United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 11, 2014 No. 108

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 14, 2014, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 11, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In these most important days and debates here in the people's House, we beg You to send Your spirit of wisdom as the Members struggle to do the work that has been entrusted to them. Inspire them to work together with charity, and join their efforts to accomplish what our Nation needs to live into a prosperous and secure future.

Please keep all the Members of this Congress, and all who work for the people's House, in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them by the people of this great Nation.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ENYART led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

ACTING VA SECRETARY VISITS HOSPITALS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, Acting VA Secretary Sloan Gibson visited the William Jennings Bryan Dorn VA Hospital in Columbia, South Carolina. Then he toured the Charlie Norwood VA Hospital in Augusta, Georgia. VA Chairman JEFF MILLER visited both hospitals in January, promoting the expedited health care for our veterans.

The lack of treatment our veterans are receiving from the VA is inexcusable. Sadly, we have learned about lack of care at VA facilities across the country leading to death, cancer, and other progressive illnesses—a preview of ObamaCare chaos. This has been a failure by the President, who was alerted by his transition team in 2009 that there was mismanagement.

Finally, now, as the former president and CEO of the United Services Organization, USO, Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson has the experience to restore accountability with our veterans. Moving forward, I have faith that the professional staffs at Dorn and Charlie Norwood VA hospitals will ensure those who fought for our freedom receive the health care services they deserve.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th—as the President should take action for victory—in the global war on terrorism.

DEMAND ACTION ON H.R. 4594

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I just shared with the Speaker that the battle to save the lives of Afghans who helped Americans as guides and interpreters has been a roller coaster, documented again Wednesday night in a gripping film, ''The Interpreters,'' by VICE News, about the American failure to protect those who helped us.

The program was brought back to life during the difficult government shutdown period by a bipartisan effort. Now that same bipartisan spirit is needed again, because only a few hundred visas remain with 6,000 people in the pipeline, with thousands more who must not be left to the tender mercies of the Taliban seeking revenge to torture and kill them.

Printed on recycled paper.

It is the moral obligation of every Member of Congress to protect the men and women who helped Americans, who protected us in some of the most difficult of circumstances.

Please don't just cosponsor H.R. 4594; demand action before we adjourn. Lives are at stake.

THE NEED FOR A MORE EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF TITLE I FUNDING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, I had the opportunity to join rural school advocates from across the country here in Washington for the release of the Why Rural Matters 2013–2014 report, a biennial report from the Rural School and Community Trust which analyzes the state of rural education for communities in each of the 50 States.

This important research document gives policymakers and the public fresh insight into the social and economic contexts that influence educational outcomes and also reinforces how these conditions must be better understood, including in the context of how the Federal Government allocates title I funding.

Title I was initially created to offset the impacts of poverty on student learning. Unfortunately, the report shows once again that children receive preferential treatment based not only on their economic circumstances, but on the basis of their ZIP Code.

Surely my colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe that all children are equal. Unfortunately, most are surprised to learn, as we were reminded again this week, this is not the case.

I believe this body can do better, for our children deserve as much.

PASSING OF U.S. SENATOR ALAN DIXON

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a good friend, a hardworking public servant, and a true advocate for the American people. Today, I rise to talk about Senator Alan Dixon, the gentleman from Illinois.

Senator Dixon was from my hometown, Belleville. He was one of the finest public servants our country has ever known. Through a storied career, he walked the halls of power in Springfield, Illinois, and Washington, D.C., but never forgot his southern Illinois roots.

He was a mentor to generations of southern Illinoisans. His sense of civility is a commodity that was sorely needed during his time in government and is in even greater demand today.

It is in his honor and memory that I encourage the spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation as we continue to serve our fellow citizens in America.

AMERICA'S FLEET SHOULD LEAVE THE COAST OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last month, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas openly united with the evil terrorist group Hamas, and at this very moment they are raining down rockets upon the innocent citizens of Israel. Half of all Israelis have sought cover in bomb shelters across their tiny country. And the Obama administration has had the reprehensible gall to praise Abbas as someone who is ''committed to nonviolence and cooperation with Israel,'' and to further proclaim in an Israeli newspaper that ''finally, peace is possible.''

Mr. Speaker, I thought nothing this President could ever say or do would surprise me anymore, but this flushed and breathless rush to embrace terrorists launching rockets at Israeli children is an unprecedented act of cowardice and betrayal.

America's fleet should, this minute, be off the coast of Israel, and the world, including Abbas, Hamas, and Hezbollah, should know that America's arsenal of freedom stands ready to defend our most precious ally on Earth.

END THE VIOLENCE IN INDIANAPOLIS

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sadness and outrage over the violence that has ravaged my Indianapolis congressional district.

Eighty people, Mr. Speaker, have been murdered so far in 2014. In the last year alone, two police officers—Officer Rod Bradway and Officer Perry Renn—were senselessly gunned down in the line of duty.

Enough is enough. I am calling on my fellow Hoosiers to end this violence, and I am asking my colleagues here in Congress and in the administration for help.

With violence on the rise, police levels in Indianapolis have dropped below 1,500 officers, the lowest number in 7 years. We need increased funding for law enforcement and programs that keep our children off of our streets. We need the resources to not only combat crime, but prevent it from happening in the first place.

It is time for us to end the violence and make our streets safe again.

BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 661, I call up the bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 661, 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 113–517, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4718

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

SECTION 1. BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT; INCLUSION OF QUALIFIED RETAIL IMPROVEMENT PROPERTY.—Section 168(k)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified property' means property—

''(i)(I) to which this section applies which has a recovery period of 20 years or less,

''(II) which is computer software (as defined in section 167(f)(1)(B)) for which a deduction is allowable under section 167(a) without regard to this subsection,

''(III) which is water utility property,

''(IV) which is qualified leasehold improvement property, or

''(V) which is qualified retail improvement property, and

''(ii) the original use of which commences with the taxpayer.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR ALTERNATIVE DEPRECIATION PROPERTY.—The term 'qualified property' shall not include any property to which the alternative depreciation system under subsection (g) applies, determined—

''(i) without regard to paragraph (7) of subsection (g) (relating to election to have system apply), and

''(ii) after application of section 280F(b) (relating to listed property with limited business use).

''(C) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(i) SALE-LEASEBACKS.—For purposes of clause (ii) and subparagraph (A)(ii), if property is—

''(I) originally placed in service by a person, and

''(II) sold and leased back by such person within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service,

such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date on which such property is used under the leaseback referred to in subclause (II).

''(ii) SYNDICATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), if—

''(I) property is originally placed in service by the lessor of such property,

''(II) such property is sold by such lessor or any subsequent purchaser within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service (or, in the case of multiple units of property subject to the same lease, within 3 months after the date the final unit is placed in service, so long as the period between the time the first unit is placed in service and the time the last unit is placed in service does not exceed 12 months), and

''(III) the user of such property after the last sale during such 3-month period remains the same as when such property was originally placed in service,

such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date of such last sale.

''(D) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 280F.—For purposes of section 280F—

''(i) AUTOMOBILES.—In the case of a passenger automobile (as defined in section 280F(d)(5)) which is qualified property, the Secretary shall increase the limitation under section 280F(a)(1)(A)(i) by $8,000.

''(ii) LISTED PROPERTY.—The deduction allowable under paragraph (1) shall be taken into account in computing any recapture amount under section 280F(b)(2).

''(iii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.— In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2014, the $8,000 amount in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the automobile price inflation adjustment determined under section 280F(d)(7)(B)(i) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting '2013' for '1987' in subclause (II) thereof.

If any increase under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $100, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

''(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—For purposes of determining alternative minimum taxable income under section 55, the deduction under section 167 for qualified property shall be determined without regard to any adjustment under section 56.''.

(b) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—Section 168(k)(4) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(4) ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a corporation elects to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year—

''(i) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply for such taxable year,

''(ii) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method, and

''(iii) the limitation imposed by section 53(c) for such taxable year shall be increased by the bonus depreciation amount which is determined for such taxable year under subparagraph (B).

''(B) BONUS DEPRECIATION AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) applied to all such property, over

''(II) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) did not apply to any such property.

The aggregate amounts determined under subclauses (I) and (II) shall be determined without regard to any election made under subsection (b)(2)(D), (b)(3)(D), or (g)(7) and without regard to subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year shall not exceed the lesser of—

''(I) 50 percent of the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for the first taxable year ending after December 31, 2013, or

''(II) the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for such taxable year determined by taking into account only the adjusted net minimum tax for taxable years ending before January 1, 2014 (determined by treating credits as allowed on a first-in, first-out basis).

''(iii) AGGREGATION RULE.—All corporations which are treated as a single employer under section 52(a) shall be treated—

''(I) as 1 taxpayer for purposes of this paragraph, and

''(II) as having elected the application of this paragraph if any such corporation so elects.

''(C) CREDIT REFUNDABLE.—For purposes of section 6401(b), the aggregate increase in the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A for any taxable year resulting from the application of this paragraph shall be treated as allowed under subpart C of such part (and not any other subpart).

''(D) OTHER RULES.—

''(i) ELECTION.—Any election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

''(ii) PARTNERSHIPS WITH ELECTING PARTNERS.—In the case of a corporation which is a partner in a partnership and which makes an election under subparagraph (A) for the taxable year, for purposes of determining such corporation's distributive share of partnership items under section 702 for such taxable year—

''(I) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply, and

''(II) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method.

''(iii) CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership in which more than 50 percent of the capital and profits interests are owned (directly or indirectly) at all times during the taxable year by 1 corporation (or by corporations treated as 1 taxpayer under subparagraph (B)(iii)), each partner shall compute its bonus depreciation amount under clause (i) of subparagraph (B) by taking into account its distributive share of the amounts determined by the partnership under subclauses (I) and (II) of such clause for the taxable year of the partnership ending with or within the taxable year of the partner.''.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—Section 168(k) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any tree or vine bearing fruits or nuts which is planted, or is grafted to a plant that has already been planted, by the taxpayer in the ordinary course of the taxpayer's farming business (as defined in section 263A(e)(4))—

''(i) a depreciation deduction equal to 50 percent of the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be allowed under section 167(a) for the taxable year in which such tree or vine is so planted or grafted, and

''(ii) the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be reduced by the amount of such deduction.

''(B) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this subparagraph for any taxable year, this paragraph shall not apply to any tree or vine planted or grafted during such taxable year. An election under this subparagraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

''(C) ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION MAY BE CLAIMED ONLY ONCE.—If this paragraph applies to any tree or vine, such tree or vine shall not be treated as qualified property in the taxable year in which placed in service.

''(D) COORDINATION WITH ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS.—If a corporation makes an election under paragraph (4) for any taxable year, the amount under paragraph (4)(B)(i)(I) for such taxable year shall be increased by the amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) for such taxable year.

''(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (2)(E) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 168(e)(8) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this paragraph with respect to any class of property for any taxable year, this subsection shall not apply to all property in such class placed in service (or, in the case of paragraph (5), planted or grafted) during such taxable year. An election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.''.

(3) Section 168(l)(5) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 168(k)(2)(G)'' and inserting ''section 168(k)(2)(E)''.

(4) Section 263A(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 168(k)(5).—This section shall not apply to any amount allowable as a deduction by reason of section 168(k)(5) (relating to special rules for trees and vines bearing fruits and nuts).''.

(5) Section 460(c)(6)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''which—'' and all that follows and inserting ''which has a recovery period of 7 years or less.''.

(6) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by striking ''ACQUIRED AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2007, AND BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014'' in the heading thereof.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

(2) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (b) (other than so much of such amendment as relates to section 168(k)(4)(D)(iii) of such Code, as added by such amendment) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(B) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 2014, and ending after December 31, 2013, the bonus depreciation amount determined under section 168(k)(4) of such Code for such year shall be the sum of—

(i) such amount determined without regard to the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service before January 1, 2014, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(C)(ii) of such Code (determined without regard to the amendments made by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year before January 1, 2014, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year, and

(ii) such amount determined after taking into account the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service after December 31, 2013, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(B)(ii) of such Code (as amended by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year after December 31, 2013, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year.

(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TREES AND VINES.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall apply to trees and vines planted or grafted after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 2. 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4718.

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.

Our current Tax Code is a wet blanket on this economy. It puts our businesses, their workers, and their products at a severe disadvantage. In this current climate, businesses aren't growing and hardworking Americans are seeing stagnant wages and fewer hours.

Adding insult to injury, the United States is the only country that allows important pieces of its Tax Code to expire. The result: businesses and their workers are left constantly guessing whether certain policies will be around next year, hurting their ability to plan for the future.

The National Association of Manufacturers told Congress that the ''expiration of bonus depreciation at the end of 2013 has had a chilling effect on the economy.'' This statement is clearly supported by the fact that for the first 3 months of 2014 total capital investment across the country fell by almost 12 percent, a major factor in why the entire U.S. economy contracted by nearly 3 percent.

A survey of NAM members found that nearly a third of business owners would not make any investments this year without bonus depreciation and section 79 expensing, which the House voted on a bipartisan basis to make permanent in May.

The legislation we have before us today would provide a permanent 50 percent bonus depreciation deduction and make the deduction available to more farmers and business owners across the country.

In Congress, we always find a way to make things more complicated, but today we can enact a simple, bipartisan provision that provides an immediate incentive for businesses to invest and hire new workers. Bonus depreciation has received longstanding bipartisan support and has been renewed on a short-term basis 9 out of the last 12 years. After so many years of this policy being in place, it is time for us to agree that we should make it permanent so businesses can do what they do best: invest in the economy and hire new workers.

The effects of making bonus depreciation permanent are real. Analysis done by the Tax Foundation found that permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent, which would add $182 billion to the economy; would increase capital stock by over 3 percent; would increase wages by about 1 percent, or $500 for an individual making $50,000 a year; and would create 212,000 jobs.

Growing a healthier economy, creating jobs, and helping Americans see bigger paychecks is exactly what this country needs.

Making 50 percent bonus depreciation permanent is supported by associations representing a variety of industries: farmers, telecommunications, manufacturers, energy, construction, retailers, and technology. Over 100 groups have voiced their support for bonus depreciation stating that it ''will provide an immediate incentive for businesses to make additional capital investments, thereby boosting the U.S. economy and job creation.''

This provision has gained strong bipartisan support in the past, as have many of the permanent tax policies the House has voted on this year. By making longstanding features of the Tax Code permanent, we can facilitate a comprehensive overhaul of the Tax Code. Such an overhaul in turn will create an America that works with a strong, vibrant economy. Today's vote will bring the immediate economic relief so many businesses and hardworking taxpayers are asking for.

I urge my colleagues to join us in making a stronger, healthier economy by passing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order against the bill.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the Budget Act of 1974. If you look at section 311, it is entitled, ''Enforcement of Budget Aggregates.''

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, violates that section of the Budget Act because it cuts the revenues below the levels that were set forth in the Republican budget that was passed on this House floor with much fanfare on May 15. The bill before us does not keep the revenues at those levels.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this point of order, to point out that on May 15 of this year Chairman RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee, filed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reporting the current revenue level for fiscal year 2015 and the remainder of the budget window.

□ 0915

And this is what he said when he filed that. This is, Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of May 15, page H4428. This is what Mr. RYAN said:

''This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels.''

This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, clearly violates that provision of the statute of section 311(a) of the Budget Act because it increases the deficit to the taxpayer by $287 billion above what was cited in the budget resolution adopted by this House. It is a clear breach of the rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the point of order be sustained and that the House Republicans have to live up to their own budget resolution which, as I say, they passed with much fanfare not that long ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the gentleman's position has absolutely no merit after the failures of this administration to grow the economy and create jobs. We have an economy that is contracting. We have more kids living at home than ever before. We have real wages declining.

After the failure of the policies of this administration to get the economy moving——

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAMP. I do not yield.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will suspend.

Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to direct his comments to the point of order?

Mr. CAMP. I do.

After the failures of the policies of this administration, the House has spoken, and the gentleman's position has absolutely no merit.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, the gentleman from Michigan clearly wasn't addressing any of the issues raised in the point of order.

I would ask the gentleman about section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which is what this point of order is based on. Let's talk about the point of order.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee voted for the House Budget Act. He voted for it, and now he is bringing to the floor of the House a provision that violates the same Budget Act that that budget was passed pursuant to.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's continue to focus on this point of order because

what we have here is a situation where Republicans came to this House floor not long ago, passed that budget, and are now here on the floor today with another bill that violates the Budget Act's section 311(a).

So I would like a ruling on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Maryland makes a point of order against consideration of the bill. Any such point of order is untimely at this point. The gentleman from Maryland is free to engage in debate on the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is the point of order as a result of the fact that the Republicans apparently passed a rule that waives section 311(a) of the Budget Act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The legislation before the House is already under consideration. Therefore, the gentleman's point of order is not timely. The gentleman's point of order would have had to have been made before the legislation was being considered.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Did the Republican rule—the rule that was brought to the floor of the House—include a provision that waived section 311(a) of the Budget Act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may consult House Resolution 661 for the answer to that question.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am looking at that, and it does indicate to me that the House Republican rule actually waived the statutory provision that requires that the bill that they brought to the floor comply with their own budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman was free to make those points during debate either on the rule or during the consideration of the legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I just would point out, Mr. Speaker, that here is exactly what happened. The rule——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will suspend.

The gentleman from Maryland is not recognized.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN raises such an important point. What is being done here is totally inconsistent, and I will come to that a bit later, but what is really important today about this bill is not what is being done here, but what is not being done here.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN points out how inconsistent this bill is. But no matter how inconsistent, it is going nowhere. And it should go nowhere.

Essentially, what it does is to make permanent what has always been considered temporary. Bonus depreciation, which has been temporarily enacted during the previous two recessions to help assist the economy during the short term—that is what it has been—allows companies to write off investments more quickly than normal, providing them an incentive to make capital investments now rather than later. And that incentive actually disappears when the provision is made permanent. That is why CRS has said its temporary nature ''is critical to its effectiveness.''

Secondly, it is unpaid for. Talk about consistency, talk about a budget bill that talks about the importance of deficit reduction, and here you have the Republicans proposing a bill that would add $287 billion in debt. That would bring the total of the bills that the Republicans have brought forth here to over $500 billion.

When all is said and done, House Republicans will have added more than $1 trillion to the deficit by permanently extending a select group of corporate tax cuts.

But let me just say I must confess I am amazed at the inconsistency of this position. It was 5 months ago in the chairman's and the Republican Ways and Means draft that they proposed to eliminate this provision entirely. Bonus depreciation was gone. And now they come forth and they say, Let's make it permanent.

That gives inconsistency a bad name. It is appalling. It is really also dangerous. And let me indicate why.

The more than $500 billion in tax spending that the House Republicans will have approved today is the equivalent of what we spent last year on all nondefense domestic discretionary spending, which Republicans have cut so deeply in recent years that it is at its lowest level on record as a percentage of GDP. That includes spending for such vital domestic priorities as health research, food safety, and veterans' health.

Left unaddressed in this approach with the Republicans are key domestic priorities such as the New Markets Tax Credit, the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, and the renewable energy tax credits.

So here we are.

Unfortunately, this bill is going nowhere. There likely will be an extension of bonus depreciation in an extender package, if we ever get to it, but for a short period of time, costing a fraction of this bill.

So what is really important today is not a bill that is going nowhere—and should go nowhere—but for what is not being done.

I just want to list what is not being done.

We have immigration reform. A Senate bill is not being brought up by the House Republicans. On unemployment insurance, a Senate bill providing help for those looking for work is not brought up here.

The employment nondiscrimination bill, the Senate bill is not brought up here. Paycheck fairness is not bring brought up. A minimum wage bill is not brought up.

We have the Ex-Im Bank caught in the contest and the conflicts within the Republican Conference. We also have a highway bill we are going to get next week with another patch because of the inability of the House Republicans to face up to the need for a long-term highway bill. And voting rights reform, you have a bill sponsored by a senior Republican in this House, and it has not seen the light of day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish by saying how appalling it is that the Republicans come forth and say, Let's make it permanent, unpaid for, costing $287 billion, when in the proposal that they put forth, this provision would have been eliminated.

That is 180 degrees in a split second. It just shows, I think, the hypocrisy of bringing this bill up, made especially hypocritical when there has been this utter failure to address all of these other legislative proposals, many of which have passed the Senate.

So we are going through the motions here today. It is really a sad moment for this institution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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. Thank you, Chairman CAMP, for your leadership on this important issue and your leadership on the tax-writing committee. If we would have had similar leadership in the Senate and at the White House, we would have a different discussion today, and that would be one on comprehensive tax reform.

Unfortunately, we are not having that discussion because there hasn't been leadership. In fact, there has been zero leadership from this White House. And after 5½ years of this President being in the White House, he still doesn't want to take responsibility for this economy. Taxes are higher. We have more regulations. We have an economy that is sputtering along. In fact, the facts are that the first quarter of this year, our economy retracted.

This bill is a jobs bill. It is that simple. It is a jobs bill. We have had bonus

depreciation since 2002. This isn't new. It has been in the Tax Code under temporary law since 2002, and extended many times—many times, retroactively. It expired, ladies and gentlemen, in December.

I was talking to a CFO of a large American manufacturer this week, and he said to me, You understand that when you retroactively do this, it doesn't help our economy.

□ 0930

When you only do it, in essence, for 1 year, which is the narrative that my friends on the other side of the aisle are acquiescing to, in that this is a fruitless waste of time because we should just accept the Senate bill that passed out of the Senate Finance Committee at the end of the year, which will retroactively extend bonus depreciation back to January of this year for another year—next year, 2015—that doesn't do a whole lot to grow our economy.

It is better than a sharp stick in the eye, 1 year; yet, if you talk to a CFO, like I did this week and as I have over and over and over again, a business plan is for several years.

When a business owner who is a manufacturer buys a piece of machinery to make a widget, it costs a lot of money. This expense is 50 percent of that, Mr. Speaker.

Guess what? You can make more widgets, and you can hire a new employee. The new employee makes money, pays taxes to the city of Columbus, pays taxes to the State of Ohio, pays taxes to the Federal Government—more tax revenue, a job, more jobs.

That is why hundreds of businesses and organizations are for this piece of legislation, which has been around—unpaid for—for 10 years.

I mean, think of the logic here, ladies and gentlemen. If we extend spending, we tell the American people that it doesn't cost them any more money. If we extend a current tax cut—so stopping a tax hike—it costs them more money. That is Washington, D.C., math. It makes no sense. That is the inconsistency.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is this is about jobs; this is about our economy. This is bipartisan. It doesn't need to be partisan. I have said before that I don't want to give up my voting card to the U.S. Senate. Let the House speak.

Let's have a good, old-fashioned conference committee. I don't expect I will get my way. I know Chairman CAMP doesn't expect he will get his way. We will have a good, old-fashioned compromise. I know that is a dirty word sometimes around here.

As my sixth grade daughter says: Isn't it supposed to work where the House passes a bill, and the Senate passes a bill, then you kind of work out the differences, and it goes to the President?

Yes, Angelina, that is the way it is supposed to work.

I wish the folks on the other side of the aisle would allow us to change this narrative of the Senate won't accept this, so let's just take the Senate bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Republicans say they would like to help, but they claim we just don't have enough resources for medical research in order to address cures for Alzheimer's, cancer, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, and other dread diseases—diabetes, for example.

Wildfire season is approaching, and there are not enough resources to begin planning to prevent those wildfires because there is not enough money to actually address the fires when they begin, and delay is occurring.

We have hurricane season and tornadoes all over the country, but there is not enough money for the National Weather Service to give us all of the details we need.

Only yesterday, we learned that Republicans were refusing, once again, to correct the bankrupt transportation fund. The best they can do is postpone the bankruptcy into next year—after the election—as our highways crumble and bridges literally fall down.

As for the comprehensive safety inspection of our food and our drugs, they would like to do it, but there is just not enough money, and there are not enough funds available to monitor effectively infectious diseases or to produce vaccines to stop other diseases.

There is not enough to adequately staff our Federal prisons. There is not enough to fully fund Federal law enforcement. There is certainly not enough to provide strong, effective foster care for the many children, after having been abused and neglected, who are removed from their homes.

As for workforce development, so that we can be competitive with our friends abroad, there doesn't seem to be the resource to permit children from pre-K to postgrad to achieve their full God-given potential.

While there are so many vital needs that we just don't seem to have the resources to address, these same Republicans tell us today that we can afford to borrow from the Chinese or the Saudis—or whoever will lend to us—the resources to deliver bonuses to some people. They urge more public debt to fund more bonuses.

While they rightfully argue on every expenditure program that we should be looking for evidence-based programs—programs that actually work and that provide the promised outcomes—and that we ought to eliminate duplication and inefficiency, they have absolutely no interest in evidence-based tax expenditures, which is what is involved today. When the evidence conflicts with their ideology, they abandon evidence and pursue ideology.

The evidence-based approach to this particular expenditure could not be clearer. What is involved here is that when any business goes out and obtains machinery, a vehicle, a truck, a building, they depreciate it over the useful lifetime of that asset—standard accounting principles.

What is involved here today is Washington math. It is the Washington manipulation of traditional accounting rules. It is a matter of violating those traditional accounting rules, and we have learned from the economic studies that that is a very sorry, not evidence-based investment.

Indeed, even as a stimulus, the analysis shows that, for every dollar that is invested, we get 20 cents of growth. A fellow could go bankrupt with that kind of economics, and that is exactly what they would have the country doing and not meeting its other needs while funding something that doesn't work.

Both the Federal Reserve bank and Goldman Sachs—which is not exactly a Democratic organization—concluded this year that letting this special tax treatment expire that they want to make permanent and extend forever will not have any significant economic impact.

Today's bill is an example of the very kind of waste and inefficiency line items that they always say, in campaign rallies, they can discover and eliminate, but which, today, they are perpetuating.

I am for a pro-growth, pro-jobs creation set of government policies—including tax policies—that promote competitiveness. It is competitiveness that involves an adequate transportation system, a trained workforce, the research in medicine as well as in technology to help us compete, but we don't have the Federal resources to hand out one bonus after another to corporations when we know it won't work, when it will not grow our economy and at the same time that the same people who are advocating for policies that don't work refuse to pay for policies that do work.

We should reject this bill. It is not in the interest of the country. It may be good politics in an election year, but it is bad economic policy, as near every economist who has looked at the issue in an objective way has concluded.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an outstanding member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that short-term tax policy is bad for business, bad for the economy, and bad for jobs, yet we have heard today from our friends on the other side of the aisle a couple of things.

Number one, some have argued that we are too busy, and there are too many other things to be dealing with

in Congress and so forth, and we ought to be doing other things rather than this. I guess you could make that argument. I don't think it is really persuasive. We can do all of these things, and they are not mutually exclusive.

There is some argument that said that this proposal somehow is a manipulation. That is how the gentleman from Texas described it. I think the manipulation is having something in the Tax Code that we know we need to make permanent and not making it permanent, so let's manipulate the adverse effect out of the Tax Code. That is what we should be doing.

There are some who have said that this is insignificant. I heard that a couple of minutes ago. This is not insignificant. According to the Tax Foundation, they say:

> Permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent.

That is not insignificant.

> It would increase capital stock by over 3 percent.

That is not insignificant.

> It would increase wages by 1 percent, and it would create over 200,000 jobs.

That is not insignificant. That is according to the Tax Foundation.

So what is the choice? The choice is to vote ''no'' and walk away from that type of growth, Mr. Speaker. Now, who would do that?

You get these types of numbers, according to the Tax Foundation, by just pushing the green button. You get that type of growth by voting ''yes'' and then by getting out of the way and letting the economy come back.

The gentleman from Ohio is not overcharacterizing this. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI)—who has great insight, by the way—is not somebody who is saying this is the panacea, and it all goes away. That was the hype we heard during the stimulus debate.

Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? It was the characterization of, if you just spend $1 trillion, it is all going to be roses after that. There is hardly anybody who uses the word ''stimulus'' anymore on the other side of the aisle with a straight arrow. It has been completely eviscerated from the talking points of the White House.

The point is we can do something significant today—not monumental, not colossal—but to characterize the type of growth that the Tax Foundation has said this will yield to as ''insignificant'' is either not a clear view of economic reality or it is just too dismissive and too much a view that we can just be saviors in this situation.

We can do some good things today, and we can support the gentleman from Ohio. We can make permanent this proposal, and we can move this economy forward.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

To the gentleman from Illinois, I favor long-term tax reform. He helped produce a long-term proposal that eliminated this provision. It eliminated it.

Now, you come down and say you want to make it permanent. I guess I can't speak directly to you.

Mr. ROSKAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. You make a fair point, and that is that permanency is something that we need to strive for. You and I would be on common ground with the idea of permanently fixing this provision.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute.

Mr. ROSKAM. Will the gentleman yield 20 seconds?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. I take your point that permanency is a good thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I said ''long-term.''

My point is you, 6 months ago, helped produce a package that eliminated this provision, and now, you come here, and you say you want it permanent. This is acrobatics. This is congressional acrobatics.

You are just spinning in an opposite direction, and you are making this place a circus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this place is riddled with ironies from week to week, and this week is no different.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee was working on a markup of legislation for another short-term extension of the highway trust fund—the transportation and infrastructure investment we desperately need in this country.

We were scratching and clawing to try to find an additional $10 billion over the next 10 months to try to keep some of these projects moving forward; and here, today, we have another permanent change to the Tax Code at a cost of $287 billion over the next 10 years and not a nickel of it paid for—no offset, no effort to pay for this at all; yet our roads are deteriorating, and our bridges are falling down.

We are literally becoming a Third World nation when it comes to our infrastructure system, and I am afraid that is becoming an insult to Third World countries today. We are turning into a Fourth World nation when it comes to our infrastructure.

Instead of having this fruitless debate on the floor yet again, knowing that this legislation won't be moving forward, we ought to be having a hearing in the Ways and Means Committee to develop consensus on a 6-year transportation bill that every State desperately needs in our country, but we are not doing that. In fact, the easiest thing to do during an election year, apparently, is to support tax cuts without paying for them.

Every economist and virtually every business owner will tell you that, substantively, this doesn't make any sense either. The whole point of bonus depreciation is to try to spur capital investment at a time when the marketplace has frozen up, and it is the fear of uncertainty that is preventing business owners from moving forward on their capital purchases.

□ 0945

You take away that temporary nature of bonus depreciation and you ruin the whole desired effect of what you are trying to accomplish.

But I have a feeling that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, and others in the committee, they already know this, and that is why, earlier this year, when they introduced their comprehensive tax reform discussion draft, they completely eliminated bonus depreciation. And not only that, they clawed back the accelerated depreciation, which is the basis of this as well, in order to help pay for a lowering of rates overall.

I would submit, of the 14 tax bills that would permanently change the Code that have been reported out of the committee so far at a cost of close to $900 billion, none of which is being proposed, if we support those measures and they get enacted into law, we might as well kiss comprehensive tax reform good-bye, because the tools that we will need to be able to lower the rates and broaden the base and make our Code more competitive are taken away from us. If you permanently extend bonus depreciation, you take away an important tool when we do run into recessionary times when businesses may need an additional incentive to invest capital and get off the sidelines.

That hasn't been the problem here. Since 2002, we have had bonus depreciation. We have got a track record now. You look back on it. Most economists will tell you it has been dubious, at best.

The 2000s were the worst job growth decade in our Nation's history. When President Bush left office in 2008, he had a net negative job growth during those 8 years when he was in office.

Since bonus depreciation expired at the end of last year, we have been averaging, every month, close to 240,000 additional private sector jobs being created in our economy today. That is without bonus depreciation being in place.

So what we ought to be doing today is having a serious discussion of how we can come together as an institution and find a way to help pay for a 6-year infrastructure bill that will create jobs, that will start spurring the economic activity that we desperately need, that will lay the foundation for long-term economic growth with a viable infrastructure system that is there to sustain it, rather than having another debate that we know is going nowhere.

And that is unfortunate because we do—and I agree with my friend from Texas, we need a pro-growth, competitive economic policy for the American people, one that recognizes reform the Tax Code to help our businesses, large and small, to be more competitive globally, but one that also recognizes that there are important public investments that we have to make as a nation in order to ensure the type of growth in the future.

Part of that is the infrastructure investment that is being neglected, or 23 extensions merely being kicked down the road with short-term measures. Part of it is having a top-flight, quality education system and a workforce development system so that we have got the best educated, best trained workforce in order to compete with increased global competition. It is broadband expansion in every inch of our territory. It is basic research funding. It is these type of things that, yes, we are going to need some resources in order to do an effective job.

But we keep coming to the floor, week after week, calling for permanent changes to the Tax Code without any ability to pay for it, that is going to hinder our flexibility in the future to really spur the type of economic growth and job creation that we desperately need.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this. Let's start coming together on a real pro-growth strategy and work on the jobs that we desperately need.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and then I will yield to Mr. ROSKAM.

To the American people it must be really confusing. So we have had bonus depreciation, this tax policy, temporary for over 10 years, unpaid for; supported by many on the other side of the aisle, unpaid for; temporary, many times retroactive. And yet, moving that policy forward for 10 more years, the same way it has been paid for over 10 years, costs money, bad policy, even though we are giving for the first time certainty, predictability to people who actually create jobs in America, who must have a business plan and must make those big purchases. Amazing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address two of the criticisms that I heard from my colleague.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a fair point about permanency. Look, permanency is a great goal. Permanency in tax reform is an outstanding goal. In this current environment it becomes clear that the President of the United States has made raising marginal rates a precondition for tax reform. We are of the view that that doesn't help grow the economy. The President clings to his orthodoxy that it does, and so it is not likely that this is going to be—a massive tax reform effort is going to be completed.

So then the alternative is, all right, well, so what do you do in the meantime? I think in the meantime what we do is we make this provision permanent. It keeps open the opportunity for us to revisit tax reform in the future. But we ought not to be leaving the types of numbers that I mentioned a minute ago.

Just to refresh your recollection, Mr. Speaker, those numbers were, by voting ''yes'' on this, according to the Tax Foundation, it grows the economy by 1 percent, increases capital stock by over 3, increases wages by 1 percent, and creates over 200,000 jobs.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin made an interesting point. There were several assertions, but one of them I found to be very, very broad. He says, substantively, this doesn't make any sense. Those were his words. Those aren't my words. Those were his words.

Now, think about that assertion, Mr. Speaker, in the context of dozens and dozens and dozens of business groups who say this does make sense, including, from his home State, the Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce; the Rhode Island Manufacturers Association; American Farm Bureau; the Associated Equipment Dealers; Illinois Manufactures', from my home State; and, Mr. Speaker, from the great State of Kansas, which is near and dear to you, the Kansas Chamber of Commerce, all of which say that this makes sense.

This is not dubious, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, that—what?—dozens of economists from all over the world have said, oh, this is a nefarious plot and it is completely not going to do anything. That is ridiculous. This is good.

The gentleman from Ohio has been working on this for months and months and months. And while it is not about him, he brings great insight to this debate. There is an opportunity, by voting ''yes,'' according to the Tax Foundation, to grow this economy. We should vote ''aye.''

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let the facts be shown: in 2006 and 2007, bonus depreciation expired, and it was renewed when the recession really took a hold. CRS has said research suggests that bonus depreciation was not very effective. We will renew it, but not for 10 years, costing $287 billion made permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), also a member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

The longer I listen to this discussion and debate, it reminds me of a game that children play: around and around and around we go, around the mulberry bush, because we keep going around and around and around.

I strongly oppose the bill that is before us that would make bonus depreciation permanent. Yes, I support bonus depreciation on a short-term basis to boost the economy if there is a letdown and to provide some incentives to do things that we might not be doing. But I cannot support adding $287 billion to our deficit for a permanent corporate giveaway while tens of thousands of my constituents and tens of millions of Americans experience deep poverty, unemployment, and economic distress.

H.R. 4718 is a corporate giveaway that even the Republican tax reform bill repealed.

There is a tremendous need to incentivize economically distressed communities like many parts of Chicago, other urban as well as rural areas, and those incentives have lapsed. They are threatened. We are not sure that they are going to be coming.

This bill continues the Republican legislative focus on the wrong issues, ignoring the key programs that create jobs, strengthen our citizens, and grow our economy.

Just imagine what unemployment insurance does. It allows the person who does not have a job—the knowledge that something is going to be coming—to go to the grocery store and buy milk or bread.

Or what happens when there is employment opportunities, if roads and bridges are being repaired? A person gets a sense of confidence that there might be work for them to do.

I remember a song several years ago about ''Get a Job''; and the guy said that every day, when he reads the paper, he reads it through and through, trying to find out if there is any work for me to do, but his wife says, ''Get a job.''

Individuals who have become totally upset because, no matter what they seem to do, there is no relief. So how could I vote for this bill when there are still 3.3 million long-term unemployed individuals who have not been aided?

I can't go to church on Sunday or walk down the street without somebody asking me: When is Congress going to do something about our unemployment checks? Are they going to come?

Or they ask: When are the repairs going to be made on our roads and bridges? When are we going to get some new sidewalks? How do you fix the potholes that are erupting all over our community?

When are we going to really take care of the Medicare physician or doctors fix?

When are we going to stop irrational budget cuts that strangle education, research, and innovation?

When are we going to provide confidence and hope?

When are we going to stop the process where the rich continue to get rich and the poor continue to get poor, and the middle class gets squeezed in to where we almost create two groups and two categories of people: those who have much and those who have little?

So I would urge that we vote ''no'' on this bill and give confidence to the American people that their needs will be taken care of.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas, I would like to submit, for the RECORD, a letter from over 100 associations that represent thousands of employers and job creators, of whom represent hundreds of thousands of employees. In the letter they say, this piece of legislation that we are about to vote on today helps them create jobs and increases productivity.

JULY 9, 2014.

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned associations—and the companies we represent—appreciate the efforts of the House Ways and Means Committee to make permanent important tax provisions that expired at the end of 2013. In particular, we support swift action on legislation (H.R. 4718) to permanently extend bonus depreciation, creating a pro-investment tax climate that will spur much needed economic growth and jobs and provide a bridge to broader tax reform.

Continued uncertainty about bonus depreciation is discouraging investment in the United States and, in some cases, keeping companies totally on the sidelines. This impacts both companies that make investments and companies that manufacture capital equipment.

In contrast, since 2008, members of our associations have responded positively to the availability of 50 percent expensing, including an important part of the legislation allowing companies to utilize Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) credits in lieu of 50 percent expensing.

Many of our companies have been recognized for this commitment to domestic investment that creates jobs and increases productivity. Renewing bonus depreciation and the comparable AMT credit in lieu of bonus depreciation will provide an immediate incentive for businesses to make additional capital investments, thereby boosting the U.S. economy and job creation.

Thank you in advance for supporting this important legislation when it comes to the House floor for a vote later this week. Our associations and member companies will continue to support comprehensive tax reform, but until an agreement becomes effective, extending bonus depreciation is essential to maintaining the nation's economic momentum. In order to plan with certainty, companies must know as soon as possible what the tax rules for capital investment and job creation in America will be in 2014 and beyond.

Sincerely,

Aeronautical Repair Station Association; Aerospace Industries Association; Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute; Airlines for America; American Boat Builders & Repairers Association; American Composites Manufacturers Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Foundry Society; American Lighting Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Trucking Associations; AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology; Arizona Manufacturers Council; Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated Industries of Arkansas; Associated Industries of Florida; Associated Industries of Missouri; Association of American Railroads.

Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Association of Washington Business; Auto Care Association; Biotechnology Industry Organization; Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.; California Manufacturers & Technology Association; Chemical Coaters Association International; Colorado Association of Commerce & Industry; Corn Refiners Association; Council of Industry of Southeastern New York; CTIA—The Wireless Association; Forging Industry Association; Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Energy Association; General Aviation Manufacturers Association; Georgia Association of Manufacturers; Greater North Dakota Chamber; Illinois Manufacturers' Association; INDA, Association of the Nonwoven Fabrics Industry; Indiana Manufacturers Association.

Industrial Energy Consumers of America; Industrial Fasteners Institute; Industrial Heating Equipment Association; Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries; Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute; International Sign Association; Iowa Association of Business and Industry; IPC—Association Connecting Electronics Industries; ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association; ITTA—The Voice of Mid-Size Telecommunications Carriers; Kansas Chamber of Commerce; Kitchen Cabinet Manufacturers Association; Medical Device Manufacturers Association (MDMA); Metals Service Center Institute; Mississippi Manufacturers Association; Missouri Association of Manufacturers; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Air Transportation Association; National Association of Electrical Distributors; National Association of Manufacturers.

National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers; National Association of Trailer Manufacturers (NATM); National Automatic Merchandising Association; National Business Aviation Association; National Cable & Telecommunications Association; National Council for Advanced Manufacturing; National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA); National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Mining Association; National Propane Gas Association; National Roofing Contractors Association; National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association; National Tooling and Machining Association; National Waste & Recycling Association; Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Nevada Manufacturers Association; New Jersey Business & Industry Association; Non-Ferrous Founders' Society; North American Die Casting Association; North Carolina Chamber.

NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Convening Technologies; NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association; Outdoor Power Equipment Institute; Portland Cement Association; Precision Machined Products Association; Precision Metalforming Association; Resilient Floor Covering Institute; Rhode Island Manufacturers Association; San Antonio Manufacturers Association; Secondary Materials and Recycled Textiles Association (SMART); South Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association; Specialty Equipment Market Association; Specialty Graphics Imaging Association.

SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association; Steel Manufacturers Association; Texas Association of Manufacturers; Textile Rental Services Association; The Hardwood Federation; The State Chamber of Oklahoma; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United States Telecom Association; USA Rice Federation; Valley Industrial Association; Window and Door Manufacturers Association; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Woodworking Machinery Industry Association; World Alliance for Decentralized Energy.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1000

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to make 50 percent bonus depreciation permanent because it grows the economy and creates jobs. Short of comprehensive tax reform, a permanent extension of bonus depreciation is our best option to grow the economy, create jobs, and lift wages.

This bill is important to Kansas manufacturers and to Kansas farmers and ranchers. The Tax Foundation found that permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent, adding $182 million to the economy, increase wages, and create over 210,000 jobs. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this legislation will increase economic growth and could reduce the debt by as much as $10 billion.

But, most importantly, today's bill moves our Tax Code in the right direction. It is broad-based in that it does not pick winners and losers and does not favor one type of investment over another. Simply, it favors investment in the types of capital that create jobs and put more money in people's pockets.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with this faulty effort for one reason and one reason only: the failure of fundamental tax reform.

Now, a good-faith effort was made in terms of drafting the proposal, but it really didn't go anywhere.

I would note in this institution, known for its emotions, that the response of the Democratic minority to the Camp draft proposal was fairly muted, thinking that this might be a worthwhile start to an ongoing conversation that would be bipartisan and bicameral.

A good start, we had. The model that we embraced over 3 years really worked quite well. Without the glare of publicity, we actually had an adult conversation back and forth between the parties, the stakeholders, and heard from virtually everybody you could hear from.

Well, when the proposal was offered publicly, the response on the Republican side was one of histrionics—Well, you can't do this. And you can't do that. Well, let's not try this. And let's not do that—even though an academic exercise had been undertaken that was worthwhile. So tax reform was killed

in the crib before there was even an opportunity to have a conversation.

Now, my friend from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) said that everybody on this side is afraid to use the word ''stimulus.''

Stimulus, stimulus, stimulus, stimulus. I am going to use it, and I am going to use it in the motion to recommit.

Stimulus has worked in America's economic history, when America actually did big things. Mr. Lincoln found time during the midst of the Civil War to do the Transcontinental Railroad. Mr. Roosevelt did the Panama Canal. Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Reagan did the Big Dig in Boston. These are worthwhile undertakings that need to be done, and not to shy away from the principle of economic growth under the guise of a remedy that has dubious economic consequences.

Now, let me say this as well. And I intend, in the motion to recommit, to speak to it.

Remember the days when tax policy here was done between the two parties? Remember when there was a healthy give-and-take, where we actually talked about our differences in the quiet of the Ways and Means room, still the most desired committee to sit on in the Congress?

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

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

Mr. NEAL. The point that I make on this is very simple. We started out with a bona fide effort to do tax reform. This is not the way to do tax reform. We need to go back to the drawing table and draft a proposal that the American people will come to see as competitive and will highlight the role that optimism has always played in American public life.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Health Subcommittee chairman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TIBERI and Chairman CAMP for bringing this very important jobs bill to the floor.

The truth is, America's economy is really hurting. This is the slowest recovery, most disappointing recovery in half a century. We are missing about 5 million jobs from our economy. We have a lot of small businesses struggling. The average family of four in America is missing over $1,000 a month from their paycheck, their budget because of this disappointing recovery.

So what is missing? Well, it is not government spending. That is above where it was in 2008. It is not family spending. That is above what it was. What we are missing is business investment. When businesses along Main Street buy new buildings, new equipment, and new software to make themselves more competitive, that is when jobs occur. And that is what is missing out of the economy.

What this bill does is make it more affordable for our local businesses to immediately write off, deduct from their taxes a portion of what they buy in equipment and software and technology. That makes it more affordable, it allows them to do more of it, and that creates jobs along Main Street. And that is what this bill is all about, creating not government jobs, not temporary jobs, not stimulus jobs. This is about creating jobs along Main Street by letting our local businesses invest.

It has always been a bipartisan bill. This is an area that Republicans and Democrats agree on. Unfortunately, it is an election year. We are going to hear all of the arguments against it. But the truth is, our local businesses are struggling. They need this tax relief. And our economy needs the jobs because we are not going to get back to a balanced budget until we have more people working and more jobs created and more revenue coming in the door.

I commend our leadership for bringing this very important business bill, jobs bill, to the floor. And I urge Republicans and Democrats to come together to support it.

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

I would like to read the Statement of Administration Policy:

> The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 4718, which would permanently extend ''bonus depreciation'' rules that allow corporations to speed up deductions for certain investments and, thereby, delay tax payments. This provision was enacted in 2009 to provide short-term stimulus to the economy, and it was never intended to be a permanent corporate giveaway. Moreover, H.R. 4718 includes no offsets and would add $287 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years, wiping out more than one-third of the deficit reduction achieved by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013.
>
> The deficit increase in H.R. 4718 is more than 20 times the cost of the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits, which Republicans are insisting be offset, and more than triple the discretionary funding increases for defense and nondefense priorities enacted in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which were offset. House Republicans also are making clear their priorities by rushing to make business tax cuts permanent without offsets, even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the earned income tax credit, child tax credit, and education tax credits expire.
>
> The administration wants to work with the Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen the economy and help middle class families, including pro-growth business tax reform. However, making costly business tax cuts permanent without offsets represents the wrong approach.
>
> If the President were presented with H.R. 4718, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield myself such time as I may consume for my closing.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is very clear. As the gentleman from Massachusetts—who is a friend of mine and who I agree with on a lot—said we should be here to talk about comprehensive tax reform and not temporary tax policy.

In my years here in this United States Congress and my years, more importantly, on the Ways and Means Committee, there hasn't been a chairman that has been more bipartisan, more inclusive, and made a stronger effort to comprehensively reform our Tax Code than Chairman DAVE CAMP. If he would have had a partner in the White House and a partner in the Senate to move the ball along as far as he did, quite frankly, in a very bipartisan way, we wouldn't be here today.

But here are the facts: for the past 5½ years, Barack Obama has been the President of the United States of America. Here is a fact: the first quarter of this year, our economy retracted 2.9 percent.

This bill is a jobs bill. Simple enough. And, in fact, during my time on the Ways and Means Committee—putting Chairman CAMP aside—without Chairman CAMP, with other chairmen, we haven't had any bipartisanship. We haven't had tax bills. We didn't have an effort to comprehensively, in a bipartisan way, have a Tax Code rewritten. It has only been Chairman CAMP.

So we can talk about theory and academics. But here we are today, with one choice in an economy that is not near where any of us want it to be after 5½ years of Barack Obama as President.

We have a piece of legislation that we know creates jobs that for 10 out of the last 12 years hasn't been paid for. For 10 out of the last 12 years, it hasn't been paid for. And there is no benefit to job creators for long-term certainty. None. Zero.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have already submitted for the RECORD a list of hundreds of associations that represent thousands and thousands of employers around the country who create jobs for hundreds of thousands of employees who say this is one of the best job-creating tools they have.

I know people who want a job. They would rather have a job than unemployment insurance. They want a job really badly.

Something my dad said to me a long time ago when he lost his manufacturing job of 25 years: ''The most important thing is a job.'' And that is how simple this is, ladies and gentlemen. That is how simple this is.

In 5½ years, we have higher taxes, more regulations. This is about jobs. This is what job creators want. Let's give them what they want. Let's go to the Senate. Let's have a conference committee. Let's work it out the good old-fashioned way.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts and I, if we got locked in a room, we could work it out the good old-fashioned way. Let's do it.

I urge my colleagues, let's not make this partisan. Let's make this bipartisan, as it should be, as it has been, and go work with the Senate to get this done and help Americans get a job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, 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. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4718 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, line 22, strike ''or''.

Page 3, line 24, strike ''and'' and insert ''or''.

Page 3, after line 24, insert the following:

''(VI) which is qualified restaurant property, and''.

Page 4, line 2, strike the period and insert '', and''.

Page 4, after line 2, insert the following:

''(iii) which is placed in service by the taxpayer before January 1, 2016.''.

Page 13, line 20, strike the quotation marks and final period.

Page 13, after line 20, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

''(F) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to any tree or vine planted or grafted after December 31, 2015.''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—Section 168(k) of such Code, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer which is, or is a member of an expanded affiliated group which includes, an inverted domestic corporation, paragraphs (1), (4), and (5) shall not apply.

''(B) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of paragraph (6), the term 'inverted domestic corporation' means any foreign corporation—

''(i) which, pursuant to a plan or a series of related transactions, completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(I) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(II) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(ii) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of which, after such acquisition, is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

''(iii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group of which, after such acquisition, occurs (directly or indirectly) primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation for purposes of this paragraph if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under section 7874 regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this subparagraph.

''(D) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iii)—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

''(ii) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

''(E) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in subparagraph (C) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(F) EXPANDED AFFILIATED GROUP.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'expanded affiliated group' has the meaning given such term in section 7874(c).''.

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?

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.

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

□ 1015

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my comments to the other side.

Mr. TIBERI, who is indeed my friend and a terrific guy, said that there is no partner at the White House. When we undertook this very significant proposal on tax reform, it wasn't the White House; it was the Speaker of our House—the Speaker of this House—who said, ''Blah, blah, blah.''

Now, I want to tell you that I am not bilingual, Mr. Speaker, but when you tell me blah, blah, blah, I get it. It ain't going anywhere. To blame the White House when the Speaker of the House poured cold water on it is outrageous.

Now, we heard of several companies that have been proceeding with inversions. For those of you paying attention to this, it simply means that a company moves offshore, they declare that they are no longer a corporate citizen of America, but instead, they will reincorporate to a foreign address for the express purpose of avoiding American corporate income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal that we have here is pretty simple. As they line up, the dam is breaking. I hear in the next few weeks that up to 47 companies—as the Congressional Research Service has pointed out—are lining up to leave. They include manufacturing, pharmaceutical, and financial services sectors.

We should be doing fundamental tax reform as Mr. CAMP laid out the proposal, but the issue of inversions and depreciation before us today, while seemingly unconnected, are intimately connected.

Mr. Speaker, given the Republican opposition to Chairman CAMP's proposal, we cannot move forward on a House bill that reforms our Tax Code in a current or meaningful way at the moment, but we can address a very fundamental issue right here this morning without changing the nature of this legislation.

We can, in fact, address the issue by linking inversion to the purpose of bonus depreciation, and through that, we can suggest that any company that moves offshore cannot take advantage of corporate inversion and bonus depreciation simultaneously. That is what we are proposing today.

Now, I have a history with bonus depreciation. Remember Nancy Johnson, a Republican Member; and Phil English, a Republican Member? I supported with them the use of bonus depreciation—as Mr. ROSKAM wanted to

hear me say, stimulus, stimulus, stimulus.

On a short-term basis, bonus depreciation makes some sense, but not to make it permanent at the cost of $867 billion.

Friends, to do bonus depreciation separate from fundamental tax reform is economic nonsense. We need a comprehensive look at the Code and remind ourselves that bonus depreciation is but the following: a tool in the toolbox to make economic repairs.

Now, this proposal that our Republican friends have today with this cost attached to it is the least defensible of all of the extender proposals that they have offered.

Our own Congressional Research Service says that you do bonus depreciation for a short-term purpose to provide an economic stimulus during a recession. It is ''a temporary investment subsidy that is expected to be more effective than a permanent one for short-term stimulus . . . Its temporary nature is critical to its effectiveness.''

Now, this is important to remember here today. Chairman CAMP repealed bonus depreciation, period. Now, we are bringing it back to be made permanent on a Friday morning, with no thoughtful or deliberative discussion other than the Speaker of the House saying, ''Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.''

What I am suggesting here today is that we cannot afford to spend $825 billion on this hit-or-miss chance that we are taking to do fundamental tax reform in this way.

Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the nub of what we are proposing. What this motion to recommit does is it keeps bonus depreciation as always intended, a temporary tool in our toolbox in an economic downturn.

This motion is a commonsense piece of legislation that extends bonus depreciation for 2 years—2 years—in a thoughtful and deliberative way, then we go back to fundamental tax reform, and then we take it up in a much more integrated way.

Now, lastly, if you voted yesterday for the DeLauro amendment, you need to be consistent today and vote for this motion to recommit which addresses the DeLauro amendment and puts behind us this conversation of ad hoc tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, 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 gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Well, I am pleased to hear that my colleague on the other side actually agrees with me that we need bonus depreciation because this motion to recommit extends that policy for 2 years.

The reason why I oppose this motion to recommit is because, again, this is temporary tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that allows important tax provisions to expire. We are alone on that. Nobody else does that. That is why it is so important that we make this policy permanent.

Let me just say that the economy is contracting 2.9 percent in the last quarter. It is not growing. We are going the wrong direction. We have people whose real incomes are declining. People are out of work. More kids are living at home than ever before. We need to do something permanent to get this economy growing.

Look, families are struggling in America. Let's do something pro-growth, something permanent. Certainly, we agree on the policy. You just don't want to do it for as long as we do.

We would like to make this permanent. We have done it for 10 years, and for all practical purposes, with the uncertainty, we have agreed that the policy should be permanent. When you do it for that long, it should be.

Let me just say, look, temporary policy never works. We have more than 100 associations and businesses representing millions of workers that have come forward and said: Please make this policy permanent, we support what you are doing, and we need it, so that we can have the certainty that we need to make investments.

Look, the Tax Foundation has said that if we do this, if we make this permanent, we will grow the economy by 1 percent, that we will add $182 billion to the economy, we will increase stock, we will increase wages by 1 percent, which is $500 for an individual making $50,000 a year.

Let's give America a raise. Let's vote for this bill. Let's vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, let me just also say a lot of Americans know that the country is going in the wrong direction, but what they are really concerned about is they don't see us doing anything to make it better.

We can restore the American Dream and not have it be some remnant of the past if we support permanent tax policy.

Reject the temporary nature of this. Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit, and vote for final passage on 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 229, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—191

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
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
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
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

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
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
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)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie

Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
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
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—12

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Kingston
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Richmond
Schiff

□ 1049

Messrs. STEWART and MULVANEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Messrs. PETERS of California and FARR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 160, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—258

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
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
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
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)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
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
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
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
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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)

NOES—160

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
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
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
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
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
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
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Doyle
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Richmond
Schiff

□ 1057

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote 403: on Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 4923—I would have voted "nay"; rollcall vote 404: on Passage of H.R. 4923—I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DesJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today, the eleventh day of July 2014, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall Nos. 403 & 404 due to a personal matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted against rollcall No. 403 and in favor of the underlying legislation of rollcall No. 404, H.R. 4718, Making Bonus Depreciation Permanent, introduced by Representative PAT TIBERI of Ohio.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR THE STATE OF ISRAEL AS IT DEFENDS ITSELF AGAINST UNPROVOKED ROCKET ATTACKS FROM THE HAMAS TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution

657, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 657

Whereas Hamas is a United States-designated terrorist organization whose charter calls for the destruction of the State of Israel;

Whereas Hamas continues to reject the Quartet's core principles—recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, and accept previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements;

Whereas Hamas has killed hundreds of Israelis and dozens of Americans in rocket attacks and suicide bombings;

Whereas since Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in 2005, Hamas and other terrorist groups have fired thousands of rockets at Israel;

Whereas since June 2014, Hamas has fired nearly 300 rockets at Israel;

Whereas Hamas's weapons arsenal includes approximately 12,000 rockets that vary in range;

Whereas innocent Israeli civilians are indiscriminately targeted by Hamas rocket attacks; and

Whereas 5 million Israelis are currently living under the threat of rocket attacks from Gaza: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel;

(2) condemns the unprovoked rocket fire at Israel; and

(3) calls on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the 6th clause of the preamble, insert the following:

Whereas Iran has long provided material support to Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, including assistance that has enabled these terrorist organizations to produce longer-range rockets capable of striking Tel Aviv and Jerusalem;

In the 8th clause of the preamble (as so redesignated), strike ''and'' at the end.

After the 8th clause of the preamble (as so redesignated), insert the following:

Whereas the United States and Israel have cooperated on missile defense projects, including Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow Anti-Missile System, projects designed to thwart a diverse range of threats, including short-range missiles and rockets fired by non-state actors, such as Hamas;

Whereas the United States has provided $235,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for Iron Dome research, development, and production;

Whereas, during the most recent rocket attacks from Gaza, Iron Dome has successfully intercepted dozens of rockets that were launched against Israeli population centers;

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come, and I am pleased to yield to Mr. MCCARTHY, the majority leader-elect. I appreciate his stance. We had the opportunity to have lunch. I am hopeful that we can have a very productive relationship, as I am sure this House and the country is.

I am pleased to yield to my friend, Mr. MCCARTHY, the majority leader-elect.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to a very strong working relationship with you.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

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

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 5016, the fiscal year 2015 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, sponsored by Chairman ANDER CRENSHAW. Members are advised that debate on the bill and amendments will begin Monday night after the 6:30 p.m. vote series. Members are further advised that it is possible that we will have an additional vote series Monday night on amendments to the Financial Services Appropriations bill.

For the remainder of the week, the House will consider a package of five tax bills from Ways and Means that will help foster charitable giving. These five bills that will be included are H.R. 2807, the Conservation Easement Incentive Act of 2014, authored by Representative JIM GERLACH; H.R. 4619, making the rule allowing certain tax-free distributions from Individual Retirement Accounts for charitable purposes permanent, authored by Representative AARON SCHOCK; H.R. 4719, which will permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, authored by Representative TOM REED; H.R. 3134, the Charitable Giving Extension Act, authored by Representative MIKE KELLY; and H.R. 4691, modifying the tax rate for excise tax on income investment for private foundations, authored by Representative ERIK PAULSEN.

The House will also likely consider the highway extension bill to ensure that the vital transportation projects continue during the busy summer construction season.

Finally, Members are advised that the House may also consider an extension of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

I thank the gentleman.

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

We have now completed six appropriations bills. The gentleman has announced we will have a seventh—Financial Services—on the floor next week. Does the gentleman anticipate doing the balance of the five remaining appropriations bills before the September 30 end of the fiscal year?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman noted, as of last night, the House has now acted on six appropriations bills, which is halfway through, and, as I mentioned in the schedule announcement for next week, the House will begin consideration of the seventh bill with the Financial Services Appropriations Act starting on Monday evening. That is as much as I see for the next week, but as we move forward through the July calendar, I will keep you notified as we continue through.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I know he has this expectation also, but I hope that we would pass the appropriations bills individually in the manner that we have considered the previous bills on this floor.

I note that the Labor-Health bill has not been marked up in subcommittee, and I would simply ask him, in light of the fact that has not moved through subcommittee yet, if that would be one of the bills that he would anticipate bringing to the floor before September 30.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not anticipate that bill coming up next week, but as we look towards the remainder of the July schedule, we will certainly notify the Members for the consideration of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

That, of course, from our perspective—and I am sure his—is a very, very important piece of legislation.

The highway bill that is coming to the floor, we know that that is critically important. It passed out of committee I think on a voice vote, although, as the gentleman knows, there was substantial disagreement on the length, the term of that. We are disappointed that we haven't either done a short-term or a long-term bill, giving confidence to contractors and jurisdictions around the country. We find ourselves in a situation now where more than 100,000 transportation projects could be delayed.

We look forward to working to not only move this process forward in the

short term, but we would like to urge, notwithstanding the fact it appears it is going to be a longer term—until May of next year—that we continue to focus on a long-term, confidence-building, economy-growing effort at a longer term reauthorization of the highway program.

The gentleman doesn't need to comment on that. I just wanted to make that comment to him, unless he wanted to say something on that.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I do want to thank the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. As you did note, it did pass out of Ways and Means on a voice vote unanimously. We are committed. We want to bring the bill to the floor and fill the hole, but we are committed to looking long term, as with many of the ideas that we have brought forth in the past, and we look forward to working with you on the highway bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

We passed, as the gentleman knows, the tax credit for investment in equipment, or the depreciation allowance. We passed that today. That was a $287 billion cost.

I would call to the gentleman's attention, as I have with Mr. CANTOR, that we are still concerned on this side of the aisle—and I know the gentleman knows this—that the unemployment insurance bill that lapsed in December of 2013 has still not been funded. There are some 3 million people who have fallen off that.

As part of your new responsibilities, you will be focused on scheduling legislation, and I would urge the majority leader to consider very seriously bringing that unemployment bill to the floor for a vote.

We believe that it does have the votes on this House floor. That is 3 million—and it is growing by thousands per month—who have run out of unemployment insurance, which is slowing our economy, but it is also, from their perspective, giving them no support to support themselves and to help support their families.

So I would urge the gentleman to look again at the unemployment insurance status originally proposed to be done retroactively. Even if we look prospectively, we would hope the majority leader would look at moving forward on the House floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, I thank him for his input. As I said earlier, in next week's schedule I do not anticipate that coming up, but as we look towards the rest of July, I will keep all Members posted.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate you not only keeping us posted, but focusing on that to see whether we might do that.

The gentleman has announced that TRIA is going to be under consideration. We believe this is a very important piece of legislation. However, it passed out of committee on a party-line vote, as the gentleman knows, and there are still concerns that need to be addressed. I would hope that we could work on those before it comes to the floor.

Does the gentleman know whether that will come under a rule and whether or not that rule will provide for an open amendatory process?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank you for yielding and for bringing up this issue.

As I mentioned the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for possible consideration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. Once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing on the measure to determine the process by which the bill will be brought before the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, we only have 12 days remaining of legislative days that we will be in session before the August break and only 22 days before the end of the scheduled session prior to the election. The scheduled date is October 2 for us to adjourn.

We believe this legislation is critical—again, for the economy and for confidence in the marketplace—to be passed. And so we would hope that to facilitate that we could pass it through this body in a bipartisan way, which would make it easier for the Senate to facilitate passage and to get that bill to the President because we think it is very important.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman to see whether or not we might overcome the partisan vote that came out and replace that with a bipartisan vote and make some accommodations on both sides to accomplish that objective. I appreciate his being willing to work on that.

□ 1115

Next to last, the Export-Import Bank. I know there is work being done on the Export-Import Bank. I know the gentleman indicated that he thought that this was not ready, at least for passage, but we know that this expires at the end of the year. We are very concerned about the adverse impact it will have.

Will the gentleman give me any information on where he thinks the consideration of that bill may be at this point in time.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. As I noticed earlier in next week's schedule, I do not anticipate that coming up next week, but as we look toward the remainder of the July schedule, we will certainly notify the Members if that will be considered in the House.

Mr. HOYER. Again, I do understand that it is not coming up next week, but the reason I mention time is we have so few legislative days left, that we are going to need to plan to address some of these issues that, I think, are going to be very important to our economic growth.

I know the gentleman is very concerned about that. We are very concerned about it on our side, and his Members are very concerned about that. We believe that the Export-Import Bank is an economic growth and an economic confidence-building measure, and we would hope we could address that.

There are also, as the gentleman knows, 41 House Republicans who have signed a letter urging that that be passed and indicating their support of it. We believe every Democrat on this side will vote for that. That is almost 200 people, and with the 41, it clearly makes a majority of this House.

We think it could be passed on this floor, and we think it would have a very positive effect on the economy, so we would urge the gentleman to consider very carefully with his colleagues whether or not we could move forward on that.

Lastly, I would say to the gentleman that we are very concerned about the children who are coming to the border. We are concerned about the process of making sure that this humanitarian crisis is dealt with in a constructive, positive way for the children, but also in a way that gives clear notice that America cannot have borders which are simply open, but must be able to authorize people to come into this country and not have them come in, in an unauthorized fashion.

In that respect, I don't know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to see The Wall Street Journal editorial today, but they made it very clear that one of the problems is that, because the system is broken and because we have not passed comprehensive immigration reform—and the gentleman, of course, based upon where he lives, obviously will probably be one of our more knowledgeable Members on this issue—that people cannot come across the border and then return in a fashion which will provide for work here by them and also for their not only coming here, but then leaving without an expectation they will ever be able to visit or work again—either family members or for the purposes of work.

We continue to believe that the passage of comprehensive immigration reform would be a solution and ameliorate the present crisis that we see at our borders, and we continue to hope that comprehensive immigration reform will also be an item on the agenda.

Although we have 22 days left between now and our October 2 projected adjournment, the expectation, I think, of all of ours is that we will come back in a postelection session—a so-called lame duck session. Either before that, in the next 22 days or in the session after the election, we believe it is critically important to address the immigration issue.

The gentleman and I have had some opportunity to discuss this over the

last number of months, and I know he is very knowledgeable about this issue and sensitive to this issue, and I would hope that we could work together to see whether or not we could put a bipartisan bill on the floor sooner, rather than later.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman's bringing up the crisis at the border.

Many of the Members in this House, on both sides, have been down to the border personally to see the crisis, and I think that is very important for all elected officials to go see.

We have a task force working on this right now. I know the President has put forth a supplemental—and the Appropriations Committee is currently reviewing the President's request for a supplemental, but I do not anticipate that coming up next week. As we look toward the remainder of July, we will keep you posted—and others—and I look forward to working with the gentleman further on other issues.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response, and I would hope that the supplemental—because it deals with a humanitarian crisis—would not be a partisan issue. We obviously need to deal with the immediate problem.

I was talking, of course, about the longer-term problem, but I appreciate the gentleman's observation with reference to the supplemental. I am a supporter of that supplemental.

Obviously, the Appropriations Committee needs to review it with respect to the proper levels of funding, but there is no doubt that we, right now, have inadequate resources to deal with the humanitarian crisis that confronts us immediately, and those funds are necessary.

I am pleased that the gentleman brought it up, and I look forward to working with him on it.

Unless the gentleman wants to make further comment, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 14, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 14, 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 California?

There was no objection.

STEPHEN, KATIE, CASSIDY, BRYAN, EMILY, REBECCA, AND ZACH STAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a family in Spring, Texas, has been executed.

The evil killer, disguised as a FedEx driver, forced his way into the home of the Stay family on Wednesday. He tied up one child, Cassidy, and waited and waited until all five children and their parents—Katie and Stephen—came home. Then he shot them one by one, killing six, and leaving Cassidy for dead. He fled the scene with more malice in his heartless soul, headed to kill the grandparents of the children.

Cassidy called 911 to alert the law, and quickly, the murderer was caught before he could kill again.

Murdered were Stephen, aged 39; Katie, aged 34; Bryan, aged 13; Emily, aged 9; Rebecca, aged 7; Zach, aged 4—and wounded was Cassidy, aged 15.

The killer had come from Utah to Texas to seek revenge against the Stay family. He targeted the Stays because his ex-wife was a family relative.

People in the quiet area of Spring, Texas, and Houston are saddened and shocked and are in mourning for their neighbors who had life viciously and violently stolen from them.

The killer is charged with capital murder in Texas, and if found guilty, hopefully, a Texas jury will help him meet his Maker very soon.

And that's just the way it is.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, this House passed legislation introduced by me and the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE—the Israel-Cole resolution—supporting Israel's right to defend itself, condemning Hamas for sending rockets over the border, supporting the Iron Dome program, and reminding the American people of the role that Iran has in supplying these terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big believer in what would we do when crisis occurs? What would we do if we had terrorists on our border, sending rockets into our communities?

If the Gaza Strip were in Dover, Delaware, this Capitol, where I am speaking, would be hit by rockets. Baltimore would be hit by rockets. Philadelphia, where tourists gathered during July Fourth to celebrate our independence, would be hit by rockets. New York would be hit by rockets. Long Island would be hit by rockets.

What would we do? Exactly what Israel is doing—we would protect our citizens. We would seek to spare civilian casualties. We would try and negotiate as best we could a peace, but do it through strength. Every nation in the world has the right and the obligation to protect its citizens; so does Israel.

AMERICA'S SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about America's southern border and of the infiltration happening by foreign noncitizens into our country.

It is clear to most Americans that the massive influx of new illegal immigrants is due to the proposed Senate amnesty bill and the President's unilateral decree that U.S. Customs will not deport these minors who cross illegally into America.

Today's immigration problems lay at the feet of the President's and the Senate's, who proposed yet another round of amnesty in America in response to continued illegal border crossings.

Honestly, what does this administration think will happen when it offers another 12 million illegal immigrants amnesty and does nothing to secure the border? Does it think there will not be more to come?

Mr. Speaker, what the American people want to see is a strong fence and a truly secure border, where we as Americans determine who is let into this country. This is not rocket science.

The American people want a government that works—one that builds the border fence, one with a gate that we control.

THE GIRLS OF CHIBOK

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was 3 months ago that the terrorist group Boko Haram attacked and kidnapped 276 female students. They were children, some 12 and 13 years old. Since then, more have been kidnapped, and some have escaped.

This Congress has a positive role to play by supporting U.S. and U.N. efforts to bring these girls home and to bring peace to Nigeria and Africa by supporting investments, by bringing development to Africa, and by encouraging all involved to do all they can to bring these frightened children home.

The African leaders have a role to play. They should be leading this effort in helping to rescue these children.

I will never forget how the world came together for one brief moment in the wake of 9/11 to support America.

''We are all Americans,'' the world said as one. I would wish now that the world would say that, until we bring these young girls home, we are all African.

AUTONOMY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is

recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the end of the session, and I know Republicans—my good colleagues on the other side—recognize that they are on track to beat last year's session, where we had the distinction of being the Congress with the lowest productivity in recorded United States history.

There seems to be some Members who are looking around to make up for lost time as to what to do. There is always the District of Columbia.

If you want to fatten your agenda, why not introduce a bill having to do with the District of Columbia? That ought to be a free enough ride. After all, the District of Columbia has a Member of Congress who can't even vote against your bill; so why not try that?

I find, as I look at the record of Members who do that, that there is a pattern there. These are often Members who have introduced very few bills that would benefit their own districts.

□ 1130

Next week, the financial services appropriation bill will be on the floor. It happens to contain the District of Columbia appropriation.

Now, of course, unless you are familiar with this bizarre situation, you will wonder, what in the world is the District of Columbia appropriation doing here in the first place? Well, it shouldn't be here because it doesn't have a dime of Federal money in it. It is an undemocratic anachronism that requires this House to somehow approve the District of Columbia, budget although not a Member of this House except me is accountable to the voters of the District of Columbia.

How is that for democracy? Yet, nevertheless, it will be before this House. And until we get the same budget autonomy that every Member's district enjoys for its own local money, we will find that your time is encumbered by a District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The real difference between the District of Columbia, of course, and the other appropriations bills that you will have before you is that our budget is balanced. We have a surplus. The Federal budget is unbalanced and has a deficit.

There are a number of amendments. We had driven these amendments down to just one, what I will call the annual abortion amendment. It has become a kind of annual ritual.

Of course, there is lots of hypocrisy in the House, but it really shows up on the annual abortion bill. Seventeen States with Members who sit right in this body allow their own localities to spend their own local money on abortions for low-income women, recognizing that the Congress does not allow Federal money to be spent for abortions—that is even when a woman will be in distress. If she is low-income, she is out of luck unless the local jurisdiction, of course, allows for such funds to be spent. And, of course, that is regularly done, except for the District of Columbia where, again, unaccountable Members have stepped in to keep the District of Columbia from doing what 17 other States already do.

When the Democrats were in charge of this House, I was able to get all of the so-called attachments to the District appropriation eliminated even the abortion attachment. It has been the only one to return.

I want to thank the House that one of these attachments has not returned; that, of course, was the needle exchange attachment that had deadly effects. And I choose my words appropriately, because that rider, which was attached to the D.C. appropriation for 10 years, literally spread the HIV virus throughout the District of Columbia and is singly responsible for the fact that the District of Columbia has the highest HIV/AIDS rate in the country.

Once I was able to get that attachment removed, we have seen injection needle-related HIV drop precipitously. That will give the House some sense of the great damage that was done by that attachment, and I am grateful—and I will say to this House how grateful I am—that that rider has not returned. I believe that one of the reasons it has not returned is that at least some Members are aware of its effects, and those effects have acted as something of a deterrent to adding that rider again.

This year, here comes the marijuana decriminalization rider. The District of Columbia was pretty late in looking at marijuana decriminalization, and I will get to the reason it looked at decriminalization in a moment. But there are 18 States that have gotten there long before D.C., the first in 1975.

I knew that there was going to be a problem because Rep. JOHN MICA, in his subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, actually had a hearing on this matter. Now, he hasn't called a hearing on Colorado, for example, which has legalized marijuana, although he has looked at Colorado. He could have simply looked at the District of Columbia. He had a whole hearing on the District of Columbia. That is what the District of Columbia has to abide in this House.

Of course, I should not be surprised, and I was not, that there came a Member who decided that he would try to keep the District of Columbia from doing what 18 States have already done before it and block our marijuana decriminalization law.

I had hoped we were in good company because of a very recent vote on this floor. A healthy 49 Republican Members voted with many Democrats to block the government from prosecuting users and sellers of medical marijuana in States that permit its use. That happened within the last month or so. And I said, oh, my goodness, we are in increasingly good company. Republicans and Democrats alike see that, without condoning any form of marijuana, the tide has changed certainly on medical marijuana.

Well, I do not have any illusion that, because the House comes together even to consensus on any matter, that that means that it will apply that consensus to the District of Columbia.

I must say that it took me more than a decade to get another rider, a rider that blocked the District from implementing its medical marijuana law. Well, that law has now been implemented, and so now we have Members looking at D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law.

At this point, 23 States have legalized medical marijuana. We are getting close to half the States.

As I indicated, 18 States have decriminalized marijuana. Now, that just means you are not going to give someone a record for smoking weed. It doesn't mean you think it is a good thing to do, but it does mean it is not worth a jail record. Not so much jail, because people don't usually go to jail; they just get a record that keeps them from getting a job.

Two States have legalized marijuana, and the House should take note of this fact: A 2014 Pew Research Center poll has now found that 54 percent of Americans support marijuana legalization. The District hasn't legalized, most States haven't legalized. The American people are ahead of where we are.

But the same double standard that I encountered on medical marijuana I am seeing on marijuana decriminalization.

By the way, marijuana decriminalization isn't new. The first was in 1975, and that State was Alaska. If you look at the map of States that have decriminalized in one form or fashion, you will not see any difference between so-called red and blue States. From California and New York to Mississippi and Nebraska—and of course the two States that have legalized marijuana, Colorado and Washington—we see that this approach to marijuana is spreading.

I think most young people don't see enough of a difference between marijuana and a substance that has done far greater harm, alcohol, to understand why there should be criminal penalties associated with marijuana, even if, like me, you don't think that it is a good thing to go around smoking anything, cigarettes, pot, you name it.

Now, nothing distinguishes the District's democratically enacted local laws, including this law, from the laws of those 18 States. We are all American citizens. But you will occasionally hear Members say something that only a tyrant would say. The Member will allude to the fact that the District of Columbia, before it had home rule, was subject in every respect to the Congress of the United States. In fact, all the laws were passed, essentially, by the Congress. What those Members will not tell you is that Congress repudiated that power 40 years ago when it

gave the District of Columbia what we call home rule, self-government.

Essentially, the Home Rule Act says the Congress of the United States will no longer either pass or interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia. We leave that to D.C. The Congress did indicate there were a few exceptions. The Height Act, which proscribes how high buildings can go in the Nation's Capitol, is an example. Another example is that the District can't pass a commuter tax, even though many other jurisdictions have commuter taxes.

Except for such examples, which are very few, there is no brand of local law that the Home Rule Act does not cover. So you can cite the Constitution all you want to, but you must also cite the Home Rule Act of 1973, which, in fact, repudiated the power of the Congress to interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia or with the District of Columbia itself.

And why wouldn't it? Who are the unaccountable Members, Democratic or Republican, of the House or Senate to have anything to say about either money they didn't raise or laws that respecting only with local concerns?

Among those you would expect to be most familiar with the Home Rule Act would be our neighbors, those who live in Maryland and Virginia. And if I may say so, we have Republican Members, Democratic Members in both those States, and, for the most part, they have respected the integrity of the District of Columbia through its own local laws.

But Representative ANDY HARRIS, I believe he is a second-termer, has not yet read the Home Rule Act; and though he lives in the region, he has not reacted as a neighbor.

□ 1145

ANDY HARRIS is from the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland is one of those jurisdictions that has decriminalized marijuana. Now, Representative ANDY HARRIS was unable to convince his own State not to decriminalize marijuana, so he steps across the border into the District of Columbia to try to tell us what to do.

He happens to be from the Eastern Shore of Maryland. District of Columbia residents are so enraged that the major D.C. rights organization, DC Vote, has called for a boycott of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. You know what? The Eastern Shore of Maryland is, in a sense, a vacation spot. It depends on people from the region—the District, Maryland, and Virginia—to visit there, especially during this season. And the District of Columbia has many allies in this region who agree with us that the Congress shouldn't be in our business.

I don't know why Representative HARRIS would want to stick his nose into the business of the residents of the District of Columbia. I can't understand why he thought that would benefit the economy of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He is from Ocean City. They live off of the rest of this region, including the District of Columbia.

I looked at his productivity here to see, is he busy? Is he not busy enough? He has introduced only 10 bills. I have introduced 63. I am trying to take care of my residents. The 10 bills he has introduced is very low productivity. I have cosponsored three times as many bills as he has cosponsored because I try to attend to the business of my own district.

I don't know if Representative ANDY HARRIS was fishing around for something to do, but he ought to fish at the Eastern Shore, and he ought to find something to do for his own residents because all he has done now is to outrage the people of the District of Columbia. And he has done worse. He has patronized us. He is saying, you know, I am a doctor. Well, you know, I am a lawyer. So what does that mean? Does that enable you to come into my district and doctor my people? ''I don't think marijuana is good for young people.'' Well, I don't either. I also don't think that young people ought to get a record for having used marijuana.

I don't know what motivated the 17, 18 States that have legalized marijuana. But let me tell why you the council of the District of Columbia decriminalized marijuana. Two studies were done. Each showed that in the progressive District of Columbia, where half the population is black and half is white and/or Hispanic, that blacks were arrested at a rate of eight to nine times that of whites for marijuana possession.

Do you know what that means for young blacks—particularly a young black man or boy in this country today? It ruins their lives.

They often live across the Anacostia, which is a low-income part of the District of Columbia. Black men in our country—regardless of income or education—are surrounded by stereotypes. Let one walk in with a ''drug possession'' stereotype on his record, and I will tell you, you are looking at a black man who, if he starts out in life that way, will have his life ruined because he has a ''drug conviction.''

I don't know why they decriminalized in Alaska or Mississippi. But I know why they did it in the District of Columbia, although it is none of the business of this House. They did it for racial justice reasons, and we are not going to have it undone by somebody who has no sense of my district.

An arrest or a conviction of any kind for a ''drug possession''—and that is what marijuana is—can lead a young man, particularly from poor neighborhoods in the District of Columbia, into the underground economy, even to selling drugs, where he was only possessing them before, because he can't find a job because he has got a ''record.'' So the District passed a marijuana decriminalization law.

I must say that this city is well aware of the effects of drugs. This is a big city. It has had its time with drugs, just like every other big city in the United States. Nobody in this city fools around with the notion of drugs. Drugs have promoted violence in our city. They have ruined lives in our city. It is the last place in America that would encourage drugs of any kind.

Also, we don't know what the effects of marijuana smoking may be. That is yet to be determined. I know this: millions of Americans are in their graves because we didn't know the effects of cigarette smoking. So the last thing I, or anyone in the District of Columbia is going to say is, go out and be free; smoke as much marijuana as you can find.

Marijuana smoking could prove to be as bad or worse than cigarette smoking. I only wish that we had known for the 100 years or so when people were ruining their lives smoking cigarettes. And the District of Columbia appears to have recognized that.

The bill requires the revenue collected from civil violations—that is, a civil violation of a fine—to be placed in a substance abuse prevention and treatment fund that is administered by the D.C. Department of Behavioral Health for substance abuse treatment and preventative programs. There are four D.C. prevention centers. They are funded by the Department of Behavioral Health. That serves all eight wards of the city.

This is what the city has already done, even though—it is interesting to note—all the polls show that penalties for marijuana use are not key to determining whether teenagers decide to use marijuana or not.

Nobody knows how to steer people away from marijuana. What they do know is that a record for having possessed marijuana can ruin your life. And if you are a person of color, it has an even greater effect.

It is important to note that all of the polls in the District of Columbia and in the country show that blacks and whites in the District of Columbia and in the United States of America use marijuana at the same rate. So why are blacks not only here but across the country given a record more often?

I would note also—and commend Councilmember Tommy Wells, who has introduced yet another bill called the Marijuana Use Public Information Campaign Act of 2014. That bill, which was recently introduced, would establish a public information campaign to educate the public on the impacts of marijuana use.

I bet most of the 18 other States haven't gone to this extent in order to deter people from using marijuana at the same time that they have decriminalized it. The District of Columbia has been very responsible.

Who is irresponsible is Representative ANDY HARRIS because the irresponsible thing to do is to mess with my district. You are not accountable to

the voters of my district. You are seeking a free ride through an act of congressional bullying. And that is the way we take it.

And like anybody who is bullied, we don't know how to do anything but fight back. We don't like to be patronized. We will not be bullied. And we will not have a Member tell the residents of the District of Columbia, who have no way to hold him accountable, what we may or may not do.

So I ask the Members of the House to be consistent, particularly my Republican friends with your own small Federal footprint approach as a core value, because of your own notion of local control, as opposed to Federal control, the hallmark of your values, I ask you simply to apply the same principles to me and to the District of Columbia that you are insisting upon for you and for your own constituents.

I will remind you that we are all Americans, that there are no second-class Americans, and that the Americans who live in the Nation's Capital insist upon being treated fully equally with all of you, all of us who are fortunate to be citizens of the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESS HAS THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ACT ON IRAQ NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I joined today with Representatives WALTER JONES and BARBARA LEE to introduce a privileged resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 105, to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year, except for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel. We did this for a simple reason. Congress has the responsibility to authorize the introduction of American troops where hostilities are imminent.

In less than 3 weeks, in three separate deployments, the U.S. has sent at least 775 additional troops to Iraq. Now is the time for Congress to debate the merits of our military involvement in this latest Iraq conflict openly and transparently.

Do we approve of these deployments and any future escalation? If so, we should vote to authorize it. If we do not support it, then we should bring our troops back home. It is that simple, Mr. Speaker. Congress has the responsibility to act on Iraq now.

Mr. Speaker, we did not introduce this privileged resolution lightly. By doing so, we have started a process to hold a debate on our engagement in Iraq later this month. We are using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution.

While this is an imperfect tool, it requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days. Like most of my colleagues, I would prefer for this House to bring up a bill authorizing our engagement in Iraq. And nothing in this resolution inhibits such important legislation from being drafted and brought before this House for debate and a clean up-or-down vote. Frankly, I wish that were happening, but I have not heard that such authorization is even under discussion, let alone being prepared for debate.

So my colleagues and I are introducing this concurrent resolution because we strongly believe Congress has to step up to the plate and carry out its responsibilities when our servicemen and -women are, once again, being sent into harm's way.

□ 1200

The time for that debate is now, not when the first body bag comes home from Iraq, not when the first U.S. airstrikes or bombs fall on Iraq, not when we are embedded with Iraqi troops trying to take back an ISIS-held town, and—worst-case scenario—not when our troops are shooting their way out of an overtaken Baghdad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate our new engagement in Iraq, before the heat of the moment, when we can weigh the pros and cons of supporting the al-Maliki government—or whatever government is cobbled together should al-Maliki be forced to step down—now, before we are forced to take sides in a religious and sectarian war; now, before the next addition of more troops takes place.

Make no mistake—I firmly believe we will continue to send more troops and more military assets into this crisis.

Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, before we are forced to fire our first shots or drop our first bombs. Now, Mr. Speaker, is when the House should debate and vote on this very serious matter.

For those who say it is too early, too premature for this debate, I respectfully disagree. The longer we put off carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, the easier it becomes to just drift along. This is what Congress has done over and over and over and over, and it has to end, Mr. Speaker. Congress must speak, and Congress must act.

This resolution, should it pass the House, would direct the President to bring our troops home from Iraq within 30 days—or should that pose security questions, no later than by the end of this year, nearly 6 months from now.

It would not require those troops that have been deployed to safeguard the security of our diplomatic facilities and personnel from withdrawing. They could remain and carry out their crucial roles of protecting our civilian personnel on the ground in Iraq.

This is why we need to take up this resolution later this month, debate our military engagement in this latest war in Iraq, and have a clean vote on this resolution, up or down, about whether we stay in Iraq or whether we bring our troops home.

We owe this much to our troops and their families, we owe this much to the American people, and we owe at least this much to our own democracy and democratic institutions that require Congress to be the final arbiter on whether our troops are sent into hostilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Representative JONES, Representative LEE, and me as cosponsors of this resolution. I look forward to debating the merits of the Iraq war later this month and voting on whether our troops should stay or leave Iraq.

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

THE THREE COEQUAL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I appreciate your being down here with me. I think about the just a couple of years that you and I have served in this Congress, and I think back, and I hope ''Schoolhouse Rock'' was on TV when you were coming along.

The thing I did when the Internet came out—yes, I was old enough to remember when the Internet came out—was I looked up the ''Schoolhouse Rock'' video, and I looked up ''I'm just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill'' because it tells the tale—and we learned that before we learned all of our times tables, we learned about how a bill becomes a law.

We learned about what this great experiment in self-governance is, and it is the United States of America. It makes me sad that it comes on less on Saturday mornings than it used to, and now, parents are down on watching as much TV on Saturday mornings.

I hope ''Schoolhouse Rock'' is still required viewing in every family in America because the whole process of how a bill becomes a law is critically important to who we are as a people—as a people.

I know it happens to you, Mr. Speaker, like it happens to me. I go back home, and I am the Congressman. I am the Congressman. I am holding the townhall meeting. I am standing up in front of the room. Maybe I am up on the stage, I have got a big microphone.

There are all these folks sitting out there in the audience, and it dawns on me that I am the servant, and all the bosses are sitting out there. That is what is so wonderful about what goes on here. You and I have the great privilege of representing a small slice of America; and, in my case, it is the Seventh District of Georgia—but the bosses live at home.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't do this the way ''Schoolhouse Rock'' laid it out, if

we don't go through that process each and every time for how a bill becomes a law, the loser is each one of those individuals who show up at my townhall meetings who are actually the bosses of this country.

The loser is the citizen in America who should be sitting on the board of directors, but who gets shut out of the decisionmaking process if we don't follow that simple cartoon that we all became fond of growing up.

Mr. Speaker, you know better than I do that there was a Supreme Court decision that came out last week. It was called the Noel Canning decision, and that Supreme Court—you know, we talk about it all the time, Mr. Speaker.

I wish I had a microphone that went out to the folks back in their offices who were watching this on TV. We could do a quick telephone poll of who folks think the liberal Justices are and who folks think the conservative Justices are and who folks think the middle is, but that Court is divided.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, you know there are some hardcore conservatives sitting on the Supreme Court today, and there are some hardcore liberals sitting on that very same bench.

Nine of those folks sitting up there on the bench—and I read the decisions when they come out, Mr. Speaker, and it is 5–4 this, 6–3 that. It is these starkly divided opinions about what the direction of America ought to be, and I get that. We are a sharply divided country. We see that in Presidential elections, and we see that in congressional elections.

This decision that came out last week, Mr. Speaker, this Noel Canning decision was decided 9–0 by the Supreme Court—9–0. It did not matter how hardcore conservative the Justice was, and it did not matter how hardcore liberal the Justice was. Every single Justice agreed.

What they agreed on—and it gives me no pleasure to talk about it—what they agreed on is that the President of the United States exceeded the authority granted to him by this United States Constitution and that the United States Congress did absolutely nothing to rein that in; and so the Supreme Court, 2 years later, had to make the decision that it was wrong.

Now, I get the balance of powers, Mr. Speaker. I get it. I get that the Congress is here as article I, and we make decisions; and then our bills have to be signed by the President there in article II.

I get it that, if we pass the wrong kind of legislation and it is unconstitutional, the courts, in article III, get to make that decision—but, dadgum it, we have that responsibility as the 435 Members who serve in this Chamber who are not the bosses of this country, but who are the servants of the true bosses of this country back home, we have the responsibility to maintain the authority on Capitol Hill that the Constitution provides.

Last week, the Court said, unanimously, 9–0, that the President can't just decide what the law is and what the law isn't, that the law exists independent of the President, and his job is to follow those laws.

Now, that is pretty clear here. You get into article II—in fact, we all take that oath when we get elected. We swear to uphold and defend the Constitution. The executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States, the legislative power vested here, and so the Supreme Court said, unanimously, that the President had overstepped his bound and that what he did was unconstitutional.

I have a quote that they used—and it is important to me, Mr. Speaker, as I suspect you hear the same thing from your constituents back home. Folks say: Why can't you get something done? Why can't you get something done in Washington? What are you guys arguing about? Why don't you get something done? Aren't there some things out there that you can do to make a difference in people's lives?

I am proud to say that you and I have collaborated on a number of those things, but folks feel the friction in this town, the friction of people who believe different things about what the future of this country ought to look like.

Here is what the Supreme Court said—and I love it in its simplicity, Mr. Speaker. The Supreme Court said last week that regardless—the Recess Appointments Clause was the clause that was being debated, this is the exceeding of his constitutional authority that the President embarked upon.

''Regardless, the Recess Appointments Clause is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction.''

It ''is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. It simply provides a subsidiary method for appointing officials when the Senate is away during a recess.''

Here, as in other contexts, friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure. The friction that you hear about back home, Mr. Speaker, the frustration that our constituents express about why folks can't get something done, why can't you agree, why is there a big argument going on, that friction, the Supreme Court says, is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.

The concern then, Mr. Speaker, is in the name of avoiding that friction, some folks want to throw out parts of this Constitution, and my question—not just for Members in this body, Mr. Speaker, but for every single constituent who votes in our national elections—what is more important? Is it more important to get something done? Is it the ends that are the most important, or is it the means?

The means that were provided to us were provided to us in 1787, that great summer in Philadelphia, where the best minds of our land came together and laid out a structure that has successfully protected the power of the people for over 200 years.

Is it the ends, or is it the means? I tell you—and I don't attribute any bad motives to the President, Mr. Speaker, I don't. I don't want to attribute bad motives to the President.

I will tell you that, in making the recess appointments that led to this unanimous decision that what the President did was unconstitutional, the President prioritized the ends.

He knew who he wanted in these job positions. He knew the Senate would never approve these people for these job positions, and so he said: Who cares what the Senate thinks? I am going to put them in anyway.

The Supreme Court said: No, you are not. No, you are not.

Now, the great shame for us, Mr. Speaker, is that it should have been the Congress that said that. It should have been the Congress that said that.

More specifically, it should have been the Senate right across this Chamber that said that, Mr. Speaker. It should have been the Senate that stood up for the power that is not their power, but is the power of the American people to engage in this great balance that is our form of government, this great balance that has inevitable friction.

We have got to decide for ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber and across the country: Are we Republicans and Democrats? Or are we Americans? Are we Green Party folks and Independent folks? Or are we Americans? Is this about which party wins and which party loses? Or is this about America?

America is not a place on a map, Mr. Speaker. You know this better than most. America is not a place on the map. America is an idea. America is a set of values.

There is so much more that unites us in this country than divides us. My challenge to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is that we rise to the occasion to protect and defend this document.

No matter how small, no matter how simple, and no matter how much it gets in the way of getting something done, this U.S. Constitution is designed to protect those freedoms, to protect those common goals, and to protect that which makes us who we are as Americans.

I am not trying to figure out who to blame, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to figure out how to solve it. When the Supreme Court—again, if you have watched the Supreme Court, these folks, they can't agree on what time to meet, Mr. Speaker. They disagree about so, so much—5–4 decision after 5–4 decision.

This divided Court—it is almost a term, Mr. Speaker, it is not the ''Court,'' it is the ''divided Court,'' that is the way it always shows up in the newspaper, the ''divided Court''—9–0 said this Congress and the American people have abdicated their responsibility to rein in this executive branch and ensure that the law was followed.

□ 1215

And here is the thing, Mr. Speaker, and you know what I am talking about:

I signed up to be on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, that is the committee that is responsible for going in and making sure the laws are followed and faithfully executed. And I joined that committee, Mr. Speaker, and you may think it foolish, but I joined that committee because I thought Mitt Romney was going to be the next President of the United States. And for too long, I had seen Republicans in Congress protect Republican Presidents and Democrats in Congress protect Democratic Presidents, and I haven't seen enough folks protecting the Constitution, protecting article I, protecting the power that the Constitution vests in each and every one of our constituents back home, and so I said I am going to sign up for this Oversight and Government Reform Committee because I am a hardcore Republican and I want to be the hardcore Republican who rides herd over the Romney administration, because you don't get a free pass because we are from the same party. You don't get a free pass because the Constitution doesn't give you a free pass. You don't get a free pass because my obligation is not to you as a fellow Republican, my obligation is to my constituents and to my country as an American.

I wanted to bring back that idea that we as a Congress, not we as Republicans and Democrats in Congress, but we as a Congress, not we as the House, but we as the House and the Senate, we as the Congress have a common goal and a common responsibility when it comes to the future of this country.

Now, sitting over there on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, folks just think I am a political hack. I try to give advice and counsel to the administration about what they are doing wrong. Folks say, he is just a Republican, that is why he doesn't like what is going on. Nonsense; 9–0, the entire United States Supreme Court said what is going on in the administration is wrong; not wrong as in a mistake, but wrong as in the Constitution prohibits it. Wrong as in it is not allowed by that most powerful law that governs this land, the United States Constitution, and everybody in this town knew it. They knew it the day that the President took that action. And yet, too many in this town were silent.

We have got to do better, Mr. Speaker. We have got to do better. There is still more that unites us than divides us. Love of this Constitution that protects our freedoms is one of those things.

So where can we start, Mr. Speaker? Where can we start? I have one recommendation, and it is a small one. I have had the experience in my 3½ years in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and you may have had the same experience, that if you can begin to agree on the little things, then the bigger things get a little easier to agree upon. You sort out those things that you have agreement on first, you lock those in as part of the final deal, and then you go out and you tackle the bigger things. So you start small, and you build. That is true. It is true of exercise, it is true of almost anything. Start small and build.

I am thinking about the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Mr. Speaker. You may think, Rob, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, for Pete's sake, that is just some little-bitty agency over there under the Federal Reserve. Well, it is not. It is a big agency. It is a growing agency. But the most important part is what I said finally in that sentence, it is under the Federal Reserve. This is what happened.

The year was 2010, and this body, this body, led by the Financial Services Committee chairman at that time, Barney Frank of Massachusetts, passed what has come to be known as the Dodd-Frank Act, named after Chairman Frank on this side and Chairman Dodd over on the Senate side, and it went after Wall Street. It went after Wall Street, and this was in the aftermath of bank failures. This was in the environment when folks were concerned about what the economic future of America would be, much like they still are today, and this purported to solve so many of these challenges through more regulation.

Now, we can argue about whether or not that was a good plan or was a bad plan. I think it was a bad plan. I think it is costing us economic growth, not helping us with economic growth, but that is not my point here today. My point here today is, as a body, as a U.S. House of Representatives, when we passed that Dodd-Frank bill, which went over to the Senate and was passed, and which went to the President's desk and was signed and is now the law of the land, we created an agency called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and we specifically and exclusively decided that this agency would not be accountable to the Congress in any way, shape or form.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, we have been charged individually and collectively with protecting the United States Constitution, which divvies up power in this country. And what is so unique about this country is that the power does not come from government and is given to the people; the power comes from the people and is lent to government for a short period of time. The power belongs to the people, and it is lent to the government for a short period of time.

Yet in our collective wisdom, and I certainly use that term loosely, we decided to create a brand new Federal agency, capable of spending hundreds of millions of dollars per year, capable of implementing hundreds of billions of dollars in regulations on America's small businesses, that we would create this agency out of the air. It had never before existed, and that we would create this brand new agency and we would place it somewhere beyond the oversight of this body. That we would bestow it with powers to crush businesses, to enable businesses, give it these powers and place it somewhere beyond the control of this institution.

It is unique, Mr. Speaker, as you know, in that its funding stream comes directly from the Federal Reserve. That would be the guys who print the money. It turns out when you can print the money and lend the money, you end up making a lot of money. So accountability over that money is almost nonexistent.

There is a renovation going on at the CFPB right now. This is an agency that has been around for 3 years, and it has a renovation going on. The most recent inspector general's report tells us they are spending $215 million to renovate their building, almost a quarter of a billion dollars, just to renovate, just to renovate a building.

Now, when I try to evaluate building space, I try to do it on a square-foot basis. What is it costing per square foot to renovate, because you do have to renovate. That is a fair business decision. According to the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, this amounts to a $590 per square foot renovation cost, $590 per square foot. Well, if you are in the real estate business, your jaw has already dropped. But if you are not in the real estate business, let me give you that comparatively.

I don't know if you have ever been to Trump World Tower in New York, Mr. Speaker, but $334 per square foot is its cost. The most expensive city in the country, $334 per square foot, compared to $590 with what the CFPB is doing.

I don't know if you have ever been out to Las Vegas, Mr. Speaker, but you have probably seen Ocean's Eleven a time or two, and the big Bellagio hotel and casino with all those big fountains out front. It is the backdrop of so many movies Hollywood puts out these days, and it is really kind of the definition of decadence in that part of the world—$330 per square foot versus $590 at the CFPB. Now, why do I bring that up? Maybe $590 is the right answer. Maybe it is. Maybe whatever is going on over at the CFPB is so important that it has to cost twice as much to build their offices as any of the most luxurious office spaces or hotel spaces in the country. Maybe that is true, but I can't tell because I'm not allowed, as a Representative here in this body, to do oversight over that institution. Why? Because its funding comes directly from the Federal Reserve, not from this Congress.

How does all of this come together, Mr. Speaker? Well, the answer is still in this little old book, still in these little pages. From the summer of 1787, there is a fabulous painting right outside these Chamber doors, Mr. Speaker, of that summer in 1787. George Washington is presiding, Ben Franklin is

seated there. All of the Constitutional Convention delegates are there as they craft this document. And what they decided was, we were going to have to have an executive to execute the laws. You can't execute the laws by committee. It was going to be too complicated, you need an executive to execute the laws. But an all-powerful executive is what those constitutional delegates had been fleeing in England. That is what the revolution was all about, so they were suspicious of an all-powerful executive, so they created the Congress first, article I, and said the power of the purse, the power of the purse, spending of the money, will reside here. Because if you cut off the money to that executive who has run amok, he won't be able to run amok any longer. That was the theory. That was the plan.

And yet this body is creating institutions—and by ''this body,'' I mean before you and I arrived here, Mr. Speaker, not on our watch—but just 4 short years ago, this body began to create government agencies and institutions that were beyond the reach of our oversight, beyond our ability to defund and beyond our ability to control.

It may be the best agency on the planet, but it shouldn't be beyond the control of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I will end where I began. Are we Republicans and Democrats first, or are we Americans first? Are we northerners and southerners, are we Independents and Green Party? Are we MoveOn and Tea Party? Who are we first? And the answer for me has always been I am a citizen first. I am an American first. This great country that I have inherited—I didn't build it, I didn't sign my name to the Declaration of Independence pledging my life and my fortune to success, no. Can you imagine? Can you imagine what it took in a time of great uncertainty when the die had not been cast for freedom to stand up and say, My name is ROB WOODALL and I pledge my life and my fortune that freedom will come to this land?

No, Mr. Speaker, that is what I have inherited. That is what you have inherited. That is what every single child born on these sacred shores inherits, what every immigrant who travels from far and takes that oath, what they inherit, and it is our responsibility to preserve it.

When we concern ourselves with the end and believe the end justifies the means, we will trample this Constitution at every occasion—at every occasion. And you need to look no further than the Supreme Court decision last week, Mr. Speaker, where unanimously these men and women entrusted with upholding this Constitution said friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure. I dare say an intentional consequence of our constitutional structure.

I know there is a lot of pressure on folks, Mr. Speaker, from their constituents back home to get something done, but implicit in that is to get something done the right way—to get something done the right way.

There are serious men and women on both sides of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker; there are serious men and women on both sides of this Capitol; there are serious men and women working in the administration who all love this country and want it to be better tomorrow than it was yesterday. We cannot allow our zeal for results to trample the document that has enabled the results that we have had so far.

And so I challenge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, whether you are the most conservative Republican or the most liberal Democrat, or anywhere in between, I challenge each and every one of us to decide that if we have a bad process, we are going to end up with a bad product. But that our Constitution, no matter how cumbersome, our Constitution, no matter how deliberate, our Constitution provides that framework where, whether we win or lose on a particular policy, our principles of freedom and opportunity will forever be preserved.

I want to get good policy out of this Chamber, too. I want to get policy out of this town. I want to make a difference in the lives of people back home, but not at the expense of the birthright that I have inherited, which is this great country and the experiment in self-government. I believe we are worthy of that birthright. I believe we can rise to that occasion, but it is not going to happen by accident, and it is not going to happen just inside the four walls of this building. It has got to happen in the hearts and the minds of every single family in this country, who are the true leaders of this Nation, and I hope those will be their instructions to us each and every day.

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

□ 1230

PLIGHT OF CHRISTIANS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Madam Speaker, there is a lot of uncertainty and instability in the Middle East. Violence and chaos are persistent themes, and political uprisings, revolutions, insurgencies, and waning democracies have controlled the dialogue on the Middle East for the last couple of years. But, if you dig a little deeper, you will find another story just under the surface, a story that we don't hear quite enough about: the plight of Christians as a religious minority in the Middle East.

Just the other day, I had a meeting with a few of my constituents who are Coptic Christians, and we discussed many of the issues facing the Coptics in Egypt. Coptics are the native Christians of Egypt, who have been a part of the Egyptian community since the 5th century A.D. They are still one of the largest Christian minorities in the Middle East.

Coptics in Egypt face growing threats of persecution, violence, and restrictions on religious practice. They have been targeted for kidnappings. In 2013, St. Mark's Cathedral was attacked during a funeral ceremony for Coptics and a Muslim who were killed in prior violence.

After President Morsi was removed from office in July 2013, a wave of violence against Christians ensued. Hundreds of churches, homes, and businesses were attacked. Violence against Coptic Christians in Egypt is nothing new, and I fear that it will persist unless something is done to resolve the issue.

Madam Speaker, in Iraq, Chaldean Christians are facing a dire situation as well. I just read a report that two nuns are believed to have been kidnapped while they were visiting an orphanage for girls. They are believed to have been kidnapped by ISIS.

Chaldeans are fleeing Iraq at an alarming rate, as many of them have sought refuge in my home district in Michigan. They are concerned about what is happening in Iraq, as many of them still have family there. Churches and homes are being looted and destroyed, and this leaves no other option for much of the community than to flee. If the situation in Iraq doesn't reverse, it is likely that the majority of Iraq's remaining Christian community will have to seek refuge elsewhere.

Madam Speaker, Assyrians are also continuing to face troubling times in the Middle East. Since the beginning of the war in Iraq in 2003, Assyrian Christian communities have been targets for attacks. Churches and monasteries have been targeted for bombings.

Assyrians have long been persecuted for their Christian beliefs, and they suffered greatly during the Assyrian genocide of the early 1900s when nearly 300,000 Assyrians were killed. Like many other Christian populations in the Middle East, they have fled and sought refuge elsewhere.

Madam Speaker, in Iran, the harsh persecution of Christians continues. According to a UN report, Iran has continually imprisoned Christians, citing ''national security'' as the justification.

Pastor Saeed Abedini is currently the most visible example of Christian persecution in Iran. Although there have been numerous calls for his release from Congress and from the President, he is still sitting in prison. He was sentenced to prison by a judge who has been known for religious freedom violations. His trial was decried by human rights groups as unfair and unflawed.

Ethnic Christians, such as Armenians, are often under surveillance or

are forced to report their activities to the Iranian Government. Protestant Christians are also viewed unfavorably by the Iranian regime. Furthermore, converts from Islam face particularly harsh consequences, as they can be charged with blasphemy or even face charges from revolutionary courts for political crimes.

These countries are all listed by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom as tier 1 countries of particular concern, meaning they are the worst perpetrators of religious freedom. However, the Secretary of State has not officially recognized either Egypt or Iraq as a country of particular concern, likely due to the United States' security interests in both of those countries, as a designation would carry the likelihood of sanctions.

Madam Speaker, many of my constituents and I are gravely concerned about the plight of Christians as religious minorities in these countries and the role the U.S. plays in aiding them.

Madam Speaker, ''If you want a friend, be a friend.'' This notion applies directly to the situation at hand. Religious freedom and human rights concerns have long been at the back of the line in U.S. foreign policy decisions, and it may be time to rethink our approach. We have continually supported regimes that are unfriendly to their people, religious and ethnic groups, and even the United States.

Madam Speaker, if we are going to support foreign governments with equipment and funding, we must more thoroughly consider the long-term impact of the freedoms of their people and the corresponding impact on relations with the United States.

Countries that continually abuse religious groups, such as Christians, are never going to see eye to eye with the United States because they lack the fundamental belief in the freedom of religion, which is the founding principle of this country.

If we want friends in the Middle East, we have to encourage respect for religious freedom and diversity, not just build strong governments and militaries. If we do this, strong relationships with these countries will be an inevitable outcome, and they will be more stable as a result.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

STATES' RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the World English Dictionary defines ''invasion.'' Among the definitions is: invading with Armed Forces; but it is: any encroachment or intrusion; the onset or advent of something harmful, as in a disease; pathologically, the spread of cancer from its point of origin into surrounding tissues.

Under Random House Dictionary, the definitions include: the entrance or advent of anything troublesome or harmful, as disease; entrance, as if to take possession or overrun—and it gives the example, the annual invasion of the resort by tourists—and also, infringement by intrusion.

It comes from Middle English from the 1400s. That is where we get our word ''invasion'' in the English language.

It is important because, in the Constitution, under article I, section 8, it says that Congress has the authority to call for the military during times of invasion. That is the Congress has that power. That is why it is in article I.

Then, as I mentioned yesterday, you have article I, section 10, which the third clause—there are three little clauses or sections there. They are not a numbered section, but the third sentence says:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

We know that the invasion into France by the Allied Forces consisted of about 150,000 troops, about 150,000 people, was the biggest invasion in history.

Since then, we come up to the year 2014, and The New York Times reported that just in recent months we have had 240,000 adults and 52,000 children—now it is being reported that it is closer to 60,000 children. Initially, as I understand, the article said since April, just 2 months, we have had nearly 300,000 people invade the United States through Texas. Then it is now being reported that there are 300,000 people making their way up from Central America to the United States.

Now, the administration and some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, they are coming because of this massive violence that they have been facing. Well, there is more violence there than there is in much of the United States. Perhaps it is comparable to Chicago. So, if they are wanting to come to a country where there is less violence, maybe they don't want to come to a country that includes Chicago. Perhaps if Chicago maybe had more gun control laws, maybe it wouldn't be so violent. That is my first thought. Then I realize, wait a minute, Chicago has more gun control laws than about anywhere else in the country, yet massive murders.

So, obviously, if people are coming to America from Central America, they don't want to be sent to Chicago. They don't want to be sent to a place where there is more violence than where they have been living. But we are told that is why they are coming.

Well, actually, when I was on the border a couple of weeks ago, and I will be there this evening, the people that I saw interviewed, the people that were there that I talked to with the help of an interpreter, they said nothing about violence they were coming from. They had gotten word that this President, this administration, was going to allow them to stay and not send them back.

That is why those who had parents who had been illegally in the country—like one little girl, her mother had been here since she was 1 year old. But now that they have gotten word in Central America that if you come illegally into the United States, the Department of Homeland Security is not providing security to the United States. No, they are providing security involved in human trafficking, becoming complicit in the criminal and illegal activity going on.

They actually have given up their role there on the border of homeland security and now they are involved in destroying our security. They are transporting, along with Health and Human Services—forget the word ''health.'' Do you really want people in charge of your health that right now, as I speak here on the floor of the House of Representatives, involved in transporting people all over our country with disease like tuberculosis, H1N1, which can be fatal, who knows how many kinds of flu that people may not have been inoculated for, scabies, lice, all kinds of disease that the Department, formerly called ''Health and Human Services,'' is now engaged in spreading bad health and disease around the country. Thank you so much Health and Human Services.

So we are in a time when the administration in charge is engaged in more lawlessness than any time in my lifetime. They are engaged in actually violating the hippocratic oath if the national leaders were doctors and took that oath.

□ 1245

It says, First do no harm. Yet harm is being done by this administration as they are spreading people around the country that are coming here in massive, invasive ways.

And our heart goes out to them. When I see these children down on the border in the middle of the night, what kind of parent sends their child, or even sends word back home, Hey, I've got a good job. I've been working here illegally for a number of years. And even though I haven't done anything for my child over the last several years, now that the U.S. is giving benefits like feeding, providing health care, giving lawyers to people that come in—especially children—bring them on up.

We may bring in lots of people.

There is story today from The Washington Times, ''Obama Seeks Brisk Passage of Border Children Funding Bill.'' Of course, he wants to do that, because it would subsidize lawyers for illegal immigrants.

People are fond of referring to the Constitution and saying, Well, we have

got to make sure people have their constitutional rights. Well, guess what? The Constitution does not guarantee the same rights to everyone. It does not guarantee the same rights to immigrants who come in legally. For sure, it does not provide the same rights to those who come into our country in violation of our law from the beginning.

It does not provide all of the same freedoms and liberties to our members of the military. As a former member of the United States Army, 4 years on Active Duty, I find it extremely offensive that an administration will seek to coddle terrorists who have killed Americans in cold blood—and been thrilled that they did so—and have written that they were thrilled that they did so, and they hope they have a chance to kill many more Americans. They coddle them and give them more rights than we do our own United States military members who are willing to lay down their lives to save this country.

That's right. Under our Constitution, article 1, section 8 gives Congress the power to provide what rights the military will have and what discipline will be utilized. That is how it was constitutional for Congress to pass the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I can assure you that in the military you do not have the right to freedom of assembly when and where you want to. Otherwise, I would have indicated that to my commanding officer at 4 in the morning when he wanted me to be out there to go 20 miles at 5.

I would have indicated a lot of things if I were able to have freedom of speech in the Army, because there were times when my superior commissioned officer gave orders that I thought were absolutely stupid, but you don't have all those same constitutional rights everybody else does. It depends on who you are and where you fall under the Constitution.

When it comes to immigration and naturalization, that is a power reserved for the United States Congress. As my old constitutional law professor David Guinn says, there is only one court in the entire Constitution that is created. Every other court owes its entire existence, jurisdiction, and actually, ability to remain in existence to the United States Congress.

That is why it is actually amusing when I hear people who are fairly smart, some of them educated in the Ivy League—despite perhaps the education that they missed out on getting as good as they might have gotten from somewhere else, like Texas A&M—and they think under the Constitution everybody gets the same rights. They do not.

I have heard people even from the holy Ivy League schools who say that everybody has the right to be in a U.S. District Court. Well, that is interesting because there is no right to even have a United States District Court. If Congress decided to eliminate all District Courts and create some other kind of court system, we could do that. That is totally up to us. We get to set up whatever tribunals—the word that is in the Constitution—underneath the Supreme Court that we care to, or not set it up. It is up to Congress. That is the authority of Congress.

So the President thinks we need to provide lawyers for illegal immigrants, and that is so interesting. I am sure that it is the perspective he gets. I know from Ed Klein's book there were indications that his able adviser, Valerie Jarrett, according to the book, is quite concerned about who is going to be the last person to give our President advice, because he is so easily swayed. So they try to make sure that he is not last advised by someone that disagrees with Valerie Jarrett or Michelle Obama's position.

Well, unfortunately, he was just at a big fundraiser in Dallas held for him by lawyers. Lo and behold, he says he wants lawyers to be paid for out of this $3.7 billion. Isn't that something? There are lawyers that are providing their services for free to illegal immigrants.

There is no constitutional requirement for someone coming into this country illegally to get a lawyer. It is not there. It is not even in the shadow of a penumbra. It is just not there.

Well, the President wants money for that. And when you break down what the President's wants money for, there is even money in his $3.7 billion—not for the military so that we can provide for the common defense—for leadership training for those who have come into our country illegally.

Yes, that is right. We need to train them for leadership so they can be good community organizers. And maybe if they learn well at these leadership training courses and they really pick it up well, maybe they, too, can be a worker at a place like ACORN, a place where they can train people how to vote Democrat, a place where they can make sure that they take voter registration forms out to other people who came in illegally.

Madam Speaker, what is happening in this country is outrageous beyond measure.

There are those who say, Well, sure, it is a certainty that these people—we are told about 78 or 80 percent of the people coming are adults and 20 percent or less are actually children—are coming to avoid violence, yet there has been no big spike in violence. So why all of a sudden this huge influx?

And though the administration officials say with a straight face, Well, we are just totally surprised, then we see from January they were requesting transportation in the near months for tens of thousands of children that would be coming in.

So forget what is said orally. Look what they have done. They have induced, lured, encouraged people to flood into our country in an invasion, and then they have prepared for the invasion, and now they say if you don't give us $3.7 billion, we are going to let it keep happening.

They don't use those words, but they might as well, when there is a far simpler solution.

If you want to really get down to the bottom of what is going on, Madam Speaker, you can look at a map of Central America. These countries where most people are coming from, over a thousand miles up through Mexico, risking life and limb to travel that far—so-called unaccompanied children that couldn't possibly come that far without help—right on their borders you have Costa Rica, you have Panama, you have Nicaragua.

You don't have to go 500 miles to reach one of these countries. There are some places of violence in those countries, but there are also some places of peace in those countries.

So if this were really all about escaping violence, and you really cared about a child, the last thing you would do is send them over a thousand miles and put them in the hands of drug cartels that may sexually abuse them, sell them into sex trafficking, or use them as drug carriers. They could just send those kids to a neighboring country where they speak the same language and where they could be cared for.

This is not about people running to America to get away from violence.

Also, we shouldn't be granting asylum to people that are lawfully in Mexico. We saw the article this week where Mexico has worked out an arrangement with Guatemala where they will have legal passage through Mexico in order to come into the United States illegally. That would mean that Mexico and Guatemala are conspiring to violate United States law.

Well, if they were in the United States, that would allow pursuit of those countries through RICO, but since they are countries, it is a different situation. But that is a criminal enterprise when you conspire with another to help violate United States law.

An article here from The Washington Free Beacon says, as of July 10, ''Unaccompanied Alien Children Program Cost $263 Million.''

For the 57,000 children that are here, you could take the $3.7 billion and give them each $67,000, and we would be a lot better off. Because that $3.7 billion, if we do what the President wants, doesn't actually stop the invasion that is going on. We are going to have to be spending that over and over and over again.

So I am not advocating we give everybody that comes in $67,000. I am just pointing out it would be cheaper to do that than what the President is proposing.

A story from Breitbart says, ''Health and Human Services Secretary: Beds for Illegals Can Cost Feds Up to 1K.'' Well, I am staying at a cheap motel in McAllen tonight, and I know it doesn't cost me a thousand dollars for the bed I am staying in.

There is a time for Congress to say, Enough is enough, Mr. President.

Initially, we didn't want to believe that anybody would intentionally lure people into the United States. We hoped that it was a reckless or a negligent act and not intentional. But look at the evidence. It hasn't been stopped. Even with $3.7 billion that is requested, there is no way, for what that is being called for, that it is going to stop the invasion that is occurring.

□ 1300

That is why I am hoping that my Governor will utilize article I, section 10, which allows a State that is being invaded—in our case, more than twice as many, just in recent months—more than twice as many than invaded France on D-day, with a doubling of that coming en route, on their way here now.

Under article I, section 10, the State of Texas would appear to have the right to use whatever means, whether it is troops, even using ships of war, even exacting a tax on interstate commerce that it wouldn't normally be allowed to have or utilize—they would be entitled, in order to pay to stop the invasion.

Texas could, under article I, section 10, engage in agreements with, say, Arizona, New Mexico—I don't know that California would agree as they are too busy sending jobs to Texas right now. The States could enter a compact to work together to stop the invasion.

Actually, if Texas just simply did what Woodrow Wilson did after Pancho Villa's thugs killed a bunch of American families—he crossed our border to kill them. One of my least favorite Presidents in our history, Woodrow Wilson, sent this new thing called the National Guard down.

You can read all kinds of different versions of how many National Guard troops he sent to the border. Whether it was 19,000 or 159,000—whatever it was—he sent thousands of National Guard troops to our border, and it was secured, and nobody came in that President Wilson did not want to come in.

He also sent General Pershing into Mexico in pursuit of Pancho Villa. He caught some of the lieutenants. He never caught Pancho Villa. I am not advocating an invasion into Mexico. I am advocating strongly that we stop the invasion into the United States.

Do you want to talk about compassion for children? My children have now finished college, but I go to schools all over Texas. I look in those precious little faces, just as I have looked at the precious little faces of people coming in illegally, but those whose parents are paying taxes, who are law-abiding, know their schools are having trouble, in many places, staying afloat.

Many school districts are in desperate trouble financially, and now, we are going to add hundreds of children in some places whose parents are not paying taxes and who are not paying property taxes to support the schools in many cases.

You are going to overwhelm those schools because you refuse to do the job the Constitution requires and that an oath was taken to faithfully execute.

We owe this country an obligation to protect it and to protect those little children whose educations will be impaired because you have to slow them down to bring other students along who don't speak the language.

Right now, in Texas, I am told that, basically, you need to speak Spanish. You really do. Why is that? Because the President is allowing so many people in the country illegally, without stopping the invasion—and we are being forced to educate those folks.

When you talk to people, as I have, down around the border—border patrolmen, constables, and others who find dead bodies—and particularly landowners find dead bodies—one border patrolman tells me, when he finds the dead body of a child, he goes home and weeps.

What are we doing, Mr. President? We are luring people here, and children are dying because they think, gee, they are not enforcing the law. This President is not enforcing the law. He is not protecting the country. The security is down, so we can go rushing in.

It is not to avoid violence. They might go to a less violent place around them. It is to come and get the benefits. The trouble is, now that we are a welfare country, more and more people will overwhelm the system, and it does move us toward being a Third World country.

Now, I have taken a lot of abuse for saying that this action also includes an effort to turn Texas blue. People have said: How outrageous is that, that you might think that a President or an administration might actually take action or refuse to take action just for political gain?

Let's see. Here is an article from RedState. A friend there on November 12, 2013, points out:

> Headed by a former field director of Obama for America, Battleground Texas' whole aim is to turn Texas from a so-called ''red State'' to another California—that is, almost singularly controlled by liberal Democrats.
>
> According to O'Keefe's video, Enroll America, a ''501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to maximize the number of uninsured Americans who enroll in health coverage made available by the Affordable Care Act,'' is sharing data with Battleground Texas.

So they are actually using government money to turn Texas into a State that votes more for Democratic candidates.

Another article from a Democratic group says:

> The Lone Star State is changing. From top to bottom of the ballot, we can change the face of Texas politics together.

It goes on to point out how Texans are carrying this movement and that its success could change the face of Presidential politics in this country as we know it. With 38 electoral votes at stake, a blue Texas would be a surefire road to the White House.

For the first time that I am aware of, we had a President who didn't decide to stop his campaign apparatus after he got elected for a second time and who has expressed the intent of turning Texas into a Democrat voting State.

Madam Speaker, the motives have been widely expressed. It is time to stop the invasion, and we have the power to do it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEADOWS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of his sister's death.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 255. An act to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes for clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic''

H.R. 291. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 356. An act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes''.

H.R. 507. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 803. An act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An act to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center''.

H.R. 2337. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 3110. An act to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 14, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6347. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0277; FRL-9911-05] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6348. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Georgia; State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0223; FRL-9912-82-Region 4] received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6349. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0018; FRL-9912-55-Region 10] received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6350. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Export Provisions of the Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Rule [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2011-1014; FRL-9911-84-OSWER] (RIN: 2050-AG68) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6351. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Amendments to Delaware's Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0245; FRL-9912-22-Region 3] received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6352. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Particulate Matter Limitations for Coating Operations [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0366; FRL-9912-09-Region 5] received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6353. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country Amendments to the Registration and Permitting Deadlines for True Minor Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0151; FRL-9911-46-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS24) received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6354. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0673; FRL-9911-08] received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6355. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines for 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0479; FRL-9912-00-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS25) received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6356. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism; A National Broadband Plan For Our Future [CC Docket No.: 02-6] [GN Docket No.: 09-51] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6357. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reliability Assurance Program [NRC-2013-0123] received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Addition of Certain Persons to the Unverified List (UVL) and Making a Correction [Docket No.: 140530464-4464-01] (RIN: 0694-AG20) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update of Short Supply Export Controls: Unprocessed Western Red Cedar, Crude Oil, and Petroleum Products [Docket No.: 140121058-4058-01] (RIN: 0694-AG06) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-032, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-026, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-030, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-058, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-049, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-033, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6366. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-015, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6367. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-025, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6368. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-057, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: United States Munitions List Category XI (Military Electronics), and Other Changes (RIN: 1400-AD25) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-10) activities report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6371. A letter from the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Burmese Sanctions Regulations received June 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6372. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semi-annual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6373. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fishery; 2014-2016 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications [Docket No.: 140106010-4358-02] (RIN: 0648-XD069) received June 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6374. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 140417346-4346-01] (RIN: 0648-XD252) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6375. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West

Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restrictions [Docket No.: 130802674-4422-02] (RIN: 0648-BD57) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6376. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2013-2014 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 140418348-4406-01] (RIN: 0648-BE14) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6377. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Administrative Wage Garnishment [FRL-9910-14-OCFO] received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6378. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4572. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5074. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the transparency and oversight of land conveyances involving the sale, exchange, or other disposal of National Forest System lands or public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management or the acquisition of non-Federal lands for inclusion in the National Forest System or administration as public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5075. A bill to provide protections and certainty for private landowners related to resurveying certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 5076. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5077. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide guidance and clarification regarding issuing new and renewal permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 5078. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5079. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the repatriation of unaccompanied alien children, 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. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5080. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time for which a conditional permit to land temporarily may be granted to an alien crewman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5081. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5082. A bill to provide tax relief for major disaster areas declared in 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5083. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve audit effectiveness and efficiency in paying for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) under the Medicare program, 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 Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Ms. MENG, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5084. A bill to ensure equal access for HUBZone designations to all tax-paying small business owners; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 5085. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Families of Fallen Heroes Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5086. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5087. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the ''Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 5088. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish procedures for class actions at the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5089. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5090. A bill to prohibit providing Federal funds for the National Endowment for the Arts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 5091. A bill to consolidate within the Department of Defense all executive authority regarding the use of armed unmanned aerial vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5092. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to expedite civil actions, claims, and appeals under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2011; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GIBSON):

H. Res. 666. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Community Development Block Grant program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 667. A resolution expressing support for dancing as a form of valuable exercise and artistic expression, and for the designation of July 26, 2014, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

235. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Resolution No. 69 memorializing the Congress to review and support H.R. 3930; to the Committee on Armed Services.

236. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 8 urging the President and the Congress to support the Republic of China's (Taiwan) participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

237. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 79 urging the federal government to adopt federal policy to prohibit the introduction of invasive species, and to manage and prevent the uncontrolled proliferation of invasive species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

238. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 736 calling for a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 371 calling for a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

240. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 118 urging the Congress to enact H.R. 25; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 7706 requesting that the Rhode Island Commerce Corporation pursue certification as a Federal Urban Promise Zone and Manufacturing Hub; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

242. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 7785 supporting the Rhode Island Commerce Corporation's Phase II Grant proposal to the United States Economic Development Administration; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. TIPTON:

H.R. 5074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 5076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5077.

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. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 5078.

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. CALVERT:

H.R. 5079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 5081.

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 1, Section 1.

Article I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 5084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1. All legislative Powers herin granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United Stats, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representitives.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 5085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 7 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the Power ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 517: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 543: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 594: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 842: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 956: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 961: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 962: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1074: Mr. BARTON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1146: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1505: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1518: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1620: Mr. KEATING, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1627: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1697: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1725: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1767: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1795: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1812: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 1844: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1893: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1907: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2020: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2264: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2415: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2453: Mr. COOK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2504: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2540: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2607: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2654: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2835: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2902: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ESTY, Ms. HAHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT OF GEORGIA.
H.R. 2975: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2976: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3229: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3333: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 3382: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3383: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3398: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3400: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3463: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3486: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3689: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3749: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3839: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3997: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4026: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4041: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4056: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 4119: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 4234: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4236: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4241: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4255: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4319: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4325: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4351: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 4385: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4407: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4430: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4440: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4445: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4449: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4450: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4459: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4489: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4510: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4622: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4632: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4651: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4709: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4726: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4736: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 4781: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4826: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4833: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4854: Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4867: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4885: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4886: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4888: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. COOPER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MENG, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 4897: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4904: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. MENG, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4907: Ms. CHU and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4929: Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ENYART, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4931: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4964: Ms. Frankel of Florida and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4977: Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4978: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4981: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4986: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 5007: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 5024: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 5038: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 5053: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5056: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. JOLLY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 231: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 412: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H. Res. 456: Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 612: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 622: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 642: Mr. HIMES, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 644: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 650: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 657: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. FORBES.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 10, July 11, 2014, by Mr. SCOTT PETERS on the bill (H.R. 3992), was signed by the following Members: Scott H. Peters, Lloyd Doggett, Peter A. DeFazio, Ron Kind, Michael E. Capuano, Matt Cartwright, Sander M. Levin, Xavier Becerra, Alcee L. Hastings, Mike Quigley, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Robin L. Kelly, Marcia L. Fudge, Daniel T. Kildee, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Bill Pascrell Jr., Hakeem S. Jeffries, Daniel B. Maffei, Ed Perlmutter, Donna F. Edwards, Danny K. Davis, Ann M. Kuster, Doris O. Matsui, Juan Vargas, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Katherine M. Clark, John F. Tierney, Frank Pallone Jr., Michael M. Honda, Janice Hahn, William L. Owens, Sheila Jackson Lee, Ami Bera, Lois Capps, Joe Courtney, Niki Tsongas, Rubén Hinojosa, Mark Takano, Ann Kirkpatrick, Eric Swalwell, Grace F. Napolitano, James P. McGovern, Chellie Pingree, Brian Higgins, Betty McCollum, Joyce Beatty, Frederica S. Wilson, André Carson, Jerry McNerney, Michelle Lujan Grisham, David N. Cicilline, James R. Langevin, Al Green, Mark Pocan, Julia Brownley, Tammy Duckworth, Jackie Speier, Alan S. Lowenthal, Ben Ray Luján, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Joaquin Castro, Tony Cárdenas, Pete P. Gallego, Raul Ruiz, Jared Huffman, Ron Barber, John Garamendi, Elizabeth H. Esty, Gerald E. Connolly, Steven A. Horsford, Diana DeGette, Kyrsten Sinema, John K. Delaney, Rush Holt, Marcy Kaptur, Derek Kilmer, Paul Tonko, Michael H. Michaud, Janice D. Schakowsky, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, George Miller, Karen Bass, Yvette D. Clarke, Sam Farr, Henry Cuellar, and Steve Israel.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE IRA BRUCE RUSKIN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and work of an extraordinary man, the Honorable Ira Bruce Ruskin. Ira was born in New York City on November 12, 1943, and passed away after a long struggle with brain cancer on July 3, 2014.

Ira Ruskin was drawn to progressive issues at the University of California, Berkeley, where he became involved in the Free Speech Movement. This began his lifelong advocacy for civil rights, women's rights and the environment. After graduating from Berkeley, he earned a degree in communications from Stanford University. He was a marketing and public relations consultant for two decades until he began his political career in 1995, serving on the Redwood City Council and as the Mayor from 1991 to 2001. In 2004, he was elected to the State Assembly, a position he held with dignity and distinction until 2010, when his illness prevented him from entering the race for the State Senate.

Ira Ruskin gave generously of his time and considerable talents to others. He helped organize and served as Chair of the Committee for Regional Water Reliability, and was Chair of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency. He also served our community as a Director of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and as an Advisor to the Redwood City Education Foundation, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the San Mateo County Joint Powers Authority, and the San Mateo County Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Advisory Board.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our condolences to Ira's beloved wife, Cheryl, to his entire family and to his many friends. It is fitting for us to honor the life of Ira Ruskin who was kind and compassionate and who will be greatly missed by all who had the good fortune to know him. He was a patriot who served his community and his country with a deep sense of dedication and integrity and his values and his life of service to others have bettered us and made our union stronger. How blessed and privileged I am to have known Ira, served our mutual constituents together, and called him my friend.

IN RECOGNITION OF CATHERINE CHRISTOPHER

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Catherine Christopher, a resident of Middleborough, Massachusetts, who today celebrates her 100th birthday.

Catherine was born on July 11, 1914 to Mary and Michael Vergos in Lowell, Massachusetts. The second oldest of her six siblings, Catherine, or Kay as her family and friends know her, left her junior high school to work at Giant Store to help support her family. Kay later married Harry Christopher at the Holy Trinity Church in Lowell on October 22, 1939, and they went on to raise three children together: Sandra, William, and Chris. In the early 1950's, the Christopher family opened a grocery store on Locust Street in the early 1950's, which they operated for thirty years.

Kay has been an active member of the local Greek Orthodox Church and she, along with her husband, belonged to a number of clubs and organizations within their community for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Catherine Christopher on this joyous occasion of her 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her continued health and happiness.

BABY BOY BORN AFTER BEING SPARED FROM ABORTION FOLLOWING MIRACULOUS INTERVENTION

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

[From the Christian News Network, Feb. 6, 2014]

(By Heather Clark)

WEST CHESTER, PA.—A baby boy was recently born in Pennsylvania after his life was spared from abortion through a miraculous series of events.

Baby Roman was 18 weeks gestation when his parents went to Planned Parenthood in West Chester last July for an abortion.

''I went to Planned Parenthood because I was stuck in my own world doing everything that I wanted to do,'' Roman's mother, Cartier, who had a previous abortion in 2012, told Christian News Network. ''I was going to go get another abortion.''

Cartier, 21, had three other children and a stepchild, and was living in government housing, where she was limited to an occupancy of six people. If she had the baby, she and her husband feared that they might have to find housing elsewhere, but had nowhere else to go.

At Planned Parenthood, Cartier found out that she was too far along in her pregnancy to have an abortion at the facility. She was directed to go to Cherry Hill, New Jersey that day to end the baby's life.

''[Planned Parenthood] gave me this paper and said, 'Here's other places that will do it,' '' she explained. ''And when I left, my husband and I got in the car [and were going to drive to New Jersey for the abortion].''

That day, a number of Christian sidewalk counselors stood outside of the facility offering help to abortion-minded mothers. Mary Ellen Caris, who has been active in pro-life ministry since 1989, was one of the counselors that eventually had contact with the couple.

''They came out an hour or so after they initially went in,'' she stated, ''They didn't look at us, and they didn't want to take any information.''

DIVINE INTERVENTION

But as Cartier's husband started the car and was ready to exit the parking lot, suddenly the transmission blew—right in front of the sidewalk counselors.

''[T]he car died,'' Caris explained. ''[The husband] tried starting it up and it just barely made it to the stop sign and died again.''

Cartier's husband started the car one more time and was able to turn the corner, but the car again stalled—this time for good.

''They had just spent $500 on the car the week before to fix it,'' Caris outlined, ''So probably he's thinking, 'Man, I just spent $500. Why isn't this car working?' ''

Suddenly, everyone began to ask themselves whether the situation was a matter of divine intervention.

''The whole time that my husband and I were in the car, we kept saying, 'What if it's God? What if He's trying to tell us something?' '' Cartier recalled.

Caris and some of the other counselors then approached the vehicle to offer help, and minutes later, worked out arrangements to take Cartier home—but with the stipulation that she first go to the local pregnancy care center.

''I said to [my husband], 'I'm just going to to do whatever this lady wants me to do so that we can get home,' '' Cartier explained, ''and then, forget them.''

But Caris said that she and the others asked God to intervene in the situation as she drove Cartier and her husband to Chester County Women's Services in Coatesville and then waited patiently for the decision.

''We were praying while they were inside,'' she remembered.

''I CAN'T DO IT''

As Cartier sat in the offices of the pregnancy care center and listened to the words of Medical Director Lisa Thomas, she said that she suddenly ''broke down.'' She texted her mother to tell her about the situation, who replied by congratulating her on the pregnancy—something that stood out to Cartier as she said that her mother had never spoken to her like that before.

Minutes later, Cartier had an ultrasound, and she knew right away that she couldn't go through with the abortion.

''I'm like, 'Oh my goodness, I can't do it,' '' she said. ''And me and my husband were immediately like, 'Alright, we're keeping him.' ''

But, Cartier and her husband still did not know how they were going to provide for their son.

''I couldn't go to work; my husband was unemployed,'' she explained. ''So now, we don't have a car, no way to get around—nothing.''

Cartier and her husband decided to pray and trust God. And that's when they began to see amazing things happen before their eyes.

''Lisa called us and said that somebody wanted to give us a van, and that we could

ride around for free,'' Cartier recalled. ''And we're like, 'Are you serious?' ''

''They called me again and said, 'Somebody wants to give you a baby blessing,' '' she continued, noting that she had begun attending Thomas' church at that time. ''[They said,] 'We don't want you to buy anything at all. . . . All you have to do is be here, and people are going to buy you everything you need for the baby.''

Each time that Cartier and her husband had a need, it was always provided for just in time.

''It was like a rush. We went through all of this—we're struggling; we didn't have anything,'' she said. ''[But then] people came into our lives and helped us. Every time we didn't have food in our house, somebody's bringing over groceries. Every time we'd think, 'How are we going to get here?' because we didn't have any gas in the car, someone would say, 'Oh, the church gave you a gas card, so you can put gas in your car.' ''

ROMAN IS BORN, AND HIS PARENTS ARE BORN AGAIN

Baby Roman was born on December 4th, and Cartier, who along with her husband have since been born again, continues to testify to the goodness of God. She shared that every detail was taken care of surrounding Roman down to even the size of the clothing that she was provided during the baby shower.

''He's two months old and he's wearing three to six-month clothes,'' she explained. ''If they had bought everything zero to three months, I would have no clothes right now. So, it's like an act of God that even happened.''

And Cartier's housing situation worked out as well as she was able to have Roman share a room with one of his siblings without issue.

She gave a word of encouragement for other mothers who might also be considering an abortion.

''Instead of being so quick about everything, sometimes you have to be so tied up in something for God to step into your life. Sometimes you've got to struggle in order to see a victory,'' she said. ''Don't get discouraged, because maybe God is trying to show you, 'You can't do it all without Me.' ''

Caris also urged Christians to get out on the streets and love and help women like Cartier who may just need some hope and support.

''We don't see behind the veil. We don't know what God is doing,'' she said. ''While praying in our prayer closets and praying about abortion in our homes and churches is really important, being a physical presence at the gates of Hell is just undeniably one of the most most powerful things you can do.''

TRIBUTE TO JEFFREY KUETER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jeffrey Kueter for being named the next President of the University of Iowa Alumni Association. Mr. Kueter will succeed current President Vince Nelson at the end of this month.

As any loyal Hawkeye knows, the UI Alumni Association is the trusted resource for more than 45,000 graduates who continue to stay involved in the university's community. The association has maintained an excellent reputation of keeping alumni engaged and united no matter how many miles may separate them from Iowa City.

Since graduating from the University of Iowa in 1993, Mr. Kueter has maintained an unparalleled allegiance to his alma mater through the devotion of his time, resources, and efforts as an ambassador to the political science department. While in his current role as President of the George C. Marshall Institute in Arlington, Virginia, Jeffrey also has presided over the Capital Area Iowa Club of Washington, D.C. and served on the UI Alumni Association's Board of Directors for seven years. In 2011, Mr. Kueter was bestowed with the association's esteemed Distinguished Young Alumni Award for epitomizing what it means to pursue a rewarding, lifelong relationship with the university.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better selection than Mr. Kueter to promote the University of Iowa Alumni Association's mission of strengthening the university through alumni engagement. Jeffrey's continued commitment to his university and home state throughout his professional endeavors embody the values espoused in the lecture halls of Iowa City and all across our great state. As the next association president, there is no doubt that Jeffrey will continue to focus his efforts to further the University of Iowa and its world-class alumni. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Mr. Kueter on his new position and I wish him the best of luck as he expands his integral role in leading Hawkeye Nation.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S HARRY WHITE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great gratitude and respect that I rise to recognize Mr. Harry White upon the occasion of his retirement after a remarkable career of dedicated military and public service to our great Nation.

Born on October 22, 1942 in Robertsdale, Alabama, Harry enlisted in the United States Air Force in 1963. He excelled in his 21-year Air Force career, developing training and educational curricula for all USAF Veterinary Services. He later served as Superintendent of Training for the USAF School of Aerospace Medicine and as Senior Enlisted Advisor for Veterinary Services at Royal Air Force Base, Lakenheath, England in 1979. Harry retired from the Air Force in 1984 at the rank of Chief Master Sergeant.

After a full career of service in the Air Force, Harry joined the Central Baldwin Chamber of Commerce. Serving as Executive Vice President, he executed an industrial development program for the tri-city area in Alabama, developing and executing numerous programs to help support the local community. After five years with the Baldwin County Chamber of Commerce, Harry became the Director of Media Relations for Naval Air Station Pensacola.

Throughout the 25 years since, which he refers to as some of the best times in his life, Harry executed public affairs for the installation and proved to be a vital liaison between the military and civilian community. Harry prepared thousands of news releases to help translate issues of importance to the local communities; coordinated media relations for dignitaries, filmmakers, and writers; and served as an anchor for the community during emergencies, relaying critical information to the public during the aftermaths of Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina, the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, and the September 11, 2001 attack on our homeland.

I have enjoyed having the opportunity to with Harry in his capacity as Public Affairs Officer and come to know him very well. Without question, Harry, always with his family and country at heart, has played an integral role in the continued development of Naval Air Station Pensacola. Looking back on his nearly five decades of service, Harry's unwavering devotion to duty, his timeless energy, and his extensive expertise will surely be missed. I am honored to call Harry my friend and I would like to thank his wife Wilma Jean, children, and grandchildren for supporting him throughout his exemplary service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of Northwest Florida, I would like to thank Harry White for a five-decade job well done.

HONORING THE CITY OF FILLMORE

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the City of Fillmore as it celebrates 100 years of incorporation. Fillmore, whose motto reads: ''The Last, Best Small Town in Southern California,'' is truly a gem of Ventura County. This tight-knit community cherishes its history and tradition, which are rooted in long-standing community values and are preserved and showcased through its many historical landmarks.

Fillmore's history extends beyond the early days of rural Southern California with its significant role in the development of the momentous railroad industry. A stroll through the Fillmore Historical Museum retells the stories of the Southern Pacific Railroad's 19th century depots.

The residents of Fillmore live alongside grand stretches of lemon, orange, and avocado groves, and at the foot of the Hopper Mountain National Wildlife Refuge and the Los Padres National Forest, home to the Sespe Condor Sanctuary. It is an honor to be part of and serve a community with such reverence for the environment and with great devotion to local agriculture in its economy. There is much to gain from preserving California's farming tradition and much to learn from the historic pastimes of this Southern Californian municipality.

As we commemorate the city's 100th anniversary, I would like to commend the City of Fillmore and its residents, past and present, on their success of reaching this milestone. I offer my sincerest congratulations during this centennial celebration and look forward to many more years of growth and prosperity.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. JACK LOANE

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a member of America's Greatest Generation, Mr. Jack Loane. Jack was a World War II Navy veteran. He passed away this June, and is survived by his children and grandchildren.

Jack was present at the naval base in Pearl Harbor during the attack and later joined the Navy on the western front. Jack's bravery knew no bounds as he was involved in the Naval Armada taking troops to Normandy, France for the D-Day Invasion. He holds the distinction of being one of the few veterans to take part in both the attack on Pearl Harbor and the counter-offensive of D-Day.

Jack will be remembered as a loving husband, father, and grandfather. He was active in the community, and tremendously proud of his service to our country. He was a frequent speaker and attendee at veteran's events, and was even honored this year at a Blackhawk's game for his service and sacrifice in defense of our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, and my distinguished colleagues of the House, please join me in honoring Mr. Jack Loane, a true American patriot. I know I join his friends, family, and brothers in arms in celebrating his life and service and honoring his legacy as a veteran and an outstanding American.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,586,759,896,863.97. We've added $6,959,882,847,950.89 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 394, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 397. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak on "H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015," under final consideration by the House.

I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can be enjoyed by generations to come.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, and the former chair of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I understand that the challenge of protecting our nation's vital assets such as transportation infrastructure requires the finest technology and the highest levels of intelligence. Nothing can bring us to our knees faster than something affecting our economic vitality.

One of the greatest engines our economy has is the Port of Houston, which hosts a $15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide? The Port of Houston petrochemical complex supplies over 40 percent of the nation's base petrochemical manufacturing capacity.

What happens at the Port of Houston affects the entire nation. The Port of Houston is critical infrastructure and the funding providing in the bill to address infrastructure needs and improvements are appreciated, but not sufficient to ensure that the nation's deep-water ports remain the best in the world.

Traffic at the Port of Houston accessed through the Houston Ship Channel has expanded dramatically. Today 2 million jobs depend on the Port of Houston. The Houston Ship Channel, which runs to the Gulf of Mexico, is the busiest channel in the nation with over 220,000 transits in 2013. We must look towards the future and make sure that port business destined for U.S. ports is retained.

Current levels of Army Corps funding barely address the operation and maintenance of our nation's ports and waterways. Nationally, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund collects adequate funding to address current needs; unfortunately the Trust Fund does not fund new construction.

By 2016, our national ports will face a major competition when the Panama Canal's major expansion project is scheduled to be completed. The changes investments being made by the Government of Panama will mean that larger vessels that will pass through their canal will carry goods and supplies, destined for U.S. ports.

The real threat is that our ports, including the Port of Houston is that our waterways like the Houston Ship Channel is not dredged deep enough to handle the post Panama Canal water way upgrade that will be available in just 2 years.

The Panama Canal will be 50 feet deep, which will provide enough draft for navigation. The 50 feet deep ships are on track to become the norm and we must be forward thinking to meet the challenge of serving these vessels at our nation's ports.

This appropriations bill must significantly increase funding dedicated to the Corps of Engineers specifically the Civil Works Operations and Maintenance program.

Earlier this year an oil spill in the Port was extremely costly and the efforts to return the port to full capacity were heroic. The incident also highlighted the need modernization that would address rapid response capabilities at Ports that focus on restoration of waterways to full activity as quickly as possible.

The Port of Houston:

According to the Department of Commerce in 2012, Texas exports totaled $265 billion.

Is a 25-mile-long complex of diversified public and private facilities located just a few hours' sailing time from the Gulf of Mexico.

In 2012, ship channel-related businesses contribute 1,026,820 jobs and generate more than $178.5 billion in statewide economic impact.

For the past 11 consecutive years, Texas has outpaced the rest of the country in exports. The Port of Houston is the:

1st ranked U.S. port in foreign tonnage;

2nd ranked U.S. port in total tonnage;

7th ranked U.S. container port by total TEUs in 2012;

Largest Texas port with 46% of market share by tonnage;

Largest Texas container port with 96% market share in containers by total TEUs in 2012; and

Largest Gulf Coast container port, handling 67% of U.S. Gulf Coast container traffic in 2012

2nd ranked U.S. port in terms of cargo value (based on CBP Customs port definitions)

For these reasons, I reservations that this bill is all that Congressional should and could do to make sure that ports around the nation can keep pace with the global recovering economy.

In addition to these problems with the bill it also contains a number of riders that are problematic:

Obstruction of EPA's ability to clarify and define navigable water and specifying which of our nation's waterways are covered under the Clean Water Act.

Permanently prohibits the Army Corps of Engineers from modifying the definition of "fill materials" to include debris and overburden from mining and excavation projects to make them subject to the Clean Water Act.

Allows people to carry firearms on all Corps of Engineering lands

Finally, the bill faces strong opposition by the Administration, which means if it is passed in its current form it will not become law.

The Administration strongly objects to the funding level of $1.8 billion provided in the bill for renewable energy, sustainable transportation, and energy efficiency programs, a $546 million reduction below the FY 2015 Budget request. This reduced funding level will stifle Federal investment in innovative clean energy research and development (R&D) at a time of significant global competition and progress.

The Administration objects to funding reduction in the bill such as the $40 million reduction from the FY 2015 Budget request that would reduce the number of grants to academic investigators and funding for staff at DOE laboratories working on fundamental discovery science and research that underpins advances in clean energy.

Further, this reduction would also affect access to world class facilities used by researchers from all sectors to conduct R&D. The bill funds the international fusion project ITER, at a level $75 million above the FY 2015 Budget request. In light of schedule delays and management reforms underway, the Administration is concerned that the U.S. contributions would outpace the readiness of the project.

The bill provides the Corps of Engineers' bill $5.5 billion for works program, nearly $1 billion above the FY 2015 Budget request. The FY 2015 Budget focuses on investments that would yield high economic and environmental returns or address a significant risk to public safety. The Administration encourages the Congress to fund the civil works program at the requested level. The funding increase for the civil works program is provided primarily by decreases in other core priorities, including clean energy. The Administration also urges the Congress to permit the Corps to commence new starts in FY 2015.

The Administration strongly objects to sections 105 and 106 of the bill, which would prevent the use of funds to address deficiencies and regulatory uncertainties related to CWA regulations designed to protect important aquatic resources while supporting economic development.

Section 106 in particular would impact an important, ongoing Administration effort to provide regulatory clarity on which water bodies are covered by the CWA, which has been the subject of two Supreme Court cases in which the Court indicated the need for greater clarity regarding the statute's scope.

My service in the House of Representatives has focused on making sure that our nation is secure and prosperous. A central component of national security is the ability of our nation's international ports to move goods and into an out of the country.

With less than 50 legislative days remaining, I cannot support this bill and I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives work together to carefully manage our time and energy to make sure that the bills we past meet our obligations to the American public and can eventually become law.

SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFELONG SKILLS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act, which will help get people back to work in higher-wage jobs.

I want to commend Chairman KLINE and Subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for their dedication and commitment to improving our nation's workforce training programs.

Our nation's current job training system is overly complex and failing hard-working Americans. Believe it or not, millions of jobs go unfilled simply because prospective employees lack the necessary knowledge and training. This bill will help address that challenge by bridging the gap between the skills workers have and those employers need, preparing workers to find good paying jobs.

This bill will also ensure hard-working taxpayers get more bang for their buck by demanding accountability and results from workforce training programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, which shows we can come together and move America forward when we set our partisan differences aside.

IN HONOR OF MRS. ALICE JANE BALLEW

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Alice Jane Ballew of Richmond, Kentucky for her commitment and service to the citizens of the City of Richmond and Madison County, Kentucky.

On the occasion of her 90th birthday, I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Alice Jane Ballew for her many contributions to Richmond and Madison County, Kentucky, and in particular to the Pattie A. Clay Infirmary Association and to Baptist Health Richmond. Mrs. Ballew has provided more than a half century of volunteer service to the Infirmary Association and the hospital, and has served on the boards of trustees of both the hospital and its foundation.

Mrs. Ballew was recently awarded the Kentucky Hospital Association's Health Care Governance Leadership Award for her positive and sustainable impact on the quality of health care in Richmond and Madison County. She has also received the Community Service Award from Richmond's Chamber of Commerce, the Outstanding Service Award from Jewish Hospital in Louisville, the Outstanding Community Philanthropy Award and the Kentucky Hospital Association's Award of Excellence.

I am grateful to represent such an outstanding, civic minded constituent.

HONORING U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE JAMES TURK

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of U.S. District Judge James Turk, a devoted public servant to the Commonwealth of Virginia, who passed away on July 6, 2014.

Judge Turk grew up on a farm in Roanoke County, and graduated from William Byrd High School. He served in the U.S. Army, and went on to graduate from Roanoke College. He won a scholarship to Washington & Lee University School of Law, and went on to practice law in Radford for many years with the firm of Dalton, Poff, & Turk.

He served in the Virginia State Senate from 1959 until 1972, and was the Senate Minority Leader from 1965 until 1972. In October of 1972, Judge Turk was appointed by President Nixon to the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia. In 2002, 30 years later, Judge Turk claimed senior status but, though a successor was appointed at that time, he continued hearing cases.

I and others who have practiced before Judge Turk found him to be honorable, helpful, friendly, and very sharp. John Fishwick, a prominent Roanoke attorney who clerked for Judge Turk in the 1980s and has appeared before him in court, said, "He had one of the sharpest legal minds I've ever known, and he also cared greatly about the people who came before him. Those people mattered so much to him." Circuit Court Judge Clifford Weckstein wrote this week, "He loved coming to work. He loved his job. And his job, as he saw it, was to do justice, every day and in every way." And Tom Bondurant, a former assistant U.S. attorney now in private practice, said, "He had a fine sense of right and wrong, and he always tried to do what was right."

Judge Turk was involved in additional public service work and charitable work, including serving as President of the Roanoke College Alumni Association, membership in the Roanoke College Society of 1842, and on the Boards of Directors for the Radford University Foundation and the C.E. Richardson Foundation. He also was a trustee for the Radford Community Hospital. He was awarded an honorary Doctor of Laws degree by Roanoke College in 1996 for his service and devotion to his alma mater.

He is survived by his brother, S. Maynard Turk and wife Pat; his beloved wife, Barbara Duncan Turk; his children, Ramona Turk, Jimmy Turk and wife Allison, Bobby Turk and wife Laura, Mary Turk Prince and husband Scott, Michael Turk and wife Barbara; and grandchildren.

Judge Turk was dedicated to his family, and was dedicated to his work. He was very well respected, a devoted public servant, and a noble defender of the rule of law. He had a tremendous impact on our community and upon countless individuals all across the region. Though Judge Turk will be greatly missed, his legacy and influence will long be remembered.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Judge Turk's family and other loved ones at this time. May God give them comfort.

CELEBRATING ST. CHARLES EPISCOPAL CHURCH'S ''MISSION IN THE MOUNTAINS''

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Charles Episcopal Church's ''Mission in the Mountains'' and to celebrate the service of seven high school participants in this effort. In June, the St. Charles Episcopal team traveled to poverty stricken areas of the Appalachian Mountains where they invested their time and energy rebuilding and repairing homes. This was the 13th year in a row members of the St. Charles community participated in a mission trip to Kentucky.

Liz Ryan, director of youth & children's development at the church, led the mission trip for the 13th time. She described the mission as life changing, saying ''One of the things that we profess to in our religion is that we respect the dignity of every human being, when you go to someplace where the need is so evident, it changes your perspective on the world.'' Ryan believes that no two trips have ever been the same and that the students take home a new perspective on how to positively impact the world.

The students, Shannon Foran, Mandalee Manning, Rachel Peyton, Johanna Matthiesen, Ian Rhead, Avery Manning, and Grace Ditch, were trained in using power tools and equipment and a variety of tasks needed to complete the building and repair projects comprising the mission. They used these skills to repaint walls, ceilings, homes, and build wheelchair ramps and fix leaky roofs.

Mr. Speaker, these hardworking young people could have been spending time at home, with friends, playing video games, or any of the other ways so many choose to spend their days. Instead, they showed leadership, compassion, and commitment to help build a better world. They chose to roll up their sleeves and get to work. They improved the lives of those less fortunate, and they set a terrific example for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in celebrating these ''Mission in the Mountain'' participants and their efforts and encouraging them to continue to lead by example.

TRIBUTE TO MR. EUGENE H. DIBBLE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, about ten years ago I had the pleasure of going to the floor of the House of Representatives to congratulate and wish my good friend Mr. Eugene Dibble a happy 75th birthday.

Today, I am pleased to be here at Howard University Law School with you, his family, friends and associates to say farewell as he transitions on to another world of which we know so little.

But what we do know is that Mr. Eugene Dibble is a member of one of America's most distinguished families. Big Gene or Gentleman Gene as he was fondly called by some of those who knew him, was indeed a man about the town. Pedigreed, intelligent, astute, wise civically socially and politically involved, and some would even say charmingly so!

Gene Dibble was a pioneer, one of the first African American stock brokers in Chicago. He told me that he owned five businesses at one time and had five children who worked in these businesses. Yes, he was advisor to the Honorable Elijah Muhammad, Muhammad Ali and to countless others. One evening after dinner at one of his favorite eating places, ''the Jockey Club'', he said to me that the most important aspects of his life were his family and heritage. He talked about you all whenever he was talking and that was practically all of the time. Gene was keenly aware of his world and always seeking, probing and analyzing and trying to figure out, always wanting to be in charge of his thoughts and actions.

It seems to me that the poet William Ernest Henley had Gene on his mind when he penned these words: ''Out of the night that covers me, Black as the pit from pole to pole, I thank whatever Gods may be, for my unconquerable soul. In the fell clutch of circumstance, I have not winced nor cried aloud, Under the bludgeoning of chance, my head is bloody, but unbowed. Beyond this place of wrath and tears looms the horrors of the shade, and yet the menace of the years, finds and shall find me unafraid. It matters not how straight the gate, how charged with punishment the scroll, I am the master of my fate, I am the captain of my soul!

And may the soul of Eugene H. Dibble rest in peace.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 14, 2014.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 5074–5092; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 105–106; and H. Res. 666–667 were introduced. **Pages H6135–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6136–37**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 4572, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–518). **Page H6135**

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation: The House passed H.R. 4718, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation, by a recorded vote of 258 ayes to 160 noes, Roll No. 404. **Pages H6110–21**

Rejected the Neal motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with amendments, by a yea-and-nay vote of 191 yeas to 229 nays, Roll No. 403. **Pages H6119–21**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in H. Rept. 113–517, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H6110**

Representative Van Hollen raised a point of order against consideration of H.R. 4718 by stating that the bill violated provisions of the Congressional Budget Act. Subsequently, the Chair ruled that provisions of H. Res. 661, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 4718, waive all points of order against consideration of the bill. **Pages H6112–19**

H. Res. 661, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5016) and (H.R. 4718), was agreed to yesterday, July 10th.

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 657, to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization. **Pages H6121–22**

Agreed to the Royce amendment to the resolution by voice vote. **Page H6122**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 14th at 12 noon for Morning Hour Debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H6124**

Discharge Petition: Representative Peters (CA) presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committees on the Budget, Agriculture, and Natural Resources from the consideration of H.R. 3992, to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes (Discharge Petition No. 10).

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6120–21 and H6121. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

21ST CENTURY CURES: INCORPORATING THE PATIENT PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''21st Century Cures: Incorporating the Patient Perspective''. Testimony was heard from Janet Woodcock, M.D., Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and public witnesses.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS: STATES VS. FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Constitutional Considerations: States vs. Federal Environmental Policy Implementation''. Testimony was heard from Robert Meltz, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

AGENCY PERSPECTIVES

Committee on the Judiciary: Over-Criminalization Task Force held a hearing on Agency Perspectives. Testimony was heard from Timothy J. Heaphy, United States Attorney, Western District of Virginia, Department of Justice; Irene M. Keeley, United States District Judge, Judicial Conference of the United States; Defender of New York; Patti B. Saris, Chair, United States Sentencing Commission; and David Patton, Executive Director and Attorney-in-charge, Federal Defender of New York.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE: THE VIABILITY OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Workforce: The Viability of the Senior Executive Service''. Testimony was heard from Samuel Retherford, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Human Resources and Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Stephen Shih, Deputy Associate Director, Executive Resources and Employee Development, Office of Personnel Management; and a public witness.

FUSION ENERGY: THE WORLD'S MOST COMPLEX ENERGY PROJECT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled ''Fusion Energy: The World's Most Complex Energy Project''. Testimony was heard from Frank Rusco, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, General Accountability Office; Pat Dehmer, Deputy Director for Science Programs, Department of Energy; Ned Sauthoff, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JULY 14, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, and Victoria Reggie Kennedy, of Massachusetts, all to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, 3 p.m., SD–342.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on the following legislation: H.R. 4771, the ''Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act''; H.R. 4250, the ''Sunscreen Innovation Act''; H.R. 594, the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2014; H.R. 669, the ''Sudden Unexpected Death and Data Enhancement and Awareness Act''; H.R. 4290, the ''Wakefield Act of 2014''; H.R. 4450, the ''Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014''; and H.R. 5057, the ''EPS Service Parts Act of 2014'', 4 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5021, the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'', 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Evaluation of the Process to Achieve VBA Goals'', 7:30 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, July 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business until 6 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, July 14

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E1146
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1144
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1145
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1147
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1143
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1146
Hurt, Robert, Va., E1145
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1145
Keating, William R., Mass., E1143
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1144
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1146
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1144
Pitts, Joseph R., Pa., E1143
Reichert, David G., Wash., E1145
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1145, E1147

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.