Boko Haram as an FTO. We welcomed it. Everybody was glad, but we missed an opportunity for approximately 2 years or more for an FTO designation.

□ 1345

Mr. GOHMERT. If that FTO—foreign terrorist organization—designation had been made earlier on, some might ask, what difference does it make? Well, clearly it could have made a big difference, because if the emphasis had been placed earlier on at just how much of a terrorist organization Boko Haram is they may not have had the power they did to do what they did.

I don't know if my friend is aware, but in talking to these mothers and the three girls that had escaped, as they talked about that night the girls said—and I had not heard this before—but they painted a picture much like my friend had painted of other locations and what Boko Haram and other radical Islamists had done. They came to the school, and it is a bit shocking that their intel was not better, but they kept asking the girls at gunpoint: Where are the boys? Where are the boys? It was a girls school, and they are: Where are the boys? Where are the boys? Well, there are no boys, and they didn't believe them at first. They wanted the boys to do exactly what the gentleman said—they were going to pull the boys out and kill them.

I said: So was it because some radical Islamists do not think that women should be educated? And they said: No, no, the point was it was a Christian school, so if you are a young man they will kill you, because men or women, you should never be educated in a Christian school even if you are not taught about the Bible at all. If it is a Christian-run school, whether it discusses the Bible teachings of Jesus and all, still you should be killed if you are a young man and abused horribly if you are a young woman. So they didn't even know that there were no boys there and were disappointed when all they had were the girls to take off and abuse them.

But just a horrible humanitarian situation. As the gentleman points out—although I have been called an Islamophobe, xenophobe, all kinds of things by people that want to portray something we are not—I was amused at the reaction I saw over my shoulder in Kabul when there were a few of us that went to meet with some Northern Alliance leaders I met with a number of times. DANA ROHRABACHER first introduced me to some, had met others.

But we were going, and they weren't sure I was going to be able to get across the city to meet them, and I was determined, and I told the State Department: You see that gate out here at the Embassy? You are going to have

to take me down because I am getting in a car and I am going to see our allies. I was informed: We are not authorized to take down a Member of Congress. I said: Then you won't stop me. My friend Massoud is sending a car. Having lost his brother, his father-in-law, he knows about security, he will keep me safe, and I am going to meet him.

Well, they arranged for a car from the Embassy that was secured and we went. When we arrived at their compound and I got out of the car, I was surprised this big group of Northern Alliance leaders came rushing down, including General Dostum. But Massoud particularly, I really have high regard for him, came rushing out, they are rushing down the porch, and I notice my other friends from Congress are going: What's going on here, they are rushing to meet each other, are they going to hit each other or what is this?

We embraced when we saw each other. They are moderate Muslims. We disagree on religious beliefs, but they are the enemy of our enemy, and those people successfully defeated the Taliban, our enemy, they want to wipe our Nation off the Earth, and all the Northern Alliance want is to be left alone and let them run their own area. It can be done. Christians and moderate Muslims can live in peace, can embrace, can be in each other's weddings, as happens in Nigeria. But when it comes to radical Islam we have got to call it what it is.

I was a bit surprised to hear from some of the people from Chibok that they honestly believe that the governor is in cahoots with Boko Haram and, if not, is either sympathetic or very afraid of them. They also have grave concern that the principal of that school may have been complicit in assisting in having this happen. That could be an issue because they didn't have enough intel to know there were no boys there, so I am not sure. At least some of the parents were very concerned whether or not the principal may have been complicit. Perhaps the principal was just concerned for the principal's own life, who knows?

But they don't know that we care, and there are some very inexpensive things that will come back as ''bread on the water'' if we assist others in stopping radical Islam right where it is—as our friend George W. Bush used to say—where they get stopped somewhere else and not right outside or inside our own homes. That is not the place you want to be stopping them.

I am so grateful for the gentleman's heart and for his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would just add, finally, that one of the big takeaways—and this was amplified yesterday by Ambassador Sanders—is that there is a huge psychological toll being imposed upon the victims, and that the PTSD experienced by the families, especially with the Chibok abduction, is enormous. The government of Nigeria, obviously, needs to walk point on trying to ensure that psychological assistance, as well as the faith community, which can provide a tremendous benefit to those suffering trauma and the aftermaths of it, be given.

One of the things that Ambassador Sanders mentioned yesterday that I thought was a very good idea is that President Goodluck Jonathan ought to meet with the families of the Chibok girls. One of the things that George Bush did, and he actually did it in my district as well—not George but his wife, the First Lady, but he did it at the White House and other venues—they met with the survivors of 9/11 and let them know not only that the sympathy and the empathy for their plight was real and the harrowing loss that they endured, but that, as President of the United States, George W. Bush, and his wife, said: We are with you, we have got your back, we care about you.

So, respectfully, I would hope that the President, Goodluck Jonathan, would open his arms and meet with the Chibok family members, the parents who are in utter agony—who wouldn't be?—at the loss of their daughters. Again, I met with one of those dads who lost two of his daughters to the abduction, doesn't know where they are, like the others, and this man, tears flowing down his face. In his case, he was one of the Muslims. There were a few Muslim girls, we don't know how many, at the school—it was mostly Christians, overwhelmingly Christian—but his two daughters were Muslim.

This trauma is real. We know from the work that the VA has done for years of posttraumatic stress disorder—PTSD—that those impacts are lifelong and they need to be addressed. When I sat, like you sat, across from some of those young victims, the lucky ones who were able to escape, this poor young 18-year-old girl that I met with was clearly broken and hurting beyond words, and yet she kept uttering and saying: But I care about my friends, what happened to my friends, where are my friends now? And tears welled up in her eyes several times.

So again, I do thank you.

There is one other idea to put on the table: The victims compensation fund. Nigeria does have significant oil wealth. While there are still huge numbers of poor people in Nigeria, there is also the idea that there are resources available. Certainly helping some people get their lives back together—when I went to the IDP camp—the internally displaced camp—in Jos last September I was struck by the destitute, the extreme poverty compounded by the exodus, and there are hundreds of thousands of refugees and internally displaced persons, obviously in Nigeria but also in adjacent countries like Cameroon.

So a victims compensation fund would be at least an effort, a gesture, to help out, it would seem to me, those who are suffering from, again, loss of life, abductions, and now no place to live too. It just gets worse and worse and worse.

I also heard harrowing stories of people who leave their homes and hide in the bush at night because Boko Haram at any night can just come knocking on the door, AK–47 in hand, ready to open fire. So the pervasive fear, especially in the three northern states, is bad and getting worse. And again, our former Ambassador yesterday said: This is a long war, and Nigeria needs to understand, and everyone who supports Nigeria, that it is not going to just end with one fell swoop. There needs to be a strategy that takes in a framework to account that this is a long and protracted war, but it has to start now.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman met with fathers. I didn't meet with fathers. I asked a pastor: Why do we not hear more and see more of the fathers of the girls who were abducted, kidnapped, and being brutalized? I was aware, and some of them had talked about, some people choose to leave their homes to sleep so that Boko Haram doesn't invade their home at night.

But some of them were explaining—and these are all mothers of daughters who were kidnapped; she had two daughters kidnapped—but that it is an interesting thing, a deeply troubling thing about evil. Sometimes people who do evil, they intentionally do things that make the victims feel guilty when it is not their fault.

One of the things that counselors constantly have to deal with, and I know from having prosecuted abusive women, you are constantly having to tell them no one deserved this, no one deserved to be beaten or harmed like you were hurt, nobody. There is no excuse, it is not your fault.

There were times that, as a judge, after sentencing, children would feel guilty, and I would say: You have got to understand, please don't leave my courtroom thinking you did anything wrong.

One of the things that some of the fathers and some of the mothers, they were telling me, they feel so guilty about, that night in the middle of the night, they get word the school has been raided and the girls have been taken. Some of the parents went running and they went all the way to where the school was. They had nothing. They were empty-handed. One woman was so appalled that her daughter had been taken she ran out and a little boy had to say: Ma'am, take my shirt, take my shirt, that she wasn't properly clad. But they were so worried about the girls they didn't think of grabbing anything. They ran.

When they got to the area where some girls were being held all of the Boko Haram had AK–47s, they had machine guns, weapons. These people had empty hands. They were told you either walk away or we kill every one of you, and they would have. They had shown that over and over. They killed people and didn't think twice.

They are thinking, well, if we kill us all here then we have no chance of helping our daughters, but we have got to get them free. We will all be killed right here, so will this do any good?

Well, now they are saddled with the guilt of thinking, maybe if we had gone ahead and ran at them and they slaughtered all of us out there, maybe the world would have listened and our daughters would be safe now.

They have no reason to feel that kind of guilt, none. But this is the kind of insidious evil that Boko Haram is engaged in. It is a travesty to anyone who cares about life or liberty and should be deeply offensive even to moderate or semi-moderate Muslims. They ought to be joining us in this call for an end to the existence of Boko Haram, to the Taliban, to all those who are so pervasive with evil.

□ 1400

This is one of the girls that escaped. It breaks your heart when you start hearing her tell her story.

Unlikely Heroes is the name of the NGO helping these victims. They are helping families. I don't know if you have heard, but just this week, Unlikely Heroes said they are now being contacted like never before from victims who were too afraid and felt like nobody cared and what difference would it make, and now, they are stepping up.

We don't have to go to war for them, but we can help direct their efforts—give them the intel, give them what they need. Then, at some point, we need to help bring pressure on the Nigerian Government to make sure that the people of Nigeria benefit from the massive amount of wealth that is going somewhere.

I sure don't see where it is going in Nigeria, but it is going somewhere. It is not being kept by the oil companies. It is going to somewhere, to somebody in Nigeria, and the people of Nigeria need to begin to enjoy some of the wealth with which their land has been blessed, and I hope we see that in our lifetime as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his compassion and for bringing these stories forward and for meeting with those families.

I did, too, hear of the false guilt—nevertheless, guilt—shared by some of the families, but what do you do when you are facedown with an AK–47 and you are holding a stick? That is basically what happened.

I have been to Abuja a number of times. I am the author, as you know, of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, America's landmark law in combating sex and labor trafficking, enacted in 2000.

I have been there a number of times, working with members of parliament—their congressmen and their senators—on trafficking legislation. They have a very, very well-written piece of legislation to combat the scourge of modern-day slavery and human trafficking.

There are many fine members of the House and Senate. Part of the problem has been the corruption in some places—in the military, in some cases—in parts of the government, and we have corruption here; so we know how insidious, as you pointed out, that can be, but when the military units that are deployed lack the skill base and the training to deal with a terrorist organization that is highly adept, coupled with the fact they don't have enough munitions, enough capabilities that any military going to war against this kind of threat need to have, it just so hampers their ability to carry on the fight. So that, too, has to change.

We are told something like $6 billion in defense spending by the government is what is going on. It seems to me—and I said this at yesterday's hearing—perhaps they need an urgent supplemental—the way we would do here—to significantly upgrade their materiel.

That was one of the first things that Ambassador Sanders said yesterday. They have the money to buy this. They need to procure it—and do it yesterday—certainly, today—and not wait any longer—so that these troops are ready, capable and trained.

So I really appreciate your point. They do have a number of fine laws. Their legislature is functioning in many ways very well. There are gaps that particularly need to be addressed. Three northern states have some serious problems. So I do think we need to be a true ally and friend.

As Professor Pham said yesterday, we will keep our footprint very light. Nobody wants U.S. troops on the ground. That is very clear, but we need to help them help themselves, especially since the Nigerians have been so generous in deploying peacekeepers to troubled areas throughout Africa and, like I said, in places like the Balkans, in Bosnia.

Mr. GOHMERT. As my friend said, there is so much good in Nigeria.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So much.

Mr. GOHMERT. We should not lose sight of that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So much good—the family, the faith community. I spent some time with a number of Catholics and evangelicals. They love God. They really want to do His will on Earth, as it is in Heaven, as we are admonished in the Lord's prayer, but they face many crippling challenges. On the sickness side, malaria is endemic. They have made major gains on the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

They have so many issues that they are trying to address and in comes this horrific Boko Haram organization, which has taken brutality to a new low. They are capable—and let's not kid ourselves. This is a gang, but it is a well-trained gang that is bloodthirsty.

We have seen it before. Look what happened in Liberia and Charles Taylor, who brutalized Sierra Leone and Liberia. Thankfully, he got a 50-year prison sentence by the special court of Sierra Leone and now is in prison, but the pain that he unleashed through his terrorism—and he was the President of that country.

Here, you have a situation where a group of thugs, well trained, are unleashing hell upon wonderful people. Again, that is why we can be of help, especially in the area of intelligence and in the area of training—of course, on the humanitarian side, sharing best practices, especially psychological trauma type of interventions.

Mr. GOHMERT. As a child growing up in Mount Pleasant, Texas, my mother's first cousins, Gene and Mary Leigh Legg, and their children—Beth, Arnold Lloyd, and Linda Leigh—were missionaries to Nigeria. They would go to Nigeria for 3 years and then come back to Mount Pleasant for a year, and they would normally live close to my house. We were always close. We went to church together. We were at each other's houses all the time.

So I grew up vicariously learning the love of the Nigerian people that the Leggs had.

Mary Leigh later had a brain tumor. There was nothing that could be done. Since it was inoperable and they couldn't fix it and she was going to lose her life, she wanted to die there among the Nigerians that she had spent her adult life helping, but the Southern Baptist mission board said: no, we can't have a missionary dying out there in the field, you have got to come back to Texas.

So just a block or so from my house is where she was—we watched her—but she really wanted to die among the people she loved in Nigeria.

Gene later remarried. Jackie and Gene then were missionaries to Nigeria. Beth, Lloyd, and Linda Leigh never lost their love for Nigeria. Jackie and Gene are back in Henderson, Texas, but they still do anything they can for Nigerians.

So I have had the affinity. I have known of the love and the graciousness of the Nigerian people since my earliest memories. It also adds to the heartache when you see what the people are going through these days.

I hope and pray that the Nigerian leaders, the governors in the northeast area and principals of schools, if they are not complicit, they need to come out and make clear that they are an enemy of Boko Haram. Let consequences follow where they may because, when those leaders in those areas stand up and make clear that they do not stand with this kind of evil, then it will give great courage to others.

So I appreciate the gentleman so very much in his efforts around the world. There is much to be done.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. GOHMERT, I want to thank you, again, for your leadership and for taking the time to go to Lagos to meet with all the families and to, again, amplify the message that we must do more. There is more that we can do.

I was extraordinarily impressed with our people that are on the ground. They are totally can-do, both our Embassy, as well as our military people. They want to help. We have got to make sure that we are resourcing them sufficiently as well.

The Government of Nigeria and President Goodluck Jonathan need to listen to the international chorus—the U.K. is there, the French are trying to be helpful on the intelligence side as well—but they own the leadership of this. They need to step up to the plate. Again, I can't emphasize enough the specialized training that could really enable their troops to efficaciously combat Boko Haram.

It needs to be done so urgently and so comprehensively. They need a comprehensive strategy.

I thank my good friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. The former Attorney General of Nigeria has also weighed in and is really working hard to combat radical Islam, and so it is good to see both government officials and former government officials like that weigh in.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Again, I say—and you emphasized it with your lifelong love of the Nigerian people and your knowledge of them—I think most Americans would be very encouraged to know just how strongly faith-filled the Nigerian people are. Whether they be evangelical, Catholic, or Muslim, they take their faith seriously. They are very ethical people, great people, very good business people.

If infrastructure and roads and bridges and the like were to become even more accomplished throughout Nigeria—as Nigeria goes, so goes the rest of Africa, it is often said—they will be a great trading partner. They are already a huge trade partner of the U.S., but that will grow exponentially, going forward.

Again, I have always been impressed with the faith of so many Africans, in general, but the Nigerians' faith in God is extraordinary.

Mr. GOHMERT. There was a press conference we had with all these mothers and the three girls sitting in the back, but it was amazing to hear the comments of all of those Nigerians. All of their comments showed forth faith. It is amazing.

I doubt that I would have said the same things that I said there in a press conference here, but since this is a big group of people who were either committed Christians or Muslims that are moderate, peace-loving people, I pointed out to them that it was obvious Boko Haram means this for evil.

They mean to harm decent, innocent people just because they are Christians—some are moderate Muslims—but they meant it for evil.

This brought me back to a place a long way from my home in the U.S., but not so far from here in Nigeria—just northeast of here—a place called Egypt, where a brother ended up because his 11 other brothers sold him into slavery.

He cried. He wept. He was thrown into a pit. He was a slave. He couldn't understand why God had deserted him. He ended up being a slave and a servant and imprisoned.

Ultimately, he became the second most powerful man in all of Egypt. Because he was the second most powerful man, he was able to save Egypt during the famine that no one knew was coming, but God revealed to him, Joseph.

When his brothers finally realized who he was and began to weep, Joseph told them: you meant it for evil—because what they did was evil, but God used it for good.

Boko Haram means this for evil, but despite all the evil and all the suffering, God can still work this together for good.

I also looked in the camera there and I said: I have a message for Boko Haram. You think your hate for Christians is so powerful, no one can overcome it. Let me tell you, there is a stronger force than your hate, and that is the love of these parents for their children, that is the Christian love you find in Nigeria, and your hate will never be able, ultimately, to win the day over the stronger force of love.

I believe that with all my heart.

□ 1415

I believe that with all my heart, and I am looking forward to the day when love triumphs over the evil of Boko Haram.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Before you got here, I think, at least, I raised the issue of Habila Adamu. He was a man whom I met in an IDP camp in Jos in September of last year. He did tell the story about how Boko Haram broke into his house, dragged him outside, with a terrorist holding an AK–47 right to his nose area.

With his wife weeping, pleading with this man not to shoot her husband, he said: You convert or else I will shoot you.

He said: I am ready to meet my Lord.

So the trigger was pulled, and he blew his face away. You can see it on the other side that he has had some reconstructive surgery.

Not only was this man a living martyr because he survived it—they left him for dead because he was bleeding so profusely—but when I met him in Jos, he didn't have a scintilla—the slightest—of malice towards the gunmen. He said he prays for them. I mean, you are talking about Christian love overcoming a terrible hatred, the likes of which we can't even understand. When he testified here—because I invited him to come to Washington to testify before my subcommittee—you could have heard a pin drop. A lot of the press, including the Associated Press, led with his story.

That is transformative, I believe, to see someone who, almost like our Lord from the cross, says: Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do.

Here was this man who was a living martyr, and I couldn't have been more moved, inspired.

I saw him again on this most recent trip, and the joy that he radiates—he radiates Christ; you see it in his eyes when he speaks—was just extraordinary and humbling because none of us know and I don't know if I could ever react like that. I hope I never do. He had that peace that surpasses all understanding. He was there, and he could have died right that day.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman.

I want to finish by commenting on the comments of our President, particularly in the context of what has gone on in the world.

The story says that, at a White House event on Wednesday, where the President took questions from Tumblr users, President Obama addressed what he will be doing in the future, but he made these comments that I just feel like we have to address in light of what my friend Mr. SMITH and I have been talking about.

The President said:

> I mean, the truth of the matter is that, for all the challenges we face and all the problems that we have, if you had to be—if you had to choose any moment to be born in human history, not knowing what your position was going to be, who you were going to be, you'd choose this time. The world is less violent than it has ever been. It is healthier than it has ever been. It is more tolerant than it has ever been. It is better fed than it's ever been. It is more educated than it's ever been.

With regard, though, to the less violent, one doesn't have to look too far to see the kinds of things that are going on in this world. The latest crime statistics indicate violent crime is up, though property crime has gone down.

Here is a story from January of this year from Reuters. This is Reuters. This is not a group that has ever been particularly kind to me. ''Religious Violence Across World Hits 6-year High According to Pew Study.''

The story says:

> Violence and discrimination against religious groups by governments and rival faiths have reached new highs in all regions of the world except the Americas, according to a new Pew Research Center report.
>
> Social hostility, such as attacks on minority faiths or pressure to conform to certain norms was strong in one-third of the 198 countries and territories surveyed in 2012, especially in the Middle East and North Africa, it said on Tuesday.

Although this story says, ''except the Americas,'' we have commented numerous times here that, in recent years, it has come to be that there is really only one group in America that it is politically correct to be absolutely intolerant toward, and that is the Christian faith. It is okay to belittle the Christian faith. It is okay to belittle the position that marriage should be between a man and a woman.

It is the exact same position the President took when he was a Senator in order to become President because that was very important in his becoming President in 2008. He took the position—most people did—that marriage

was between a man and a woman, and it is a Christian position. I mean, it is in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. Jesus, himself, said that a man shall leave his mother and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh, and what God has joined together let no man put asunder.

That is marriage, Biblical marriage. Anybody who retains the belief that Jesus had and that Moses conveyed as he got it from God was that it was between a man and a woman.

If you hold that position now, it has become widely accepted that, gee, you should lose your job, that you should lose money, that you should have the Nation turn in hatred upon you and your family. Heck, some people want you to go to jail. They want you prosecuted. They want the IRS—they want everybody—after you just because you believe the same thing that Senator Obama said he believed before he became President and that Jesus said was actually the law of God and that Moses said was the law of God. Yet, nowadays, if you take that Christian position, you are a hate monger, and we want to destroy you, which is in direct opposition to the quote that was so often stated during the Revolution. It was attributed to different people. I think more people attributed it to Voltaire:

> I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

It used to be that on college campuses they would invite different people so they could get good arguments and good debates among the students. Now they don't want anybody who doesn't fit the cookie-cutter, liberal mode of whoever is in charge at the university. For heaven's sake, who would have ever dreamed at Brandeis University's founding that, when a Muslim woman stood up against the evils of radical Islam, she would be refused to be allowed to come to the university.

It is time we stand up for freedom, liberty here and everywhere.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this afternoon to take the opportunity to fully inform Members—and, yes, also members of the public—of the actual rights of the people who live in the District of Columbia, who demand respect for their local laws the way every Member would demand respect for the local laws of her own jurisdiction, and yes, if necessary, to call out Members who violate their own principles of local control of government against Federal interference.

I am very pleased that very few bills that trample on the local rights of the people who live in the Nation's Capital have been signed into law and that very few have gotten out of this House even recently. Part of that is because we stand up and fight, but we are at some disadvantage. The District of Columbia delegation consists of me, and we have no Senators. But no red-blooded American would sit down while somebody tramples over her local jurisdiction without getting up and saying something about it and, yes, without doing something about it.

I want to be fair to my colleagues because some of this, I think, has to do with simple ignorance. Some of it has to do with a blind spot. The blind spot is very troubling. The blind spot means that principles that easily soak into them with respect to every single district in the United States somehow haven't made it into their hearts or their heads when it comes to the District of Columbia. It troubles me, but I believe that, when Members think about their own principles, they will think before they simply jump into the jurisdiction of another Member's district.

Particularly when this happens repeatedly, we think that the constituents of the Member should be informed, and we try to inform the constituents. Indeed, we inform the entire State where the constituents are from. If a Member insists upon inserting herself into the affairs of another jurisdiction many miles from home, and if she needs to be called out, that is what we have to do.

Congress 40 years ago passed the Home Rule Act of the District of Columbia. It is too bad it took that long to pass. The culprits there were Democratic and Republican, and indeed, for much of the 20th century, whether they were Democrats or Republicans. The Democrats finally got understood, and the Home Rule Act of 1973 was passed. That act gave all local affairs of the District of Columbia to the local government—to the council and the Mayor of the District of Columbia. My job is to see to it that Members remember the Home Rule Act of 1973 and do not invade the local jurisdiction of our city, Washington, D.C.

I was a little troubled, although I see no real effect thus far, about a memorandum that came from David Mork—the Chief of Staff of Representative PETER ROSKAM, who is the chief deputy whip for the House GOP—inviting Members to insert special provisions, even of a partisan or an ideological nature, into the upcoming appropriations bills. We have checked, and, actually, we have seen very little of that so far. Our concern, of course, is with such inserts that affect the District of Columbia.

By the way, it is interesting that there would be a whole memo inviting Republicans to do so. They haven't done so very much on the appropriations bills that have come through thus far, but I think that probably has a lot to do with how little policy the Republicans have been able to get through the Congress of the United States. So, when you are driven to appropriations bills for policy, you have been driven to a very low level for a lawmaker. The bait hasn't been much bitten, and I am pleased of that for the Nation. I simply want to say, if such ideological policies attached to appropriations are inappropriate for national appropriations, imagine how totally unsuitable they are for an appropriation that may affect the District of Columbia.

□ 1430

One may wonder, what is the District of Columbia local appropriations bill doing in the Congress of the United States?

Very good question. The District of Columbia wants budget autonomy—but we haven't quite gotten there yet, and I very much appreciate that we have had Republican and Democratic support for the proposition that the $6 billion we raise in the District of Columbia is for us and us alone to say anything about.

Imagine, in a Tea Party Congress, how they would react if somebody had anything to do with their local funds.

Well, that is exactly how I am going to react. I am not going to stand for it. I am not going to stay quiet for it, and I am going to see that your constituents know you are meddling into somebody else's business, in violation of your own principles.

It continues to happen, but it happens at far less of a rate than it used to. When I first came to Congress, I used to have to stand on the House floor for hours at a time rebutting attempts to attach to the D.C. appropriation anti-local control amendments. Those are far, far fewer.

Appropriators don't like it. The appropriators simply want to get their appropriation bills done. But occasionally, some of these attachments will come through—to date, only one remains.

. . . Others come through as free-standing bills. And I appreciate that the Speaker doesn't often let those bills get to the floor.

But we feel quite insulted when a Member decides to introduce a bill to, essentially, erase what the local government has put into law. A favorite one of those issues that continues to apparently invite such meddlers is, of course, D.C.'s gun laws.

The District of Columbia has some of the strongest gun laws in the United States. After all, we are a big city. We are the capital of the United States. Foreign dignitaries routinely are in our streets. Every Cabinet official is routinely in our restaurants, and we don't need a lot of guns in a city like this.

We had an even stricter gun law. That was struck down by the Supreme

Court of the United States. We believe in obeying the Supreme Court and in obeying Federal law, so the local government rewrote its local gun laws.

We still have among the strictest gun safety laws in the United States, and the courts have upheld these new gun laws every time they have been attacked. They have been attacked in the courts.

Our gun registration requirement was recently attacked in the courts, and the courts upheld the District's gun registration requirement.

The District's ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines was attacked in the courts, and the courts upheld the District's ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines.

Recently, somebody shot a gun outside of the White House that reached the window, the upstairs, the second-floor window of the White House. You surely wouldn't want a lot of those running around the District of Columbia, and the courts have understood that.

Yet, there will be attempts to go at the city on guns. I don't care about guns in your district. I ask you not to care about guns in mine.

Yet, Representative JIM JORDAN of Ohio has introduced a bill that would wipe out all the gun laws of the District of Columbia. Can you imagine that?

Take every last one of them and wipe them off the books.

Those are local laws passed to protect our local citizens. What is he doing in this?

We keep winning in court, and this Member, Representative JIM JORDAN of Ohio, has introduced only five bills in this Congress. He needs to think about national bills, not bills that trample on the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

We have made a decision, the courts have upheld our decision. I thought that is what the Framers founded the United States of America for, to allow local governments to remain local, to have a Federal Government that took care of things that were not local.

This is local. The gun laws of the District of Columbia protect 650,000 people who live here and visitors who come here. They have nothing to do with Representative JIM JORDAN's district.

Now, to the credit of the majority, this bill has not moved. It hasn't moved in committee, and it certainly hasn't moved to the floor. But we resent that it was filed at all because it didn't have to do with anybody's district except the District of Columbia.

The Member who was just on the floor, Rep PHIL GINGREY of GA has introduced an interesting amendment, Representative PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, expressing the sense of the Congress—now, understand a sense of the Congress measure has no legal effect. And he has, when questioned by the Court, indicated that this was ''a message bill.'' So he is a messaging bill not using his own constituents but using mine.

This messaging bill says that Active Duty military personnel, in their private capacity, should be exempt from the gun safety laws of the District of Columbia, but not from any other district.

For the third year in a row, I am going to get this one taken care of. Twice he introduced it as a part of the defense authorization bill, and twice I have been able to have it taken off.

It got passed again in this House. I am going to get it taken off again.

In this country, we respect local control. If you were to ask me which side of the aisle speaks most vociferously about local control, I will tell you that side of the aisle. So when Republicans interfere with local matters of the District of Columbia, they are in violation of some of their most threshold principles.

Representative JORDAN, interestingly, introduced, and I think this may not have had to do with the fact that it was the 1-year anniversary of the Newtown shooting, but that is when he introduced the bill. There were services all over the country then.

I think he just introduced it because that is when he thought of it, and it was on his National Rifle Association checklist.

Most recently, Representative MARK MEADOWS of North Carolina has introduced a bill that would keep the Federal Government from deducting, as an employer, the union dues of Federal employees. It is a labor right. If you vote that your employer can deduct your dues, he can do so, private and public employer.

Well, I wouldn't be on this floor if this were only a national bill. That is consistent with Representative MEADOWS' views. But Representative MEADOWS has reached into the District of Columbia.

Now he says, not only Federal employees, but he is saying that the District of Columbia government cannot also deduct union dues, as the union members have asked them to, even though these employees who have asked the District to do that are paid for 100 percent by local funds.

Who would take that in this House?

Well, I am not going to take it. And he does so by redefining the District of Columbia to be a Federal agency. And here is the ultimate insult.

Seeing that he has no right to do that, he redefines the District of Columbia as a Federal agency for purposes of this bill.

Well, I am here to tell you that 650,000 people who are number one in Federal taxes paid, number one to the Federal Government, $12,000 per capita per year and they are not simply going to take that kind of treatment from individual Members of Congress.

You don't redefine us. We have been defined as American citizens, and we are going to be treated that way. We are no more a part of the Federal Government than North Carolina, where Mr. MEADOWS is from, is a part of the Federal Government.

One of the favorites is, of course, abortion. A bill to expand the Hyde amendment treated us as a part of the Federal Government. There has been a 20-week D.C. abortion ban bill.

Now comes marijuana decriminalization. The House had a hearing on D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law. I objected that there would even be a hearing. There should have been no such hearing.

There had been four prior hearings—and those prior hearings had not mentioned, even the two jurisdictions, there were two of them, that had made marijuana legal, and there are about 18 that are decriminalized.

The only hearing that was held was held on the decriminalization of the District of Colombia.

Who will take that in this House?

Well, I asked to testify, and to the credit of Mr. MICA, the chairman of the subcommittee, I was given the right to testify.

When the 20-week abortion bill relating only to the District of Columbia was introduced, I was denied even the right to testify.

Well, I am going to find some place to testify, even if it is on the floor of the House of Representatives because you are not going to treat the 650,000 Americans I represent as second-class citizens. You are not going to do it without protest from their Member.

A Member, Representative JOHN FLEMING of Louisiana, was permitted to sit in on the D.C. marijuana decriminalization hearing. He is not even a member of the committee. It is all right with me. But the first thing he did afterward was to violate his 10th amendment principles.

He went out and said, well, I know what I am going to do. I am going to try to keep this D.C. marijuana bill from becoming law. And then when we called him out on it, and the press went to him, he said, well, wait a minute. I haven't said I was going to really do it. I am really waiting to see whether I should do it.

□ 1445

Well, I am waiting too, Representative FLEMING, because you said you were going to do it because you could do it because you think you have the jurisdiction to do it.

Well, you don't. Technically, of course, Congress can reach into the Home Rule Act and violate the Home Rule Act. You can do that, but who would say that was in keeping with your own 10th Amendment principles, your own principles of small government, your own principles that all that matters is local government, your own principles that the Federal Government shouldn't even be in what the Federal Government is doing?

This is a controversial subject, but that is what we have local jurisdictions and States for, to respect our differences. We are a Union of States, and we are not all the same. At least 18 States also have marijuana decriminalization laws.

Representative FLEMING should not be interfering with a jurisdiction 1,000 miles from his own. He has introduced only 11 bills in this Congress. I have introduced 57, and none of them have interfered with anybody else's business, and I am not going to take it when you come here to interfere with mine.

This is interesting. At the hearing, there was open disagreement among Republican Members in Congress because there are Republican libertarians in this Congress. Sometimes, they don't abide by their principles, but they are more likely to do so.

He was called out by the Member who has since introduced the amendment to the FY 2015 COmmerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill that passed this House, that keeps the Federal Government from interfering with medical marijuana laws that have been sanctioned by the local jurisdiction. Guess what? That passed this House with 49 Republicans voting for it.

I want to say here how much I respect my Republican colleagues who try to put their principles into effect when they see such legislation, national or local; and I ask you to put yourself in my position.

Should I sit still when you treat the people I represent as if you could toy with them, use them for messaging, forget that they are number one in Federal income taxes paid to support the government of the United States?

I don't even have the same vote you have on this floor, and no Senators do I have. I have only myself and my will and my determination to call every one of you out, not only on this floor, but to every newspaper in your district, every newspaper in your State, all of those who sent you to Congress because you said you were for small government and local control. Well, if you are for it, I am going to hold you to it.

I don't know what is going to happen with the D.C. marijuana decriminalization bill. I do know this: that I don't expect the District law, which is here now on a so-called layover—what an insult that is. We have to bring our local laws here and let them lie here and if it is a criminal law, for 60 days, to see if anybody wants to jump up and overturn our local laws.

I don't think that is going to happen because I don't think there are that many hypocrites in the Congress of the United States.

There was a bill—and I am not going to call out this Member's name because it was never introduced, but it was passed around for cosponsors. It was a bill that reached into something—I don't even think it was ideological—it was just meddling—that would keep the District of Columbia from using automated traffic enforcement systems.

You know, they are the kind of systems we have in 521 jurisdictions, 24 States, and I don't know if this Member or his staff had gotten a ticket. He didn't say so. All I know is: What in the world are you doing interfering with how we keep people from being struck by cars? Maybe we shouldn't have those in some States. We have them in the District.

The Member did not introduce it, so I am not going to call his name on this floor. I can only thank him for thinking about this bill, and I have come to ask for Members to think very carefully as to what they would do if they were in my place.

You have been sent to the House of Representatives to represent your constituents. You have been sent to protect them, as well as to enable them to have whatever other people in our country have.

Suppose your constituents were number one in Federal taxes paid to the government of the United States. Is there one of you anywhere who would not do as I am doing this afternoon and insist that the people you represent be treated as the fullblooded American citizens that they are?

That is what we are. We intend to be treated that way, and we will never be quiet about it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the Federal Reserve, and if you want a real stemwinder of a conversation here on the House floor, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the Federal Reserve to you. It is nonstop laughs and giggles and interesting information.

I can't get started without referencing my friend from the District of Columbia who just spoke, and she spoke with such passion. I have the great pleasure of serving on the House Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. As you know, it meets right behind the wall up there. It is the only committee that meets in the Capitol, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia is often there, speaking just as passionately on behalf of her constituents.

It is hard because, as she spoke with absolute certainty about the role that the District of Columbia plays, the Constitution speaks with similar certainty, and that is what makes it a difficult conversation to have.

The Constitution set up this governing district and gave those responsibilities to the U.S. Congress to administer.

Now, the Home Rule Act—and if folks haven't looked at the Home Rule Act, it is a fascinating read. Like so many things that we do in this Chamber, it was done for all the right reasons and has its fair set of unintended surprises along the way.

Here is what the Constitution says in article I, section 8, and it says, in part, this:

> Responsibilities of the Congress, to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district, not exceeding 10 miles square, as may, by cession of particular States—you will remember, Virginia and Maryland both ceded real estate in order to create the District of Columbia, we used Maryland's half, we gave back Virginia's half—and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be.

Exclusive jurisdiction granted to the Congress by the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, but then we passed a statute that gave certain home rule rights and responsibilities away.

Now, that statute, of course, is secondary to the Constitution. The Constitution is controlling. The statute is secondary, and that statute grants the rights and the privileges that the Delegate was referencing.

That happens so often here, Mr. Speaker, that we have constitutional responsibilities, and then we have statutory authorities, and sometimes, those come into conflict.

I happen to have one of those on my mind tonight, and it is the Federal Reserve Act, Mr. Speaker. If you are ever looking for a good read, can't quite get to sleep in the evening, let me suggest the Federal Reserve Act to you.

It is not a fascinating read, but it is an incredibly important read, and it says, in part, this—this is the Federal Reserve Act, Mr. Speaker. You can't see it from where you are, but it says this:

> The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee shall maintain long-run growth of the monetary and credit aggregates commensurate with the economy's long-run potential to increase production, so as——and this is the important part——so as to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.

The authority to control the Nation's money supply lies here in Congress. The authority to control interest rates, as they are related to the money supply, lies here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress delegated that to the Federal Reserve Board through the Federal Reserve Act, and the Federal Reserve Board's mission, again, is to:

> Promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had this conversation before. If you have ever been in a high school economics class, you are thinking, hey, wait a minute; can I really promote full employment and interest rate moderation with the same language? Don't I lower interest rates in order to get maximum employment? Don't these things sometimes run countercyclically to one other?

It is a very difficult mandate that we had given the Federal Reserve. I want to talk about how they have handled that because, Mr. Speaker, the frustration I hear from folks back home is:

You are the United States Congress, why can't you get things done? Why won't you move together? Why won't you be effective? In what? In growing jobs and expanding the economy.

Now, we have done some things here of which I am very proud—collaborative things, bipartisan things, bicameral things—that have absolutely taken us a few steps in the right direction. I wish we were moving more rapidly in the right direction. I am finding it harder to get agreement here than I expected, 3 years ago, when I came to this body.

The Federal Reserve then has taken it upon themselves, through this Federal Reserve Act mandate that I read earlier, to try to improve, stabilize—insert your favorable word here. They are not villains. They are out to help try to improve our economy.

What I have here, Mr. Speaker—again, you can't see it. I have the Federal Reserve's balance sheet. Now, what is important about the balance sheet, Mr. Speaker—I go back to 2007, and what you see is the Federal Reserve's balance sheet is relatively stable, just over about $800 billion.

Now, again, if you are working in a high school economics class—this is not the millions with an m. This is billions with a b. $800 billion is the typical size of the balance sheet at the Federal Reserve, but we enter these financial crises in 2008, 2009, 2010, the size of the Federal Reserve balance sheet doubled, and then it quadrupled. It doubled, and then it quadrupled.

Mr. Speaker, in the period of about 3 months, the Federal Reserve's balance sheet went from $800 billion up above $2.4 trillion.

I want you to think about that. The budget of the entire United States of America is about $3.5 trillion. It goes up. It goes down. It is about $3.5 trillion. In the span of about 3 months, the Federal Reserve—created by Congress, empowered by Congress—expanded its balance sheet without any additional approval of Congress by about $1.7 trillion.

The Federal Reserve expanded its balance sheet in 3 months by twice as much as the entire Federal Government spent in that same period of time without a single vote, without a single conversation in this Chamber, without a bit of consent from the Speaker, from the majority leader of the Senate, from the White House, $1.7 trillion.

Now, you can't see the colors on the chart, Mr. Speaker. The balance sheet, of course, has a variety of components to it. Traditional security holdings that the Federal Reserve has always had, those actually are a smaller part of those holdings today.

What we are looking at is, in this beige area, it is long-term bond purchases. It is Federal Government debt purchases.

It doesn't take a long conversation to begin to get concerned when an entity created by the Federal Government is actually buying all of the Federal Government debt—or at least a substantial portion of it.

What does that mean to our long-term economic growth?

□ 1500

Again, if the Federal Reserve was enacted to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates, then how is doubling the balance sheet, tripling the balance sheet—now we are just almost at $4 trillion. That is beyond quadrupling the balance sheet. That is coming close to quintupling the balance sheet. What does this mean about the long-term economic security of America?

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is something that happens—$4 trillion—without a single vote in this Chamber, without a single vote across the Capitol in the Senate, without a single signature by the President, and without any consent by the American people whatsoever. Four trillion dollars in balance sheet expansion with not a single bit of consent of the governed.

Well, why is that important, Mr. Speaker? It is because this doesn't happen by accident. This happens in response to a crisis. Now, this Chamber responds to crises, and the administration responds to crises. But the Federal Reserve responded to an economic crisis. It tried to do what it could do to help the economy grow.

Well, I happen to have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the testimony from then-Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, February 9, 2011. Now, Mr. Speaker, you won't remember February 9, 2011 here in this Chamber, but that was my first month on the job. I had just gotten sworn in, and they had just given me the voting card for the Seventh District of Georgia. I am sitting in the House Budget Committee, and here comes Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke to talk to me—just a freshman here in Congress—about economic policy and how it is we are going to grow the American economy.

Well, that might have been my first month on the job, but it wasn't Chairman PAUL RYAN's first month on the job. He was a veteran. He was our chairman at that time, as he is today. He was a veteran of the budget process, and he asked Dr. Bernanke: I am looking at the expansion of the balance sheet. The chairman said: I am looking at QE2—quantitative easing 2 at the time it was called—and I am trying to figure out what this is going to do to the economy long term.

I want to quote from Chairman Bernanke because it is important. The clarity is important. Chairman PAUL RYAN was asking whether or not all of this work by the Fed was going to monetize our debt, whether inflation was going to come and we were going to solve our debt problems by just inflating everybody's money right out of existence.

And Chairman Bernanke said:

> No, sir. No, sir. Monetization would involve a permanent increase in the money supply to basically pay the government's bills through money creation.

That is not what we are doing, he says.

He says this:

> What we are doing here is a temporary measure which will be reversed so that at the end of this process, the money supply will be normalized, the amount of the Fed's balance sheet will be normalized, and there will be no permanent increase, either in the Fed's balance sheet, or in inflation.

In February, 2011, Chairman Ben Bernanke says that the Fed's balance sheet will be normalized. The Fed balance sheet will return to a normal level because what was happening at the Fed at that time was a temporary measure.

Again, Mr. Speaker, you won't be able to read these numbers, but I want to help you find February 2011 on this chart. February 2011 is right here. Right here.

It was at this point where you see a mild dip, Mr. Speaker, where Chairman Ben Bernanke said that the balance sheet—which has risen not to twice its normal levels but to three times its normal levels—this is a temporary measure, and the balance sheet will begin to return to normal. Mr. Speaker, we are 3 years later, and far from returning to normal, the size of the balance sheet has doubled.

Temporary measure. Don't worry about it. We are on our way, going to return to normal. But rather than return to normal, the size of the balance sheet has again doubled. Not one vote in this Chamber. Not one vote across the Capitol in the Senate. Not one signature by the United States President. Not one bit of consent from the 300 million Americans who are governed. Balance sheet doubled.

What does that mean? Why is this important? Mr. Speaker, I know what you are saying. I promised you a humdinger of Federal Reserve conversation this afternoon. I told you the Federal Reserve was an exciting topic, and you are thinking, Rob, you are talking balance sheets. Balance sheets don't inspire me at all. Well, okay, what about interest rates, Mr. Speaker? Do you remember the interest rates of the 1970s? Because I do. Do you remember when getting a 12 percent mortgage was getting a pretty good deal? Because I do.

Folks don't realize that today. If you were born after the 1970s, you have been in a time of relatively moderate interest rates. This, what I have here is 10-year interest rates, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury 10-year rates. And I go back to about 1960 and we track these rates out. Back in the 1960s, they were about 5 percent, 4 percent. Go right on up there into the end of the Carter years, the beginning of the Reagan years, hit 16 percent on a 10-year Treasury coming out of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. And then after those Carter, Reagan years, you begin to see those numbers decline. And you go all the way out now and you are looking at yields under 2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these are interest rates on money the Federal Government borrows. Now, again, I hate to dwell too much on my high school economics class lessons, but you know how interest works, right? If there is a lot of something and you want to borrow it, you pay a little bit of interest. But if there is not much of something and you want to borrow it, you have to pay more interest. Or, conversely, if there is a lot of debt, in order to get folks to buy that debt, you have to pay higher interest rates. But if there is only a little debt, to get folks to buy that debt, you pay lower rates.

Well, we have more debt in this country than we have ever had before, Mr. Speaker. Never before in the history of this country have we had as much debt as we have now. Never before have we rolled that debt up above the size of the GDP as we have now. Never before have we borrowed as much from the next generation of Americans sacrificing their future prosperity for our current benefit. Never before. So you would think that we would be paying the highest rates in American history.

Let's go to the chart. No. No. The highest rates in American history were back in the late 1970s, early 1980s, Mr. Speaker. What we are paying are the lowest interest rates in American history. Now, I want you to sort through that with me, Mr. Speaker. We have more debt than we have ever had before. We are borrowing more from the world than we have ever tried to borrow from the world before, and yet interest rates on our borrowing are going down instead of up—going down instead of up.

The debt today in America, Mr. Speaker, is four times higher than it was in the late 1990s. Yet, the interest service on the debt today is the same because we are borrowing at these low teaser rates.

What enables these low teaser rates? Among other things, when the Federal Reserve is willing to buy those bonds, long-term Treasury purchases. You see them right here. They didn't even exist prior to 2009. Now those purchases have grown to over $1 trillion. It turns out that you can get lower interest rates on your money if you are willing to buy it from yourself and pay yourself back. You can charge less.

But what does that mean to long-term economic security in this country, Mr. Speaker? Because that sounds a little bit like a dangerous Ponzi scheme to me. Maybe there is something aberrant about the 10-year rates.

So, I want to look here, Mr. Speaker. Again, you can't see my colors, but I charted those 10-year yields from 2009 out until today, and I have coordinated them with the implementation of this Federal Reserve policy called quantitative easing. The red squares, Mr. Speaker, indicate when quantitative easing stops. The green squares indicate when quantitative easing starts. Quantitative begins 2009, QE2, QE1 ends.

QE2 begins, QE2 ends. QE3 begins, QE3 not yet quite ended. And you will see that the interest rates directly correspond—directly correspond—to when these Federal Reserve programs begin and end. Dramatic manipulation of interest rates. Again, not a single vote in this Chamber, not a single vote across the Capitol in the Senate, not a single signature by the President, and not a single bit of consent from the hundreds of millions of Americans who are governed. Interest rates being manipulated.

It is not just the 10-year rates, Mr. Speaker; it is the 30-year rates, too. Again, this is long-term money. If you borrow almost $18 trillion—as we have borrowed here in this country—you are not going to pay that overnight. That is a long-term promise. So you would expect that these long-term rates would be getting higher and higher and higher and higher because the risk is greater and greater and greater. Again, we threaten America's fiscal security by borrowing from tomorrow's generations to pay for today's benefits. It is fair to question the morality of that, Mr. Speaker.

If you started your small business on the day that Jesus Christ was born, and you lost $1 million on your first day in business, but you worked hard, you worked 7 days a week, Mr. Speaker, from the day Jesus Christ was born until today, and you lost $1 million every single day, you would have to work for another 730 years, Mr. Speaker, to lose your first trillion dollars—your first trillion dollars. Another 700 years, $1 million a day, 7 days a week to lose your first trillion dollars.

We have borrowed from tomorrow's children, from tomorrow's generation, from tomorrow's prosperity almost $18 trillion. Yet interest rates are going down.

Why is that? It is because, number one, we are the best of all the worst economies on the planet. Let's be clear. Of all the disastrous economies on the planet, ours is the least disastrous. And so folks still want to come and buy American debt. Thank goodness. Forbid the thought that one of these other economies is going to improve one of these days, we are going to have a harder time finding debt service. How much more of our own money can the Federal Reserve buy? Most debt in American history. Highest percent of GDP in American history. Interest rates going down.

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe this all sounds like a pretty good scheme, then, if I can borrow as much money as I want to beyond historical norms but I can keep interest rates as low as I want to below historical norms. Maybe what this means is I found the secret mechanism for making money—I can just create prosperity for the American people out of thin air.

Well, it turns out that is not quite true. In fact, it is not even close. What I have here, Mr. Speaker, is the dollar index. The dollar index is an index of the value of the American dollar around the globe. Because a dollar is meaningless. What is meaningful is how much a dollar can purchase. If I can only purchase one Coca-Cola, Mr. Speaker, with a dollar, then that dollar is worth one Coca-Cola. If I can purchase 12 Cokes with a dollar, then that dollar is worth a whole lot more to me. It is still just a dollar. We don't care about the dollar. We care about how much it will purchase. That is what this chart shows.

Again, Mr. Speaker, QE1 goes into effect, QE1 ends. QE2 goes into effect. QE2 is announced, it goes into effect, QE2 ends. QE3 is announced, it goes into effect, it goes out over the horizon. This is what I want you to see, Mr. Speaker: QE1 goes into effect, and in the midst of the QE1 operation, before it begins to wind down, the value of a dollar has dropped by 15 percent.

I want you to think about that. If we tried to pass a bill in this Chamber that looked at everything that everybody had in this entire great country of ours and taxed it all at 15 percent to bring that in immediately, what do you think the chances are we would pass that? What do you think the chances are we would get one vote on that? The Senate wouldn't pass it. The President wouldn't sign it. But, yet, when we devalue our dollar, we devalue everything that everybody has by the exact same percentage.

In the case of QE1, 15 percent reduction before that program decided to wind down. Come over here to QE2. It is another 5 percent reduction in the value of the dollar, Mr. Speaker.

Here is the thing. We can print as much money as we want to. It is our right as a sovereign nation. But the more you print, the less valuable it becomes. That is what Chairman RYAN was asking when he was asking Chairman Bernanke if he planned to monetize the debt. He was asking: Do you plan to print so much money that the money itself becomes less valuable? If you owe $1 trillion, do you plan to print so much money that you pay back the trillion dollars with these newly printed dollars that are worth only a fraction of what the original borrowed money was worth?

QE1, dollar collapses 15 percent. QE2, dollar down 5 percent. For every action, there is a reaction, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Reserve has these mandates: interest rates, inflation, full employment. There are only so many levers they can pull. And, in fact, the answer is that they have run out of levers, Mr. Speaker. That is why you see the balance sheet looking the way it is today. Look at all these lines that never existed before in the history of the country. Look at these lines. Long-term Treasury purchases. That is new. That is something that has just been implemented in the last 5 years. Folks ran out of tools.

Look at this line, Mr. Speaker. Federal agency debt. Mortgage-backed securities. Whoever thought of the Federal Reserve purchasing mortgage-

backed securities—by the billions? Monthly, by the billions never existed before in the history of this country—an expanding part of the balance sheet today.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, there are only so many tools that the Federal Reserve has to use in order to try to keep this economy afloat, each one of these tools never approved by the Congress, never approved by the President, never approved by the American people; and yet, the Federal Reserve's balance sheet is now larger than the entire budget of the United States of America. Isn't it time we have this conversation?

Chairman RYAN says: Isn't this monetizing the debt?

Chairman Ben Bernanke says: No, this is a temporary measure. Balance sheet levels will return to level.

When were they going to return to normal? Well, that comment was in February of 2011. Since that time, we have seen another 100 percent increase in the size of that balance sheet.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the Federal Reserve is wrong. I have some grave concerns. We have asked the question: How is it you are going to unwind these giant balance sheets?

The answer is: I don't know. We have never seen it done in the entire history of the United States of America, but don't worry about it, it is going to be fine.

It is a frightening thing. Here we are, in the longest recession of my lifetime, the most stagnant growth coming out of a recession, that we have ever seen coming out of a recession in the history of this country, the Federal Reserve pulling all of the levers it knows how to pull, Congress pulling all of the levers it knows how to pull, the balance sheet getting larger, unwinding it getting harder.

I want you to open up The Wall Street Journal the next time you have a chance, Mr. Speaker, and keep an eye on this dollar index. I can't say it too strongly, that if I tried to pass a 5 percent tax on everything that everybody has, everybody earns, everybody owns, I would be laughed right out of this Chamber; yet through monetary policy, we could devalue all of those exact things by that exact amount, and nobody would even know.

There would be no record of debate here in this Chamber. There would be no record of a vote in the Senate. There would be no bill that the President signs or vetoes. It would happen with the stroke of a pen with the Federal Reserve Governors, and America would be none the wiser. Every day, you can find it. Track that dollar index, Mr. Speaker.

What happens when you start to devalue money, Mr. Speaker, is you start running into inflation, and we see that. I talked earlier about what happened in those Carter years before President Reagan came in.

We were looking at annual inflation way up above 12 percent—back after World War II, again, printing a lot of money, borrowing a lot of money, economic turmoil, even though people were at work, maximum employment, but inflation rate was up about 18 percent, but here we go. This chart is from 1946 out to 2014.

Folks ask: Rob, why are you so worried? Isn't inflation kind of low today?

Inflation is incredibly low today. Think about that. We have pumped all of this new money into the economy. We have all this additional liquidity. We have all this cash parked on the sidelines, and yet inflation is incredibly low, but ticking up.

The question isn't what is inflation today, Mr. Speaker. The question is: When inflation starts to move, will we be able to control it?

We have spent so many of our tools trying to stimulate the economy, and again, we can question whether or not that was the intent of the Federal Reserve Act when it was passed, to have all of these new levers created and pulled in a time of economic crisis, but they have been created, and they have been pulled; and so when inflation comes, will we still have any tools in the toolbox to control it?

This is not just my fear, Mr. Speaker. You can go this week to The Wall Street Journal. This is June 9:

> Inflation is rising in the United States and could become a serious problem sooner than the Federal Reserve and many others now recognize.

Going to the end of that article:

> The key to the future is how the Fed will respond when prices steadily rise above its 2 percent target rate, while the overall unemployment rate is still relatively high. A misinterpretation of labor-market slack and a failure to create a positive real Federal funds rate could put the economy on a path of rapidly rising inflation.

In the old days, the Federal Reserve, with all of the power it has and all of the levers it has to pull, all of the tools in its toolbox, focused on inflation and interest rates and employment; but with all of those levers having been pulled, with inflation on the rise, with unemployment stubbornly high, and with interest rates stubbornly low, what levers are left to pull when the next crisis comes?

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of if the next crisis comes, it is a question of when the next crisis comes, and when we do these extraordinary things to solve today's crisis, we put America at risk for tomorrow's crisis.

I do not fault those folks who are trying to make things better, but I do fault us as an institution if we allow the prosperity of tomorrow to be traded away to treat the ills of today.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Act, commit it to your reading. We will be down here again because this is an issue that this Chamber must exercise our article I controls.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 13, 2014, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5942. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-07-0059; AO-388-A22, AO-356-A43 and AO-366-A51; DA-07-03] received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5943. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No. AMS-FV-13-0071; FV13-920-2 FIR] received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5944. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Trafficking Controls and Fraud Investigations [FNS-2012-0028] (RIN: 0584-AE26) received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5945. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9909-82] (RIN: 2070-AJ53) received April 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5946. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received May 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5947. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Combustion Turbine Alternative Control Requirements for the Milwaukee-Racine Former Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0206; FRL-9908-93 Region-5] received April 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5948. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Mondelez Global LLC, Inc. — Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0179; FRL-9910-04 Region-3] received April 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5949. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAr-2012-0002; FRL-9910-06 Region-3] received April 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5950. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0216; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-045-AD; Amendment 39-17818; AD 2014-0704] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5951. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1072; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-17828AD 2014-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5952. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Centrair Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0018; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-17822; AD 2014-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5953. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0042; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-050-AD; Amendment 39-17823; AD 2014-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5954. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0255; Directorate Identifier 2014-Nm-056-AD; Amendment 39-17840; AD 2014-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5955. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0637; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-030-AD; Amendment 39-17830; AD 2014-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5956. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0164; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-17834; AD 2014-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5957. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0233; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-053-AD; Amendment 39-17825; AD 2014-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5958. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0020; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-039-AD; Amendment 39-17821; AD 2014-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5959. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Jefferson City, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0587; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-8] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5960. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace, and Establishment of Class E Airspace, Tri-Cities, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0806; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-21] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5961. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sylva, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0439; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-9] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5962. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Nashville, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0932; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-24] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5963. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0025; Airspace Docket No. 14-ANE-1] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5964. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Geneva, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1086; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-40] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5965. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30950; Amdt. No. 3583] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5966. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30594; Amdt. No. 3587] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5967. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30591; Amdt. No. 3584] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5968. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30955; Amdt. No. 3588] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5969. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Ruling: Retiree Health Benefits Provided Through Employer's Wholly-Owned Subsidiary (Rev. Rul. 2014-15) received May 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5970. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — The U.S. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program [Docket No.: USCBP-2013-0029] (RIN: 1654-AB01) received May 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to allow advanced biofuel, biomass-based diesel, and cellulosic biofuel to satisfy the mandates of the renewable fuel program only if domestically produced, to eliminate the corn ethanol mandate under such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the regulation of emissions of carbon dioxide from new or existing power plants under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4851. A bill to promote access for United States officials, journalists, and other citizens to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4852. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow individuals to elect to receive the Medicare Summary Notice electronically, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. CAPITO,

Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify when the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to prohibit the specification of a defined area, or deny or restrict the use of a defined area for specification, as a disposal site under section 404 of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception from the passive loss rules for investments in high technology research small business pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4856. A bill to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4858. A bill to establish the San Gabriel National Recreation Area as a unit of the National Park System in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that the Administrator of General Services verify that a building to be leased to accommodate a Federal agency is located a certain distance from public transportation before entering into the lease agreement; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4860. A bill to clarify that a closure of a branch or campus of an institution of higher education may qualify a borrower for loan discharge under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4861. A bill to establish the Commission on Access to Care to undertake a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of access to health care at the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4862. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to meet with certain advisory committees to receive administrative and policy recommendations to improve the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4863. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are victims of sex-related offenses with access to a special victims' counsel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4864. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that working families have access to affordable health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COLE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 4866. A bill to reverse the Department of the Interior's listing of the lesser prairie chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, to prevent further consideration of listing of such species as a threatened species or endangered species under that Act pending implementation of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan and other conservation measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4867. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 4868. A bill to expand the Moving to Work demonstration program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARR, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 622. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the national security interests of the United States and its allies and partners with respect to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 623. A resolution recognizing the importance of dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities and promoting research, education, and awareness; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H. Res. 624. A resolution recognizing the 350th anniversary of the founding of New Jersey and honoring the valuable contributions of people of the Garden State; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 625. A resolution honoring Greyhound Lines, Inc., of Dallas, TX on the occasion of its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 626. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Nonviolence Week'' to raise awareness of youth violence in the United States; 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. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 4851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 4853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 4854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States)

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have the Power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 4858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 4859.

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 3 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 4863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation provides authorization for the Secretary of a military service component to extend Special Victims' Counsel Services to a National Guard and Reserve victim who is assaulted by another member of the military while not in a duty status. Members of the National Guard and Reserve frequently perform military duties when they are not in a military status and the legislation provides SVC legal assistance regardless of their duty status at the time of the assault. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 4866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 ''The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 188: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 259: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 318: Mr. BENISHEK and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 455: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 485: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 493: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 494: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 543: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 596: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 855: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 901: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1015: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1020: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1070: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1125: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1136: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1150: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1286: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1416: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1449: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 1507: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1518: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1563: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1755: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1795: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1852: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1918: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2001: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2028: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2066: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 2084: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2323: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2415: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2453: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2504: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2682: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 2807: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2959: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 3045: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3245: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3367: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3382: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 3413: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3485: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3505: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 3544: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 3556: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3680: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DINGELL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3708: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 3722: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3774: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3836: Mr. BARBER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3839: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3854: Mr. REED.

H.R. 3877: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3991: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 3992: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4060: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4086: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4136: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4162: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4219: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 4240: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4252: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4315: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4316: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4318: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4321: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 4325: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4333: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 4351: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4365: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 4410: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4411: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4446: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 4450: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4502: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4510: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4515: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4525: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 4526: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4576: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4577: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4578: Ms. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS AND MR. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4582: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ELLISON and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 4612: Mr. YOHO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 4630: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 4631: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 4653: Mr. DUFFY and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4664: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4680: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4693: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4704: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4714: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4717: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4723: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4731: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 4749: Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 4752: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4756: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4757: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4778: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4781: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4782: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4783: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4786: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4790: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4805: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4808: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4813: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 4826: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 109: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 171: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 489: Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 587: Mr. SIRES and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 593: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 594: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 601: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PETERS on, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 621: Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.