United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014 No. 112

House of Representatives

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:

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

Strengthen the constitutional commitments of the Members of this people's House in their work today. Guide and sustain them in Your wisdom, and inspire all, especially those in leadership, with the insights needed to assist our Nation at this time.

As the Members return once again to their districts, may their encounters with those whom they represent be fruitful and bring confidence to all that our future as a Nation will be secure and productive.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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.

SAVE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Securing Access Via Excellence, or SAVE, Medicare Home Health Act, legislation introduced by my colleagues Mr. WALDEN and Dr. PRICE to replace the cuts to Medicare home health funding under the President's Affordable Care Act with a value-based purchasing program.

Home health care allows the ill and disabled to access essential care services within the home setting and enables our seniors to have more control over health care decisions.

The Affordable Care Act cuts Medicare home health by 14 percent by the year 2017. This will have a devastating impact on a large portion of the 3.5 million Americans who receive these services, including more than 143,000 in Pennsylvania. Of equal concern, these cuts could result in the loss of thousands of jobs for caregivers and health professionals.

The SAVE Medicare Home Health Act will achieve the same level of savings in the Medicare program. Rather than indiscriminately cut this funding, this legislation protects beneficiaries' access to home health by making these services more effective and cost efficient.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. America's seniors deserve as much.

PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN KEN GRAY

(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, today, I rise to commemorate the life of a great southern Illinoisan, a man who knew this Chamber very well, U.S. Congressman Ken Gray.

Kenny's ability to fight for southern Illinois is unmatched, from building interstate highways, Rend Lake, the Marion Federal Penitentiary, to building bridges, countless post offices, and water lines.

Whether convincing President Carter to tour an underground mine or escorting President Kennedy to Carbondale and Marion, Congressman Gray was a one-of-a-kind advocate for southern Illinois.

I counted Kenny among my friends, and he loved serving in this House. We will always remember him as the gentleman whose personality was as colorful as the suits he wore to the Capitol each day.

Colleagues, join me in remembering World War II veteran, Congressman Ken Gray.

Kenny, thank you for your service to your Nation, your State, and to southern Illinois.

PROTECTING OUR DIGITAL ECONOMY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to highlight legislation that the House passed this week protecting the future of our digital economy.

The rise of the Internet has been a great American success story. One of the biggest reasons for its success is the fact that the government hasn't needlessly gotten in the way of innovators who have grown the information superhighway to what it is today.

This week, the House passed, with bipartisan overwhelming support, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act to continue to allow the Internet to

Printed on recycled paper.

flourish and protect the opportunities that arise with it.

Without this legislation, we will see taxes increased on hardworking Americans and decreased access to the Internet. It is estimated that low-income households would actually bear 10 times the financial load as high-income households just to go online.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that was voted on this week is as common sense as it comes. I ask and urge the Senate to take action as well so we can protect Internet access from taxation.

NOT MY BOSS' BUSINESS ACT

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, last month's Supreme Court decision in the Hobby Lobby case is a serious step backwards for women's health. It sets a dangerous precedent where bosses are in control of their employees' health care decisions. And it worries me.

As a doctor, I know that in order for a woman to make the best decision, she needs to sit down and have a conversation with her physician. It is important that we have all options available.

Long-term contraceptive methods like IUDs are often the safest option and up to 20 times more effective than the birth control pill, but upfront costs can make it difficult for some women, particularly low-income women, to afford these methods. Prescription birth control can often cost up to $600 a year, and if women can't afford it, they are more likely to use it in an inconsistent manner.

That is why I am proud to support the not my boss' business act, which ensures that employers can't pick and choose what health services a woman can receive. Health care decisions should be made between a patient and a doctor, not her boss.

ENERGY AND ROADS EQUAL JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, the people of West Virginia want to invest in the future of our State and our Nation. We want safe roads and the opportunity to work.

This week, we took steps in the House to invest in our infrastructure and our domestic energy production, actions that will help create and sustain American jobs. On Tuesday, we passed a bill in the House to invest and rehabilitate our Nation's infrastructure. Roads create jobs. Investing in our roads and bridges creates not only construction jobs, but also grows the economy by ensuring reliable interstate commerce and travel.

I have seen firsthand the difference that good infrastructure can make. Whether it is in Berkeley County or U.S. Route 35 in Putnam and Mason Counties, it has helped to grow that local economy.

Yesterday, my bill, the Coal Jobs Protection Act, passed in the House Transportation Committee with bipartisan support. A robust mining industry is not only good for the miners and their families, but good for the businesses who depend on these workers to buy goods and services and good for the communities who depend on those tax dollars.

Investing in our roads and our energy production will create more prosperous times for my State of West Virginia and for our Nation.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the humanitarian crisis that is happening at our border.

Since October of last year, more than 50,000 children have fled their homes and turned themselves in to the United States Border Patrol. These children are fleeing extreme violence, extortion, and poverty. As they await their hearings, some are being transported to my district in the Inland Empire.

Several weeks ago, the first wave of buses transporting these children was scheduled to arrive right outside my district. I was disappointed and disturbed to see some of my fellow Americans curse, spit at, and block one of these buses filled with women and children who have endured traumas many of us will never understand.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. We are a nation of laws and compassion. As this body determines its course of action, we should ensure that every one of these children is taken care of and treated with dignity.

ISRAEL UNDER SIEGE

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the real and present danger that Israel finds itself in today. Quite simply, Israel is under siege.

Hamas has fired over 1,000 rockets in the last few weeks into the country. Millions of Israelis are at risk. Hamas is a designated terrorist organization that calls for the destruction of Israel.

The aggression of Hamas leaves Israel with no choice but to defend its citizens, and we must show that we stand with Israel against unprovoked rocket attacks. Hamas must immediately end the unprovoked attacks and agree to a ceasefire.

In addition, Israel finds itself under siege by the persistent threat of a nuclear Iran. Stringent economic sanctions remain our only peaceful option by which to persuade Iran to suspend its quest for nuclear weapons. However, with the negotiations deadline approaching this Sunday, we must present a credible military threat and strengthen sanctions should Iran not respond to peacefully ending their pursuit.

The last window of opportunity we have to keep Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability is soon closing. Preventing Iran from achieving nuclear weapons capabilities is essential. We must stand with Israel.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I heard on the radio a Palestinian mother who said: I wish the bombing would stop so that I could get food for my children.

I don't expect that that mother would in any way deny Israeli mothers and fathers from their ability to live in peace.

I rise today to stand with the right of Israel to exist and to defend herself and to call upon the redoubling of peace efforts by the United States to ensure that there is a peace resolution. I also hope that, as Egypt is negotiating a ceasefire, the terrorist group Hamas can be isolated and the people in the Palestinian area in Gaza and the West Bank would come together as one, with Mr. Abbas leading a peaceful region.

It is time now for the unprovoked rockets to stop and for people to come together in a coalition of peace.

I have been to Israel. I have seen the Iron Dome. It is an Iron Dome of protection. I have listened to the President of Israel, who has argued for peace.

Let us stand for peace and the ceasing of the firing of rockets and a negotiation of settlement that is permanent.

WORKERS AT SPINA BIFIDA ASSOCIATION LATEST VICTIMS OF PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is increasingly detached from the needs and concerns of western Pennsylvanians.

The Spina Bifida Association of Western Pennsylvania works to improve the quality of life for people with spina bifida and their families by providing much-needed service, education, advocacy, and housing.

Mr. Speaker, I recently visited with the men and women who work there, as well as the residents and program participants of the facilities and programs they operate. The workers are dedicated and caring people, and they do tremendous work.

As of July 1, 2014, Mr. Speaker, the Spina Bifida Association was forced to

discontinue coverage for its 25 full-time employees because President Obama's health care law made it so unaffordable for them to continue—another broken promise of President Obama's oversold health care law.

It is past time for President Obama and his unelected Federal elites to change course and begin pursuing policies that help people and not his out-of-touch and out-of-control Washington, D.C.

□ 0915

NIGERIA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore this country and the world to direct our attention to the kidnappings of more than 300 young Nigerian women in May and of another eight girls just yesterday.

The leader of the Nigerian Islamist group, Boko Haram, who claims responsibility for the kidnappings, has referred to these young women as ''slaves'' and has threatened to sell them like chattel.

These deplorable actions can only be stopped by bringing the full weight of international condemnation and law enforcement to bear on those responsible and the ideology that they exploit. We must find the perpetrators and combat their backward ideas in the court of public opinion.

Every child has an absolute right to receive an education in a safe and protected environment. We must redouble our efforts to better the lives of people around the world who may be too poor and too isolated to protect themselves. These girls could have been our daughters, our sisters, our nieces, or our friends.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4719, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 670 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 670

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-51 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 670 provides for the consideration of a package of tax deductions for charitable contributions to organizations in the form of excess food inventory and conservation easements, as well as authorizing tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts, lowering the excise tax on private foundations, and extending the date by which taxpayers can make charitable contributions to be considered for a tax deduction. This is a package of policies, each of which has been supported by the overwhelming majorities of both parties.

The rule before us today provides for a closed rule for H.R. 4719, which is the standard rule for tax bills. Of course, the minority will have its customary motion to recommit. This is a straightforward rule.

H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, will benefit the countless numbers of Americans who rely on and utilize charitable organizations in communities throughout the country. A great incentive for many Americans to contribute to those organizations or to contribute in a greater capacity than they otherwise might are the tax deductions that have been made available by the Federal Government. Congress, long ago, decided it was sound public policy to incentivize charitable giving, encouraging citizens to open their pocketbooks and lend a hand to those less fortunate—and Americans are a generous people. Moreover and importantly, today's bill makes these tax provisions permanent so that Americans will not have to worry from year to year whether the tax deductions on which they have come to rely will be available to them that year.

Recently, the House passed a permanent tax credit for corporate research and development. There were 62 Democrats who voted against the measure. Their reasoning, as far as I can tell, was not against the policy but of maintaining that the measure was not paid for. However, pay-fors are something in Congress that we need when we are creating new programs or are allocating money not previously appropriated, essentially making the American people pay more in taxes. The offsets are unnecessary and not needed when we are actually shielding the American people from having their money taken in the first place in the form of a tax.

Moreover, we heard on Tuesday night while in the Rules Committee markup of today's rule—and I suspect we will hear some about it today—the fact that the two tax-related bills before us today in the rule are not paid for. Congress only needs to pay for a tax credit if one subscribes to the belief that all money in our country belongs first to the government, then to the people. I reject this mindset. Congress does not need to justify or pay for not taking more money from the American people. Congress needs to justify and, thus, pay for policies that take money from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, even if you did subscribe to the notion that all money in this country, first and foremost, belongs to the government and that the government has to pay for allowing Americans to keep their money, the exact provisions contained in the America Gives More Act have traditionally not been offset, and Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee, on the Rules Committee, and Democratic leadership have often voted in favor of these same provisions in un-offset legislation in previous years.

In the absence of a larger, comprehensive tax reform package, permanent extenders like these make sense. They bring back stability and certainty to businesses that are constantly having to wait to see if Congress will, in fact, act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. The legislation consists of a package of five bills previously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, which would add an estimated $16 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Like every Member of this body, I strongly support charitable giving. I tout the fact in the Rules Committee frequently that I am proud of the fact that I work directly with three food pantries—one that I am extremely proud of that works with grandmothers and grandfathers who are taking care of their children's children and who find great needs. I might add that that

particular charity has seen a diminution, a diminishing, of charitable giving. I might add additionally to that, when I look across the board in my community, I find that charitable giving is down, and I think that is commensurate with the kind of economy that we are in.

I applaud Americans who donate what they can to the causes they care about. I would go as far as to say that I support many of the measures that are in this bill. However, in its present form, I cannot support it. The Republican majority has divided what used to be a complete extenders package into smaller parts, some of which will be debated here today and some of which, I predict, will never reach the floor for debate, certainly not a vote. My friends have managed to make a traditionally nonpartisan and noncontroversial issue both partisan and controversial. The provisions we are debating are not paid for and, yet, are made permanent.

I am afraid that this bill is part and parcel in a pattern of what I perceive as reckless, irresponsible behavior on the part of the majority. Republican inconsistency on fiscal responsibility and the deficit is stunning. Whenever we are considering a bill they like, they are happy to ignore the deficit and waive all of the rules that enforce fiscal discipline; but whenever Republicans don't like a proposal, they hide behind budget rules to block it. On the one hand, they have blocked or delayed everything from extending unemployment insurance, to an SGR doc fix, to emergency hurricane relief, demanding that they are fully offset. Yet, when it comes to tax credits, they waive their own budgeting rules, as they are doing here, and run up the deficit as they are doing here. This bill alone will add an additional $16 billion to the deficit over 10 years. These are the people who continuously decry the fact that we have deficits, and these are the people who continue to say that they are spendthrifts in the sense that they are taking care of the budget. That is just the beginning.

Today, the Ways and Means Committee has reported 12 unpaid-for tax extenders at a cost of $614 billion over 10 years. The House has passed five at a cost of $518 billion over 10 years. I might add this is budget hocus-pocus. It was referred to as ''voodoo economics'' at another point in time. For example, you take something like we did with the highway trust bill earlier, and you pay for it. You spend the money in 6 months, and then you pay for it over a 10-year period of time, which substantially mitigates against what their intent is rather than to do what is needed, and that is a highway infrastructure bill that will give our Nation reassurance with reference to construction measures and make sure our bridges are not falling down and that our roads are safe to drive on.

Look at the bill that we were dealing with last week. My friends threw away another $287 billion, or at least they proposed to. Much of this stuff isn't going anywhere, but they proposed to throw away another $287 billion on an extenders package just like this one. Let me repeat: $287 billion. Now we are going to add another $16 billion to that number. It is as if we are looking for new ways to be dysfunctional.

Instead of creating a stable economy, they are picking and choosing their favorite provisions and are extending them piece by piece. Rather than reforming our Tax Code, they are making it up as they go along. Assuredly, all of us have great respect for our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have that awesome responsibility of finding the ways and the means to fund this government, and I for one—and I am sure I speak for many—have great respect for DAVE CAMP, the chairman of that committee.

At the beginning of this session, Chairman CAMP proposed tax reform. I might have agreed or disagreed with an awful lot of it, but inside his own Conference, he could not get people who would support meaningful tax reform. Instead, now, in refutation to much of what he had put forward by denying some of these 60-plus extensions—he had said that many of them should not be in the measure—they come and cherry-pick and get the ones that they want and put them here rather than reform this Tax Code.

Is there anybody in this country, in this Congress, in the House, or in the Senate who believes that the Tax Code is fair and simple for everybody—business and/or Americans? No. They are making it up as they go along—a tax extender here, a tax extender there, something I like here, and I don't like that over there.

Let me tell you what we should be doing. We should be passing bills that create jobs in this country.

□ 0930

We should be repairing our infrastructure, and all of us know this.

When I came to Congress in 1992, then-President Bill Clinton identified—and we agreed—that there were 14,000 bridges in America that were in need of repair, but now, what we find is that there are substantially more bridges, and some have fallen down in that period of time, and yet, we are piecemealing the transportation issue, kicking the can down the road.

I commented in the Rules Committee some time back, this kicking the can down the road concept, if it were an Olympic sport, then Congress would not only get gold and bronze and silver, they would also get aluminum because they are real good at kicking the can.

We should be passing bills that tackle comprehensive immigration reform. Is there anybody, including all of the don't come here people that are out there shouting at children—in many instances—and mothers and people who don't speak our language, that have undertaken the most unreasonable, for any of us, journey to try to get to a better life for themselves—and people standing there, shouting at them, rather than collecting ourselves as a sensible country—of immigrants, I might add—and allow, among other things that we try to do, not just comprehensive immigration reform, indeed, we should do border security.

We have to have clarity, not only for those who may seek to come here, but for all of us. We need clarity as it pertains to immigration.

Will they put it on the floor just for a vote? No. It will not happen, and yet, we will see this piecemeal, and we will see this back and forth some time next week.

The President proposes $3.7 billion. Someone on the other side said that is too much money. The President says we need more judges and more lawyers, and we need lawyers on both sides I maintain, and yet, we find ourselves in the position of not being able to do anything and not doing it hurriedly enough.

We have this crisis on our border, which doesn't even come close to rivaling the many issues that are developing in the world, from Ukraine to Israel to Yemen, back across the board to Syria, and countless other places, our relationships are in jeopardy, and all of it is placed at the hands, if you let these people tell it, of Barack Obama.

Many of the issues that are developing developed over periods of time, and they largely did so because this Congress does not have the courage to stand up and do the things that are vitally necessary for all of America, Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal. The needs are great, and we are doing very little of anything at all.

We have 10 more days until we go on recess to campaign, and when we do go on recess to campaign, that will be for the whole month of August. Then we will come back here a few weeks in September, and we will be gone the whole month of October.

What in the world would stop us then from having the time and the necessity to sit down together in a bipartisan way and come up with what is needed for immigration reform in this country?

We have 3.3 million people—after the expiration of the unemployment insurance measures in this country in the month of December, we now number 3.3 million people out of work, in the cold, and that has cost the economy more than $10 billion.

Of those 3.3 million people, I remind my friends who stand up here with their patriotic notions that they espouse, and I believe they believe in our troops. We are fond of saying that around here.

I believe they believe that we should be secure, as do I, with reference to our military, but 300,000 of those people that are unemployed are veterans, not to mention all of the problems at the veterans hospitals that we need to attend to, rather than finger-pointing

and trying to find measures to beat each other down, rather than try to lift America up.

House Republicans have found time to sue President Obama for doing his job, but we haven't found time to pass these important bills.

I said humorously, before I began to hear it often, that if President Obama is going to be sued by the Speaker for doing something, then I want to participate in the lawsuit against the Speaker for doing nothing.

We can try to appease the most extreme end of the Republican Party, but we can't pass the laws that address the challenges facing Americans all across this Nation, and for this dereliction of duty, maybe somebody should consider when we are talking about a lawsuit—what I said humorously—really considering suing this institution and its Speaker for not doing those things that are a few that I have identified.

In yesterday's hearing in the Rules Committee, I ended my remarks—and we had outstanding witnesses, experts in this area, ranging from Elizabeth Foley, from Florida International University; to Jonathan Turley, from George Washington University; Simon Lazarus, from the Constitutional group; and Walter Dellinger—all of them—at least three of them being extremely experienced in the subject matter and each of them addressing the subject of standing, as I did, in asking them questions at different times.

Most of us know that this lawsuit is not likely to go anywhere, and at some point, all of the witnesses agreed that there are challenges ahead with reference to this lawsuit, and all of them knew and know that there is absolutely no precedent for this action, none.

There is a case, McClure v. Carter, that has some similarities, but even that one did not cross the threshold that is needed. I did end my comments by saying that I was being partisan, and I will end this portion of my comments by saying I am being partisan.

These are the people that for the 52 years, nearly, that I am a lawyer, that have argued against frivolous lawsuits. If there was ever a frivolous lawsuit, then the one that is proposed to be filed by the Speaker of this House gives frivolous new meaning. It is indeed just that.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on this matter, the administration, as it is wont to do, filed administration policy. We refer to them in our committees and around the House as a SAP.

What the administration said is the following:

The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

I am going to come back to this, but before we go forward, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would give Members a second opportunity this week to consider reversing the damage done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision.

No employer should have the right to limit the health choices of its employees, male or female. It is pure discrimination when 99 percent of women in this country have used some form of birth control during their lifetime, but to now have to literally go through unreasonable measures to simply secure the fundamental health care they need.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Justice Elena Kagan, our three women Justices stood unanimously against the Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case.

They sit on the highest court in the Nation, and by no coincidence, the three women's dissent is representative of what I heard from the women I talked to in my district.

I asked women at home to send me in three words how they feel about the Court's decision. This is what they shared with me: Jennifer from Melrose, sad, disappointing, disturbing; Anna from Framingham, backwards, scary, hurtful; Jeanine from Waltham, disgusted, wrong, outraged; Susan from Cambridge, need more Ginsburgs.

The Court's decision to strike down women's access to basic health care is only the latest in systemic efforts to unwind the progress women have made.

Why aren't we demanding equal pay for women from our employers, rather than giving a woman's boss the right to make the most personal health care decisions for her and her family?

Congress has an obligation to correct this course. The amendment and the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act makes certain that a woman's boss does not interfere in her basic health care. It simply affirms that when the law provides for insurance companies to cover basic health care for all, all people are entitled to that health care, period.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a good friend who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to this body about the outrageous Supreme Court decision, the Hobby Lobby case.

I look at this, not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor. Now, in my training, we took an oath. That oath was to put our patients first, to do good.

My core job as a doctor is to sit with my patients, answer her questions, talk about the risks and benefits and the various options that are available, but then to empower my patients to make the decisions that best fit their lives.

To women, there is no greater decision than when to start a family, when to become a mother, and that is why protecting those reproductive rights and reproductive options are so important. That is core to our oath as physicians, and that is why the Supreme Court's decision on Hobby Lobby was so outrageous.

We have got to fight against this encroachment of the government or the Justices in the Supreme Court coming into my exam room and getting between me and my patients. That is outrageous. It is an affront to individual liberties. It is an affront to what we do as doctors.

It is not just me speaking. This is doctors all across America. The American Congress of OB/GYNs calls this ruling outrageous.

□ 0945

We need to have all options available. But what am I to do now if a Hobby Lobby employee comes to me as a patient, sits down and says: You know, I am not ready to start a family at this juncture. I would like to know what my contraceptive options are; I would like to know what some of the safest methods are.

Well, IUDs often are 20 times more effective and are extremely safe, but the Supreme Court has now made that option unavailable for me. They didn't go to medical school. I did. As a doctor, it is my oath to provide all those options.

Now, others might say, well, that patient can still choose to get it. The reason people have health insurance is because they want to have health care available when it is necessary. What if that patient can't afford that health care option? For many patients, hourly workers, often contraception can cost up to $600 a year. They are not able to afford it. That is why this is such an outrageous decision. We have got to keep the government and the Supreme Court out of our exam room.

And it is even more personal than that. I am a husband and I am a father. I want my daughter to grow up in a country where she is in control of her health care decisions, where she is in control of her body.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BERA of California. So as a doctor, as a father of a daughter, I am

proud to support the not my boss' business act because it puts patients back in charge of their health care decisions. We, as a country, prize individual liberties and individual freedoms above all. So this gives those decisions back to the patients.

Mr. BURGESS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my classmate and good friend.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to bring the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act to the floor.

In 1993, I was a leader in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. If you had told me then that RFRA would one day be used to allow employers to dictate to employees what preventive health care they can or cannot use, if you had told me then that I would stand on the House floor in 2014 fighting to ensure that women have the ability to make their own most basic health care decisions regardless of their boss' religious beliefs, I would never have believed it.

We wrote that bill to be a shield to protect an individual's personal exercise of religious beliefs, not a sword to enable employers to impose their religious beliefs on their employees.

No matter how sincerely held a religious belief might be, for-profit employers, like Hobby Lobby or Conestoga Wood, must not be allowed to impose their beliefs or that belief on their employees as a means of denying their employees access to critical preventive health care services.

I was proud to work with the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) to introduce this simple legislation to ensure that, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's mangling of RFRA, employers cannot deny their employees access to federally mandated health services.

Every woman must have the right to follow her own beliefs and guidance when making health care choices. This bill simply guarantees that the boss' beliefs cannot supersede that right.

I was disappointed to see that none of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted earlier this week to bring this bill to the floor. I urge them to stand with us today or else, when they go home this weekend, to tell the men and women of their districts that their health care decisions are now going to be made for them by their bosses, regardless of their own choices, regardless of their own religious beliefs or the doctor's recommendations; and tell them that you believe that their boss' religious beliefs must be imposed on them, notwithstanding their own religious beliefs, which don't count; and tell them you did nothing to stop this.

This country will not stand for that. We have fought for too long to preserve the right of all Americans to make their own health care choices and, I must add, to make their own religious decisions to refuse to act now.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, allow this bill to come to the floor, and send a strong message that health care choices are not your boss' business and that your religious beliefs trump your boss' religious beliefs.

Your boss has a right to his beliefs. You have a right to your beliefs. Government must not allow him to impose his beliefs on you.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am a proud cosponsor of the measure that was just spoken to, and I am very pleased that my colleague came here to speak on it.

Rather than read the entirety of the Statement of Administration Policy at this time, I will submit that statement for the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4719—AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Reed, R-New York, and 9 cosponsors, July 17, 2014)

The Administration supports measures that enhance non-profits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's Budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

However, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 4719, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations and add another two similar provisions without offsetting the cost. If this same, unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add $500 billion or more to deficits over the next ten years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013. Just two months ago, House Republicans themselves passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures.

As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue and create tax breaks that primarily benefit higher-income individuals, while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and non-defense priorities such as research and development in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. House Republicans also are making clear their priorities by rushing to make these 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 Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's social sector. However, H.R. 4719 represents the wrong approach.

If the President were presented with H.R. 4719, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Now, there is something else we need to discuss about this rule. Once again, we are debating a closed rule.

When I came to Congress, I was listening on the radio. I didn't know very much about rules. And a part of why Democrats in the majority lost, in my opinion, was the harangue that was going on on the radio about closed rules.

Well, I came here, and I wound up on the Rules Committee, and now I know a little bit about closed rules. I also know that we have set an all-time record in the history of the United States Congress, for now, in this particular rule that is before the House of Representatives, the 65th time this session, we are going to have a closed rule. What that means, America, is that your Representative on either side will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment to this measure with reference to tax extenders. This is the most closed rules that this Congress has considered ever, and I expect we are not finished yet and that the number of closed rules will continue to grow.

We started the 113th session with a pledge of transparency and openness from the Speaker of the House, but that has fallen by the wayside, and it has done so in historic proportion. Enough already. The majority should do the responsible thing and bring up bills that actually matter, bills that will address the many challenges facing this country, challenges, as I have pointed out before, about our crumbling infrastructure and, most importantly, creating jobs, even as it pertains to immigration reform.

Everyone who looks at that measure that says, if we had clear immigration policy, whether it was dealing with H–1B visas, whether it was dealing with farmworkers, whatever the measure, that it would increase our revenue in this country and enhance our overall economic circumstances.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on this 65th closed rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me try to take some of these points in order that we have heard over the last 45 minutes.

The gentleman talks about tax reform. I hope that means that he is prepared to join me on H.R. 1040, a measure that would provide a flat tax to the citizens of the United States. There is no more egregious function that most of us have to deal with every year than dealing with the IRS.

Unfortunately, because of the actions of the administration, the IRS now stands in ill favor with a majority of Americans. The President, himself, promised in 2013 that he would get to the bottom of the problems in the IRS and that he would get them corrected. I believe that he should. This is the agency with which we all have to deal every year. No one likes the taxman, but it is imperative that the American people have the confidence in the agency that is tasked with collecting their taxes.

On the issue of the VA, it is in conference. We will hear from them. Is the VA going to require a higher appropriation than we gave a few weeks ago? Perhaps. But I would also like to see the new administrator, the new Secretary of the VA be able to discharge people from his employment if they have, in fact, acted in bad faith.

I must have missed the firings that have occurred at the VA amongst the Senior Executive Service. I am not even talking about political appointees. I am talking about people who are lifers within the VA who seem perfectly content to continue business as usual. You are not going to fix that problem if you just pump more taxpayer money into the system. I wouldn't disagree that more money may be necessary at the VA, but we do have to fix the problem that is endemic in the agency if we don't expect the same result to be clearly evident in 2 or 3 years' time.

Let me just talk briefly about the issue that came up about the Supreme Court decision. Unlike Mr. NADLER, I was not here in 1993 and 1994. I was not part of the Congress that passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, but many of the same people who wrote and voted for and defended the Affordable Care Act, the cast of characters is remarkably similar. In fact, the gentleman from New York, Senator SCHUMER, when he was a Member of the House, was, I believe, the lead sponsor of that, and he is now in the Senate. The majority leader in the Senate was a ''yes'' vote on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

So this is a law that was written by Democratic sponsors in a Democratic-controlled House, signed by a Democratic President. How could they not know? How could they not know of its existence when they were writing the Affordable Care Act?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Let me continue with this thought, and if there is time, I will consider yielding to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Now, while they were crafting the Affordable Care Act, they were fully cognizant of the same restrictions they had written into law in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The Supreme Court simply looked at the facts and said that a Federal agency—in this case, the Department of Health and Human Services—in a rulemaking activity cannot negate a law that was passed by the people's representatives in the Congress. I think that is as it should be.

If there was anything, there were drafting errors in the Affordable Care Act. I have spoken about that time and again. But why weren't the same people who were tasked with writing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, why weren't they watchful while they were writing their own health care law?

Now, let's talk for just a minute about the Hobby Lobby decision. The first thing—and it is important to stress this—no FDA-approved contraceptive that was available to women before the decision is unavailable after the decision. The Court simply said that the government cannot force a citizen to violate his or her religious beliefs paying for medicine that a citizen believes takes a life. No employer before or after Hobby Lobby can prevent a woman from purchasing any contraceptive that is currently available.

We also heard criticism from the minority that the House was doing other things than doing its work. I would just point out that the House is doing its work. Forty jobs bills have passed this House and are sitting, waiting for activity over in the Senate. And we saw how quickly the SKILLS Act, after the Senate renamed it and it came back to the House, how quickly it got to the President's desk. So the fact that the bills are over there waiting is a problem of the other body. It is not a problem of the House. The House has been doing its work.

Yesterday we passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill. Mr. Speaker, I would ask rhetorically: When was the last time that the House passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill? It was 2007, the first year that the Democrats had taken over the majority. We haven't seen an appropriations bill for Financial Services in—what?—5 years' time. This was a landmark achievement yesterday.

Let's look for just a moment at the number of amendments that have been heard under open rules. On appropriations bills this year, we are through seven appropriations bills as we sit here in the middle of July. That is a significant achievement in and of itself. There have been 395 amendments heard to appropriations bills. That hardly sounds like a closed process. There have been 210 Republican amendments, 185 Democratic amendments, and that was exclusive of yesterday's passed appropriations bill.

So I don't think you can rationally make the argument that the House is not doing its work and that, as we go through the appropriations process, it is not open.

□ 1000

I have some other things that I want to say about the deficit, but I will be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding for just a moment because this is a colleague from Texas, and there are many issues that we have agreed on with respect to Texas.

I might say to you that I am a strong proponent of religious liberty. You had mentioned Hobby Lobby in terms of some of the issues you were discussing. I think I have stood fast on that question. I only raise the point, and you made the point that anything that was approved pre-Hobby Lobby by the FDA, but in actuality we know that, just from the religious liberty point of view, this is a slippery slope because it pits the large entity against the individual rights, and we know under our Constitution that the very premise of religious freedom is the idea that there is no pronounced, structured religious plan in place that denies me my freedom. And that is what you have done to women as it relates—when I say ''you,'' excuse me—that is what the decision has done. It has made the boss in charge of an individual.

I would just make the argument we can stand for religious liberty, but we must stand for it not only for corporations but for individuals such as women who use contraception for health care, Doctor. And you know that that happens. You are certainly very much an experienced medical professional. I would just make the argument that I can't imagine in the course of your medical history that you have not seen women who need contraception for health care.

The other point that I would just finish on is that, as I indicated on the question of a slippery slope, how else can a corporation suggest that I am, because of my needs, infringing upon their religious liberty? I am obviously going to be disadvantaged because, in essence, I am a minority of one. I am an employee. I am scared for my job. But I need to be able to express my religious freedom, and it may infringe upon someone else's. Let us be careful about this. And I frankly hope——

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I need to reclaim my time. Mr. Speaker, slippery slopes work both ways, and those people who are worried about laws that would require the ending of life are worried about that slippery slope as well.

I would just reiterate the point: no contraceptive that was previously available is now unavailable because of the Hobby Lobby decision. If there are problems in the way the law was written, I would remind people it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic

President who signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President that signed the Affordable Care Act. They perhaps should have taken better care in writing their law.

We had the hearing yesterday in the Rules Committee about the President taking care that the laws are faithfully executed. Perhaps we ought to have a faithful writing of the laws, as well.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of the America Gives More Act of 2014, making permanent the tax deductions for charitable contributions to food banks and conservation easements, and allowing for tax-free IRA deductions. It is a sound public policy, and I am certainly grateful to my colleague from New York (Mr. REED) for writing this legislation, which will have a positive impact on the countless charities in this country which provide such critical services to our neighbors in need.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 670 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5051) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5051.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 670, if ordered, and adopting the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
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)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
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
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

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

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
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
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Labrador
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1031

Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KINZINGER, FORBES, PETERSON, ADERHOLT, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 428 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 183, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
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)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
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
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Conyers
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Hanabusa
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott, David
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield

□ 1039

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 213, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—201

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
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
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Conyers
DesJarlais
Foster
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield

□ 1046

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3212. An act to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON H. RES. 645, REQUESTING PRESIDENT TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011; AND REPORT ON H. RES. 647, DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011

Mr. CAMP, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged adverse report (Rept. No. 113–524) requesting that the President of the United States transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the executive office of the President that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; and a privileged adverse report (Rept. No. 113–525) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, which were referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 670, I call up the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 670, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–51 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4719

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''America Gives More Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOOD INVENTORY.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (iv).

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking clause (ii), by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clauses:

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of such contributions for any taxable year which may be taken into account under this section shall not exceed—

''(I) in the case of any taxpayer other than a C corporation, 15 percent of the taxpayer's aggregate net income for such taxable year from all trades or businesses from which such contributions were made for such year, computed without regard to this section, and

''(II) in the case of a C corporation, 15 percent of taxable income (as defined in subsection (b)(2)(D)).

''(iii) RULES RELATED TO LIMITATION.—

''(I) CARRYOVER.—If such aggregate amount exceeds the limitation imposed under clause (ii), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)) as a charitable contribution described in clause (i) in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

''(II) COORDINATION WITH OVERALL CORPORATE LIMITATION.—In the case of any charitable contribution allowable under clause (ii)(II), subsection (b)(2)(A) shall not apply to such contribution, but the limitation imposed by such subsection shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of such contributions. For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), such contributions shall be treated as allowable under subsection (b)(2)(A).''.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—If a taxpayer—

''(I) does not account for inventories under section 471, and

''(II) is not required to capitalize indirect costs under section 263A,

the taxpayer may elect, solely for purposes of subparagraph (B), to treat the basis of any apparently wholesome food as being equal to 25 percent of the fair market value of such food.''.

(d) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vi) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—In the case of any such contribution of apparently wholesome food which cannot or will not be sold solely by reason of internal standards of the taxpayer, lack of market, or similar circumstances, or by reason of being produced by the taxpayer exclusively for the purposes of transferring the food to an organization described in subparagraph (A), the fair market value of such contribution shall be determined—

''(I) without regard to such internal standards, such lack of market, such circumstances, or such exclusive purpose, and

''(II) by taking into account the price at which the same or substantially the same food items (as to both type and quality) are sold by the taxpayer at the time of the contribution (or, if not so sold at such time, in the recent past).''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 2013, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) LIMITATION; APPLICABILITY TO C CORPORATIONS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENTS ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 408(d)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (F).

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

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Subparagraph (E) of section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (vi).

(2) CORPORATIONS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking clause (iii).

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES BY NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any qualified conservation contribution (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) which—

''(I) is made by a Native Corporation, and

''(II) is a contribution of property which was land conveyed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act,

shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer's taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(2)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 15 succeeding years in order of time.

''(iii) NATIVE CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'Native Corporation' has the meaning given such term by section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 170(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''subparagraph (B) applies'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B) or (C) applies''.

(3) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this subsection (or any amendment made by this subsection) shall be construed to modify the existing property rights validly conveyed to Native Corporations (within the meaning of section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act) under such Act.

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

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) TREATMENT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY INDIVIDUALS BEFORE DUE DATE OF RETURN.—If any charitable contribution is made by an individual after the close of a taxable year but not later than the due date (determined without regard to extensions) for the return of tax for such taxable year, then the taxpayer may elect to treat such charitable contribution as made in such taxable year. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual's distributive share of a partnership's charitable contribution, and an individual's pro rata share of an S corporation's charitable contribution, shall not be treated as charitable contributions made by such individual.''.

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

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF THE TAX RATE FOR THE EXCISE TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2 percent'' and inserting ''1 percent''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. 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. 4719.

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

There was no objection.

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

The American people are the most charitable people in the world, donating money, food, and clothing in times of need. Their donations ensure that charities and foundations can help individuals and communities across the country.

There are numerous provisions in the Tax Code that encourage giving, and the bill we have before us today, H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act, ensures that some of these provisions are made permanent so individuals, businesses, and farmers can donate and give back more. The first provision will make permanent and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory by businesses, regardless of how they are organized.

Food banks are a vital part of communities, helping Americans put food on the table and provide for their families when they have come across hard times or suffered through a natural disaster.

The Food Donation Connection has estimated that since this tax deduction was expanded in 2006, donations have increased 127 percent. Unfortunately, a provision in current law that encouraged passthrough businesses to contribute food inventory expired at the end of last year, and charities and foundations across the country are urging that it be restored and made permanent.

According to Feeding America, 3.6 billion pounds of food is distributed by food bank members each year. This legislation would significantly increase food bank access to the 70 billion pounds of nutritious food wasted each year.

Today, we have the opportunity to continue this important credit, allowing all businesses, farmers, and ranchers to take advantage and donate more nutritious food to the millions of Americans who need it most.

This bill also ensures that seniors who donate to charities from their Individual Retirement Accounts can do so without a tax penalty. According to the Independent Sector, this provision has ''prompted more than $140 million in gifts to the work of nonprofits since enactment, assisting social service providers, religious organizations, cultural institutions and schools, and other nonprofits.'' Making this provision permanent can only serve to increase the generous donations that charities rely on.

In addition, the bill will make permanent the deduction for contributions of conservation easements. This provision will also increase the amount of land or property donated for charitable use. Witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee have testified that in the first 2 years of the enactment of conservation easements, the number of donations doubled compared to the previous 2 years, resulting in a 32 percent increase of acreage conserved.

This is one area, especially, where long-term planning is essential. To allow this to expire makes it much more difficult for the often multigenerational planning necessary to take place. In Michigan, I have seen the benefits of conservation easements firsthand. This is a tremendous legacy for future generations.

The tax reform draft the committee produced earlier in the year would encourage charitable giving in several important ways and, by creating a stronger economy, analysis found that it would increase charitable giving by an estimated $2.2 billion each year.

Two important charitable provisions from the draft—lowering the excise tax on private foundations and extending the tax deadline for charitable contributions from December 31 to April 15—are included in the America Gives More Act.

At the end of the year, many taxpayers have no idea what their tax liability will be, and it is only after struggling through the daunting process of preparing their tax return that they know with certainty. If taxpayers were permitted to make and deduct contributions prior to filing their tax return, I believe many Americans will be even more generous in supporting religious and charitable causes. Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee found that allowing donors to deduct gifts until April 15 would result in significantly more charitable giving.

Another provision from the draft would lower and simplify the excise tax on private foundations, making compliance easy, especially for smaller foundations. As a result, foundations will have more of their resources available to support charities and exempt organizations across the country.

All of these provisions are bipartisan and have the support of over 850 charities and foundations across the country, who wrote to Congress stating:

> Without an incentive in place and assured, many of the gifts the charitable incentives were intended to promote will simply not take place.

I will insert in the RECORD the letter from Independent Sector, supported by 850 charities and foundations across the United States.

INDEPENDENT SECTOR,
July 15, 2014.

OPEN LETTER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Millions of individuals and families are served by the essential work of America's public charities, which is made possible in part by incentives for charitable giving in our tax code. The House may soon have an opportunity to address tax legislation that would renew and make permanent three key incentives for donations to America's public charities. We strongly urge you to approve legislation that would renew the IRA charitable rollover and the enhanced incentives for donations of food inventory and land conservation easements, each of which expired as of January 1, 2014.

Originally enacted in the Pension Protection Act of 2006 as a way to encourage increased charitable giving, these three provisions have demonstrated a significant impact on the nonprofit community. The IRA charitable rollover increases the ability of older Americans to make gifts to charities by allowing individuals age 70½ or older to donate up to $100,000 to a qualifying public charity directly from their IRAs without incurring tax on the withdrawal. The provision has prompted more than $140 million in gifts to the work of nonprofits since enactment, assisting social service providers, religious organizations, cultural institutions and schools, and other nonprofits.

The enhanced deduction for donations of food allows individuals and organizations to reduce their taxable income by providing qualifying food inventory to certain charitable organizations. According to Feeding America, 3.6 billion pounds of food is distributed by food bank members each year. This legislation would significantly increase food bank access to the 70 billion pounds of nutritious food wasted each year, particularly the 6 billion pounds of produce that does not make it to market.

The enhanced deduction for donations of land conservation easements allows land owners to get a meaningful deduction for permanently retiring development rights to their property to protect and preserve significant natural resources. A survey by the Land Trust Alliance showed that this incentive helped 1,700 land trusts increase the pace of conservation by a third—to over a million acres a year.

Unfortunately, these charitable tax provisions were allowed to expire on January 1 for the fourth time in recent years. On each of the three previous occasions, an entire package of tax extenders was reinstated retroactively at the end of the following year. While this may be an adequate solution for many provisions in the extenders package, these charitable provisions are different. Without an incentive in place and assured, many of the gifts the incentives were intended to promote will simply not take place. The time to plan and execute the gifts will have already passed by.

For all these reasons, we urge you to support legislation to permanently reinstate these critical giving incentives, namely: H.R. 4619 (to make permanent the IRA charitable rollover); HR 4719 (to permanently extend the charitable deduction for donation of food inventory); and H.R. 2807 (the Conservation Easement Incentive Act). We hope to see them combined and passed as a package as soon as possible in order to continue sustaining the vital work of charitable organizations in our communities.

Thank you for your consideration,

Independent Sector; 92nd Street Y; Achievement Centers for Children; Ackland Art Museum; Acton Conservation Trust; Adults with Developmental Disabilities; Advonance; Agricutural Stewardship Association; Agudath Israel of America; Agudath Israel of the Five Towns; Air Force Museum Foundation; Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank; Alabama Dance Council; Alachua Conservation Trust; Alexander Haas; All Saints Church; All Stars Project (ASP); Alliance for Children and Families; Alliance of Arizona Nonprofits; The ALS Association; Amador Livermore Valley Historical Society & Museum on Main; American Alliance of Museums; American Autoimmune Related Diseases Association; American Behcet's Disease Association; American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network; American Chemical Society.

American Clock & Watch Museum; American Folk Art Museum; American Friends Service Committee; American Heart Association; American Jewish Committee (AJC); American Library Association; American Lung Association; American Red Cross; Americans for the Arts; Americans for the Arts Action Fund; America's Charities; Amon Carter Museum of American Art; The Ananda Center for the Arts; Anderson County Museum; Andy Warhol Museum; AngelCare/Americans Care & Share; Angus Nazarene Food Pantry; Ann Arrundell County Historical Society, Inc.; Annette Strawder Here to Help Pantry; Antique Boat Museum; Apache Creek Deaf and Youth Ranch, Inc.; Appalachia Ohio Alliance; Argus Museum; Arkansas Nonprofit Alliance; Armstrong County Museum; Arthurdale Heritage, Inc.; Association for Healthcare Philanthropy.

Association of Art Museum Directors; Association of Direct Response Fundraising Counsel; Association of Fundraising Professionals; Atlantic Coast Conservancy; Auburn Automotive Heritage, Inc. & Auburn Cord Duesenberg Automobile Museum; Bainbridge Island Land Trust; Baltimore Heritage Area Association; Baltimore Museum of Art; Bass Museum of Art; Bay Area Food Bank; Bayer Center for Nonprofit Management at Robert Morris University; Bayou Land Conservancy; Bayshore Baptist Church Food Pantry; Bedford Historical Society; Believer's Sanctuary; Bellville Christian Food Pantry; BethanyKids; Bishop Hill Heritage Association; Black Swamp Conservancy; Blair County Historical Society; Blue Ridge Conservancy; Blue Ridge Land Conservancy; BoardSource.

Boise Art Museum; Boston Baroque; Boston Children's Museum; Bowers Museum;

Boys & Girls Clubs of Austin County, TX; Boys & Girls Clubs of Southeastern Michigan; Branford Land Trust, Inc.; Brazoria County Alcoholic Recovery Center; Briar Bush Nature Center; The Bridge Ministries; The Bridge Over Troubled Waters; Bridging for Tomorrow; BrightFocus Foundation; Buckner Children & Family Services; Burchfield Penney Art Center; The Burd Group; California Association of Food Banks; California Association of Museums; California Museum of Ancient Art; California Science Center Foundation; California State Parks; Calyx Sustainable Tourism; Capital Area Food Bank of Texas; Carbon County Museum; Care and Share, Inc.; Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy; CASA Program for the Ogeechee Circuit; Casa Rosa Food Pantry.

Catawba Lands Conservancy; Cathedral Arts Project, Inc.; Catholic Foundation of Eastern Montana; Cedar Rapids Museum of Art; Cedarhurst Center for the Arts; Celiac Disease Foundation; Center for History; Center for Nonprofit Excellence; Center for Non-Profits; Center for Success and Independence; Central Co-op; Central Pennsylvania Food Bank; Champlain Area Trails; Cheyenne Center, Inc.; Chicago Humanities Festival; Children's Discovery Museum; Christian Tabernacle; Civil War Trust; Clay Center for the Arts & Sciences of West Virginia; Clear Lake Food Pantry; ClearWater Conservancy; Cleveland Zoological Society; Clinton Symphony Orchestra; Coalition for Pulmonary Fibrosis; Colby College Museum of Art; Cole Art Center at Stephen F. Austin State University.

Collins Group, A Division of Donald A. Campbell & Company; Colorado Nonprofit Association; Colorado-Wyoming Association of Museums; Columbia College (MO); Columbia Land Trust (OR & WA); Columbia Museum of Art (SC); Columbia Pacific Heritage Museum; Columbus Museum of Art; Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley; Community Care Center, Inc.; Community Food Bank of Eastern Oklahoma; Community Food Pantry in Tool (TX); Community Food Pantry of Franklin County, Texas; Community Foodbank of New Jersey; The Community Foundation for Crawford County; Community Foundation for Muskegon County; Community Foundation for Southwest Washington; Community Foundation of Eastern Connecticut; Community Foundation of Northern Colorado; The Community Foundation of South Puget Sound; Community Foundation of the Great River Bend; Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area; Congaree Land Trust; Connecticut Electric Railway Association dba Connecticut Trolley Museum; Connecticut Farmland Trust.

Connecticut Food Bank; Connecticut Land Conservation Council; Connecticut Nonprofit Human Services Cabinet; Connemara Conservancy Foundation; Conservation Foundation of the Gulf Coast; The Conservation Fund; Conservation Tax Credit Transfer, LLC; Conservation Trust for North Carolina; The Contemporary Austin; COPD Foundation; CoreStrategies for Nonprofits, Inc.; Cornerstone Outreach Center of Amarillo, Inc.; Council for Christian Colleges & Universities; Council of Michigan Foundations; Council on Foundations; Cow Marsh Creek Consultants, LLC; Cradle of Texas Conservancy, Inc.; Crawford County Historical Society; Crested Butte Land Trust; Crisis Center of the Plains; Crocker Art Museum; Crossroads at Park Place, Inc.; Cultural Alliance of Fairfield County; Cultural Assets Consulting; Cumberland Land Trust.

Currier Museum of Art; Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; Da Vinci Science Center; Dallas Museum of Art; Dance/USA; Dare to Believe Ministries Outreach Center; Dare to Care Food Bank; Datil Educators Club; Deke Slayton Memorial Space & Bicycle Museum; Delaware Center for the Contemporary Arts; Delaware Highlands Conservancy; Denver Art Museum; Des Moines Art Center; Desert Foothills Land Trust; Dixon Gallery and Gardens; DMA Nonprofit Federation; Donors Forum; Douglas County Historical Society; The Drawing Center; Duck Hollow; DuPage County Historical Museums; Dutchess Land Conservancy; Earl Scruggs Center; East End Baptist Church; East Hillsborough Historical Society, Inc.; East Texas Food Bank; Eastern Sierra Land Trust; Ecology Project International.

EcoTrust; Edisto Island Open Land Trust; Eightmile River Wild & Scenic Coordinating Committee; Ellis County Museum, Inc.; Eno River Association; Epilepsy Foundation; Epiphany Lutheran Church; Equestrian Partners in Conservation (EPIC); Erie Art Museum; Essex County Greenbelt Association; Exploration Place; Family Abuse Shelter of Miami; Family League of Baltimore; Family Worship Center Food Pantry; Faye Gehl Conservation Foundation; Fayette CARE Clinic; Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies; Feeding America; Feeding America San Diego; Feeding America Southwest Virginia; Feeding America Tampa Bay; Feeding Indiana's Hungry; Feeding Pennsylvania; Field Museum; First Baptist Church (Atlanta, TX); First Baptist Church (Bovina, TX); First Christian Church Food Pantry.

First Christian Church Outreach (Conroe, TX); First Resource Center; Fishtown Preservation Society, Inc.; Flathead Land Trust; Florida Holocaust Museum; The Florida Orchestra; Florida Philanthropic Network; Food Bank of Central New York; Food Bank of Delaware; Food Bank of Northeast Arkansas; Food Bank of the Albemarle; Food Bank of the Rockies; Food Bank of the Southern Tier; The Food Bank of Western Massachusetts; FOOD for Lane County; Food Industry Alliance of New York State; Foodbank of Southeastern Virginia; The Foodbank, Inc.; Foodshare; Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina; Forgotten Harvest; Fort Ticonderoga; Foundation Layers; Fox Valley Family YMCA; Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center; Franklin Area Community Services.

Franklin County (KS) Historical Society; Franklin Institute; Franklin Park Conservatory and Botanical Gardens; Freshwater Future; Freshwater Land Trust; Frick Art and Historical Center; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Friends of Balcones Canyonlands National Wildlife Refuge; Friends of Lopez Island Pool; Friends of the Mitchell Gallery of Flight; Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge; Frist Center for the Visual Arts; Galveston Bay Foundation; Gates Mills Land Conservancy; Gateway Science Museum; Gathering Waters Conservancy; Geist Fall Creek Watershed Alliance; The General Society of Mayflower Descendants; Genesee Valley Conservancy, Inc.; George Eastman House; Georgia Center for Nonprofits; Georgia Charitable Care Network; Gilroy Historical Society; Girl Scouts of San Gorgonio; Girl Scouts of the USA; Girls Inc.

Glen Ellyn Historical Society; Glencairn Museum; Global Orphan Assistance Foundation; God's Pantry Food Bank; Gold Coast Railroad Museum; Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy; Golden State Bonsai Federation and Bonsai Garden at Lake Merritt; Goldstein Museum of Design; Good Neighbor Community Builders; Good Samaritan Health & Wellness Center; Goshen Land Trust; Grand Encampment Museum; Grand Haven Area Community Foundation; Grand Rapids Art Museum; Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy; Grantmakers Forum of New York; Grassroots International; The Graue Mill & Museum; Great Peninsula Conservancy; Great Plains Food Bank; Great Plains Welsh Heritage Project; The Greater Boston Food Bank; Greater Chicago Food Depository; Greater Grace Outreach; Greater Hudson Heritage Network; Greenbelt Land Trust of Mid-Missouri.

Greensboro Land Trust; Grosse Ile Nature and Land Conservancy; Grounds For Sculpture; Gulf Coast Community Foundation; Gulf Coast Symphony; Hammer Museum; Harmony House; Harry Chapin Food Bank of Southwest Florida; Harry S. Truman Little White House; The Hartt School; Harvard Art Museums; Harvest Assembly, House of Blessing; Harvest House; Harvest Texarkana Regional Food Bank; Harvesters—The Community Food Network (KS); Harvesters—The Community Food Network (MO); Hawaiian Islands Land Trust; Heart of the Lakes Center for Land Conservation Policy; Heaven's Windows; Hedley Senior Citizens; Heifer Foundation; Heifer International; Helping Hands Outreach Center of Gasconade County; Henderson Food Pantry; The Henry Ford; Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art.

Heritage Museum (OR); Heritage Museum of Orange County; Hidalgo Medical Services; High Museum of Art; High Plains Food Bank; Higher Heights Church of God Food Pantry; Highlands-Cashiers Land Trust; Hill Country Land Trust; Hillsboro Independent School District Education Foundation; Hillwood Estate, Museum & Gardens; Historic Flat Rock, Inc.; The History Center in Tompkins County; Holy Family Home and Shelter, Inc.; Holy Family St. Vincent de Paul; Holy Ghost St Vincent de Paul; HomeAid Atlanta; Honolulu Museum of Art; Hope Food Pantry; HOPE Outreach; House of Help Hempstead; The House of the Seven Gables Settlement Association; Houston Food Bank; The Humanity Institute for Children & Families (HICF); Hunger-Free Pennsylvania; Hyde Hall; IBB Local 684 Labor Participation.

Idaho Coalition of Land Trusts; The Idaho Foodbank; Iglesia Trinidad (TX); Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Illinois Collaboration on Youth; Illinois Network of Charter Schools; Illinois Valley Symphony Orchestra; Immune Deficiency Foundation; Indian Hill Music; Indiana Philanthropy Alliance; Indianapolis Museum of Art; Informal Learning Experiences; Inner Wisdom, Inc.; Interfaith Caring Ministries; International Primate Protection League; Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation; IRIS Orchestra; Iron and Steel Museum of Alabama; Irving S. Gilmore International Keyboard Festival; Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum; The Isamu Noguchi Foundation; Islamic Society of North America; Jack Hadley Black History Museum; Jacksonville Zoo and Gardens; Jacob and Terese Hershey Foundation; Jefferson Land Trust.

Jemez Helping Hands; Jeremiah Call Christ Ministry/Jeremiah's Food Pantry; Jesus Outreach Ministries; Jewish Federations of North America; The Jewish Museum; Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art; Joseph's House; Julian Pathways; Kansas City Symphony; Kansas Land Trust; Kenton Conservancy; The Kingdom Zone Before & After Community Center; Kings Local Food Pantry; The King's Palace Food Pantry; Kohl Children's Museum of Greater Chicago; The Kreeger Museum; Kress United Methodist Church; Ku'ikahi Mediation Center; K–VA–T Food Stores/Food City (TN); K–VA–T Food Stores/Food City (VA); Ladies In Action; Lafayette Symphony; Lancaster Community Library; Lancaster Farmland Trust; The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County; Land Conservancy of Adams County; Land Trust Alliance.

The Land Trust for Tennessee; Laredo Crime Stoppers, Inc.; LeadingAge; League of American Orchestras; Leander Independent

School District Educational Excellence Foundation; Lebanon Food Pantry; Leelanau Conservancy; Lehigh Valley Abundant Life Ministries; Leigh Yawkey Woodson Art Museum; The Leighty Foundation; Life Challenge; Light of Christ Food Pantry; Literary Arts; Little Miami Food Service; Littleton Conservation Trust; LIVESTRONG Foundation; Living Faith Food Pantry; Living Water I.A.M; Livingston County Historical Society; LJC Mercy Ministries; Local Infant Formula for Emergencies, Inc. (LIFE-Houston); Lorraine Street Church of God in Christ; Los Angeles Regional Food Bank; Louisiana Food Bank Association; Louisiana Landmarks Society.

Louisville Zoological Garden; Lowe Art Museum; Lupus and Allied Diseases Association, Inc.; Lutheran Services in America; Magdalena Samaritan Center; Maiden Alley Cinema; Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust; Maine Association of Nonprofits; Maine Coast Heritage Trust; March of Dimes; Marin Agricultural Land Trust; Martin Luther King Jr. Center; Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation; Mason Food Pantry; Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition; Massillon Museum; Matthew 25 Ecumenical Food Pantry; Maxwell Museum of Anthropology; McCary's Chapel United Methodist Church; McHenry County Historical Society & Museum; Mead Art Museum; Meadowlark Methodist Food Pantry; Meals On Wheels Association of America; Memorial Baptist Food Pantry; Menil Collection; Mental Health Association of Rhode Island; Mesothelioma Applied Research Foundation.

Miami Springs Historical Museum; Michigan Historic Preservation Network; Michigan Nonprofit Association; Mid-South Food Bank; The Miller Art Museum; Milwaukee Art Museum; Mims Chapel Drydock Food Pantry; The Minneapolis Foundation; Minneapolis Institute of Arts; Minnesota Historical Society; Minnesota Land Trust; Mission Aviation Fellowship; Mission Northeast, Inc.; Mississippi Food Network; Mississippi Valley Conservancy; Missouri Association for Museums and Archives; Missouri Street Church of Christ Pantry Program; Mitchell Prehistoric Indian Village Preservation Society; Mobile Medical Museum; Mojave Desert Land Trust; Molly Brown House Museum; Mon General Foundation; Monadnock Conservancy; Montana Association of Land Trusts; Montana Food Bank Network; Montclair Art Museum.

Montgomery County Emergency Assistance; Montgomery County Food Bank (TX); Montgomery County Lands Trust (PA); Montgomery County Youth Services (TX); Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts; Morton County Historical Society Museum; Mountain-Plains Museums Association; Mt. Canaan Missionary Baptist; Mt. Manna; Murphysboro Food Pantry, Inc.; Muscarelle Museum of Art; Museo de Arte de Ponce; Museum Association of New York; Museum at FIT (Fashion Institute of Technology); Museum of Arts and Design; Museum of Contemporary Art; Museum of Contemporary Art Denver; Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego; Museum of Cultural and Natural History; Museum of Danish America; Museum of Fine Arts Boston; The Museum of Fine Arts Houston; Museum of Fine Arts, St. Petersburg, FL; The Museum of Flight; Museum of Glass; Museum of Latin American Art; Museum of Science, Boston.

Museum of Zavkhan Province; My Brother's Keeper Outreach Center; Mystic Art Association, dba Mystic Arts Center; N.C. Center for Nonprofits; Nacogdoches HOPE; Nantucket Historical Association; Naperville Heritage Society; Naples Historical Society; National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Omaha; National Association for Interpretation; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Clock and Watch Collectors; National Atomic Testing Museum; National Audubon Society; National Bottle Museum; National Civil Rights Museum; National Council of Nonprofits; National Czech & Slovak Museum & Library; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; National Museum of American Jewish History; National Museum of Wildlife Art; National Parks Conservation Association; National Soaring Museum; National Veterans Art Museum; National Watch and Clock Museum.

National Wildlife Federation; National Woodland Owners Association; National Youth Leadership Council; Native American Rights Fund; Natural Land Institute; Natural Lands Trust; Natural Resources Defense Council; The Nature Conservancy; Nebraska Land Trust; Needy Basket of Southern Miami County, Inc.; Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art; Nevada Land Trust; New Canaan Historical Society; New Covenant Christian Fellowship; New England Museum Association; New Hampshire Boat Museum; New Hampshire Charitable Foundation; New Hope Seventh Day Adventist Church; New Jersey Conservation Foundation; New Museum; New Path, Inc. aka New Path Outreach; New River Conservancy; New River Land Trust; New York Botanical Garden; New York Live Arts; NGO Foundation; Nisqually Land Trust; Nonprofit Association of Oregon.

Nonprofit Coordinating Committee of New York; Nonprofit Institute at College of Southern Maryland; Norman Rockwell Museum; North Carolina Museum of Art; North Carolina Symphony; North Creek Baptist Church; North Creek Baptist Church Food Pantry; North Group Consultants; North Olympic Land Trust; North Salem Open Land Foundation; North Shore Land Alliance; Northeast Iowa Food Bank; Northwest Montana Historical Society; Northwest Railway Museum; Norwich University; NPO Accounting Solutions; Nunda Historical Society; NY Textile Conservation, LLC; Oblong Land Conservancy; Ohio League of Conservation Voters; Okanogan County Community Action Council; Okanogan Land Trust; Oklahoma City Museum of Art; Old Pine Farm Natural Lands Trust; Old Stone Fort Museum.

One Powerful Movement Community Development Center; Onondaga Historical Association; Open Door Pantry; OPERA America; Orlando Museum of Art; Orlando Science Center; Ouabache Land Conservancy; The Our House Tavern; Ozark Regional Land Trust; Pacific Battleship Center; Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History; Pacific Science Center; Paducah Area Food Pantry; Paducah Symphony Orchestra; Pajarito Environmental Education Center; Palm Springs Art Museum; Parkdale Valley Land Trust; Parks & Trails New York; Passages Alternative Living Programs, Inc.; Pathways Food Pantry; Patsy's Place Transitional Home; Peabody Essex Museum; Pelican Coast Conservancy; Pennsbury Land Trust; Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts; People Attempting To Help ''PATH''; People Helping People.

Peoria Riverfront Museum; Peralta Memorial United Methodist Church; Petersen Automotive Museum Foundation; Philabundance; The Phillips Collection; Phoenix Art Museum; PhotoArts Imaging Professionals, LLC; Pines and Prairies Land Trust; Pinnacle Community Church; The Pittsburgh Foundation; Places of New Beginnings; Plant City Photo Archives & History Center; Point Blue Conservation Science; Portland Art Museum (OR); Portland Museum of Art (ME); Pound Ridge Land Conservancy, Inc.; Prairie Public Broadcasting; Primary Care Development Corporation (PCDC); Project Restoration Outreach; Project Sister Family Services; Prospect House Museum; Puerto Seguro, Inc. (PSI) Safe Harbor; Pulitzer Arts Foundation; Ralphs Grocery Company; Redwood Empire Food Bank.

Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland, African American History and Culture; Regional Food Bank of Northeastern New York; Renaissance Charitable Foundation, Inc.; Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center; Rensselaer County Historical Society; Rescue Rehome Resource; Restoration Care Ministry; Restore & Enlightenment Ministries; Riverside Baptist Church Crisis Closet; Rochester Area Community Foundation; Roger Williams Park Zoo; Rooted In; Roxbury Land Trust; Sacramento Mountains Senior Services, Inc.; Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust; The Salvation Army; San Angelo Museum of Fine Arts; San Antonio Food Bank; San Antonio Museum of Art; San Diego Natural History Museum; San Diego Youth Symphony and Conservatory; San Diego Zoo Global; San Francisco Heritage/Haas Lilienthal House; San Isabel Land Protection Trust; San Jacinto County Historical Commission; San Jose Museum of Art; San Jose Museum of Quilts & Textiles.

Santa Fe Texas Education Foundation; Save The Prairie Society; Scenic Hudson; Schingoethe Museum, Aurora University; Science Factory Children's Museum & Exploration Dome; Scleroderma Foundation; Sealy Christian Pantry; Seattle Art Museum; Second Harvest Food Bank Mahoning Valley; Second Harvest Food Bank of Central Florida; Second Harvest Food Bank of East Central Indiana; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northeast Tennessee; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northeast Tennessee; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northwest North Carolina; Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties; Second Harvest North Central Food Bank; Sedoan Historical Society; Senior Connections; Sequoia Riverlands Trust; Seventh-Day Adventist Church (Tulia, TX); Shared Harvest Foodbank; Sharlot Hall Museum; Shepherd Senior Citizens, Inc.; Sheridan Community Land Trust.

Shiloh Museum of Ozark History; Sierra Foothill Conservancy; Silver City Gospel Mission; Six Rivers Land Conservancy; Skagit Land Trust; Society for Experimental Graphic Design (SEGD); Society for Preservation of Long Island Antiquities; Society of St. Stephen Outreach Ministry (SOSS); Society of St. Vincent de Paul in Houston, TX; Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum; South Carolina Conservation Exchange; South Texas Food Bank; South Union Church of Christ Food Pantry; Southbury Land Trust; Southeast Area Ministries; Southeast Missouri Food Bank; Southeast Texas Arts Council; Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy; Southside Church of Christ Food Pantry; Spearman Ministerial Alliance; Spinal Cord Injury Network International; Springfield Museum of Art; Squam Lake Natural Science Center; St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary; St. Andrews United Methodist Church Food Pantry; St. Anne de Beaupre Food Pantry; St. Anthony's Bread Food Pantry; St. Augustine Lighthouse and Museum.

St. James Episcopal Church Food Pantry; St. John of the Cross Food Pantry; St. Joseph Museums, Inc.; St. Leo the Great St. Vincent de Paul; St. Louis Area Foodbank; St. Louis Art Museum; St. Mary's Food Bank Affiance; St. Mary's United Methodist Church (TX); St. Monica Food Pantry; St. Monica Knights of Peter Claver, Ladies Auxiliary, Court #151; St. Monica's Altar Society; St. Paul's Lutheran Food Pantry; St. Stephen Presbyterian Food Pantry; St. Stephen's of St. Andrews United Methodist Church (TX); St. Vincent de Paul in Los Lunas, NM; St. Vincent de Paul in Artesia,

NM; St. Vincent de Paul Society (St. Philip Neri Catholic Church); Stax Museum of American Soul Music; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute; Stockton Symphony Association; Sts. Joachim and Ann Care Service.

Stuart Pimsler Dance & Theater; Studebaker National Museum; Sullivan Museum and History Center; Summit Land Conservancy; Tacoma Art Museum; Tall Timbers Research Station & Land Conservancy; Tampa Museum of Art; Telfair Museums; Temenos CDC/Bread of Life, Inc.; Temple University Anthropology Laboratory; Tennessee Parks and Greenways Foundation; Texas Land Conservancy; Texas Land Trust Council; Texas Quilt Museum; THE PROGRAM for Offenders, Inc.; Theatre Communications Group; Three Angels Seventh Day Adventist Church; Three Village Community Trust; The Time IN Children's Arts Initiative; Timken Museum of Art; Toledo Museum of Art; Toledo Northwestern Ohio Food Bank; Towne Learning Center; Travis Audubon; Tread of Pioneers Museum; The Treehouse Center, Inc.; Tri County Assembly Choice Food Pantry; Triangle Land Conservancy; Tri-county Meals.

Trinity Garden First Food Pantry; The Trust for Public Land; U.S. Military Combat Camera History & Stories Museum; U.S. Pain Foundation, Inc.; UJA-Federation of New York, Inc.; The Ukrainian Museum; Ukrainian National Women's League of America; Union Symphony Society, Inc.; United Assembly (Plainview, TX); United Food Bank; United Way Fox Cities; United Way of Buffalo and Erie County; United Way of Greater Cincinnati; United Way of Portage County; United Way Worldwide; University Christian Church; University of Michigan—Dearborn; University of Michigan Law School; Upper Savannah Land Trust; Upscale CDC; Upshur County Shares Food Pantry; Urban Gateways; Utah Food Bank.

Utah Museum of Fine Arts; Uvalde Baptist Church Food Pantry; Venice Community Housing Corporation; The Vermont River Conservancy; Vermont Symphony Orchestra; Vero Beach Museum of Art; Vesterheim Museum; Vietnamese American Community Center; Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; The Viscardi Center; Vision Weavers Consulting, LLC; VisionServe Alliance; Voices of Victory; Walker Art Center; Wallowa Land Trust; Wartburg Community Symphony; Washington Association of Land Trusts; Washington Nonprofits; Washington State Historical Society; Washington Street Family Service Center; Way Food Pantry; Wee Care Child Center, Inc.; Wellsprings Village, Inc.; West Central Ohio Land Conservancy; West Side Baptist Early Education Center; West Wisconsin Land Trust; Western New York Land Conservancy; Western Reserve Land Conservancy; Western Rhode Island Civic Historical Society; Westmoreland County Agricultural Land Preservation.

Westmoreland Museum of American Art; Westport Arts Center; Whidbey Camano Land Trust; White Deer-Skellytown Lighthouse Food Pantry; Whitney Museum of American Art; Wilbarger Creek Conservation Alliance; The Wilderness Society; Wildling Museum; Wildwood United Methodist Church; Williams Temple Church of God In Christ; Wilmette Historical Museum; Wings for L.I.F.E. (Life skills Imparted to Families through Education); Winston-Salem Symphony; Wisconsin Youth Symphony Orchestras; Wood County Senior Citizens Association; Woods and Waters Land Trust; Wyoming Symphony Orchestra; Yellowstone Art Museum; YMCA of the USA; York County Heritage Trust; Zimmerli Art Museum.

Mr. CAMP. The goodwill of the American people is unmatched, and we should do everything we can to encourage Americans to do more, enabling charities, nonprofits, foundations, and schools across the country to expand their reach and serve those most in need.

A ''yes'' vote on this bill is a vote for hardworking Americans who selflessly lend a hand every day to their neighbors, communities, and others in need.

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

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

I want to be clear what this debate is about and what it is not about. It is not a debate about the merits of public charities and private foundations.

All of us support the good works of the charitable community and strive to provide charities and foundations with the resources they need to carry out their mission. Indeed, along with Congressman GERLACH, I am the lead sponsor of the food donation deduction.

I think that highlights that this is a debate not about charities, not about foundations. It is about fiscal responsibility and fiscal priorities.

Today, Republicans have selected to make permanent 10 of the approximately 60 expired tax provisions without a single dime of offset—not a single dime. After today, if this bill passes, the House will have approved $534 billion worth of tax provisions without a single offset, wiping out more than half of the total deficit reduction enacted last year during the bipartisan fiscal deal.

Indeed, this bill is totally inconsistent with the Republican tax reform draft they unveiled in February. And, I might add, if you add up the 14 bills that came out of the Ways and Means Committee, entirely unoffset, it is $825 billion.

I was reading, this morning, the debate which I heard yesterday on a motion to recommit. I was reading this language from Mr. CRENSHAW in opposition to the motion to recommit.

□ 1100

This is what he said about how Republicans proceed with budget issues:

> We do it just like every American business does, like every American family. They sit down. They take the money that they have, and they set priorities. Then they make some tough choices. That is what we have done.

There is not a single tough choice in what the Republicans are doing. It is, essentially, throwing discretion and tough choices to the wind.

Also let me say that their approach is inconsistent with their own tax reform draft of some months ago. The enhanced deduction for food contributions that the chairman has spoken so eloquently about was expressly repealed in the Republican reform draft, and the rollover provision was allowed to expire. So you have irresponsibility, you have inconsistency, and you also have a violation of priorities, because left to an uncertain fate are important provisions, like the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, the New Markets Tax Credit, and the renewable energy credits, as well as the long-term status of expansions to the EITC and the Child Tax Credit.

This is the Statement of Administration Policy just issued:

> The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges.
>
> The President's budget includes a number of these proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals. However, the administration strongly opposes the House passage of H.R. 4719, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations and add another two similar provisions without offsetting the cost. If this same unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add $500 billion or more to deficits over the next 10 years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013.
>
> Just 2 months ago, House Republicans, themselves, passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures. As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue and create tax breaks that primarily benefit higher income individuals while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and non-defense priorities such as research and development in the bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.
>
> House Republicans are also making clear their priorities by rushing to make these 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 EITC, to the Child Tax Credit, and to education tax credits expire.
>
> The administration wants to work with Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's social sector. However, H.R. 4719 represents the wrong approach. If the President were presented with H.R. 4719, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

So what in the world are we doing here today? What in the world are we doing? We are passing another bill that deepens the deficit, that is contrary to the rhetoric of the Republicans and is going nowhere in the Senate—zero. It is hard to figure this out, Mr. Speaker. What is motivating Republicans to be so totally inconsistent and irresponsible?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

I want to start my comments today by focusing on the merits of this proposal and then by offering some comments in response to my good friend from Michigan in regards to the budgetary concerns that he articulated in his opening remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a commonsense bill that is the right thing to do for America. It is the right policy because what we are doing with the America Gives More Act of 2014 is putting in our tax policy provisions on a permanent basis that are going to provide for enhanced charitable giving in America. That is the right thing to do. We care about Americans, especially fellow American citizens. In times when they need it the most, we are going to stand with them. Our tax policy under this provision would be made permanent to encourage fellow Americans to help Americans. To me, it makes sense. It is a fundamental question of fairness, and it is a fundamental question of: Do we care about our fellow citizens in their time of need?

I have one piece of legislation in this underlying bill in particular that I wanted to articulate, and I want to thank my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee who are going to speak after me in regards to their individual pieces of legislation that make up this America Gives More Act of 2014. That provision that I am going to talk about is the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act.

Essentially, all we are doing under the Tax Code is recognizing that we are going to treat all businesses, all people the same across America when it comes to their excess food inventories—be it in their restaurants, expanded to farms—so that our farmers can be in a position to give that food that otherwise would go into a landfill to the people who need it most: fellow hungry Americans.

To me, that makes sense, and that is where we have supported this legislation. It has come out of the committee, and it has gotten bipartisan support. Groups across the country took out an ad in our local paper here today, and they support this effort to not have food go to a landfill but to go onto the tables, onto the plates of fellow Americans who need it most. That is why this legislation is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague talk about the concern about the deficit. I share that concern, but the question that has to be answered is: Why have these extenders historically been renewed on a temporary basis without an offset? It is because it is the policy of the Tax Code that we are trying to make permanent here. Prior Members of Congress—and the President, himself, when he was in the Senate—supported the extension of these extenders without an offset because it was good policy. It is the right thing to do, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. REED, do I care? It is my bill, with Mr. GERLACH, that you have taken and put your name on—my bill. To make it permanent without any offset, with over $500 billion already done, is the wrong way to do the right thing. I care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, the tax provisions that are being considered today include the much-needed Conservation Easement Incentive Act, a bill I introduced with my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH). As a matter of fact, I have worked on this issue ever since I have been here. The last time that we introduced the bill, it was Mr. CAMP and I who carried the bill.

It is important, and since its first passage in '06, farmers, ranchers, hunters, and conservation groups alike have waited a long time for the security provided in this measure. It needs to be extended, and it needs to be made permanent. Conservation easements help protect valuable natural resources and scenic open spaces by allowing private landowners to permanently retire the development rights on their land. This bill keeps farmers and ranchers on the farms and on the ranches.

This provision is more than just about landowners, however. More than 70 percent of our wildlife gets food and shelter from our privately owned working farms, ranches, and forest lands, but we are losing these habitats to development at an alarming rate of about 5,000 acres per day. As an outdoors person—a hunter, a fisher—I am well aware of the importance of having places to hunt and fish and of the importance of that to our communities. I also know that many outdoor recreational activities depend on maintaining viable fish and wildlife habitats.

It is also important for clean habitats. Our urban areas benefit from this—watersheds, for instance, right outside of New York. If it weren't for this type of measure, we wouldn't have clean watersheds. New York City and the surrounding areas wouldn't have water. This incentive helps maintain healthy wildlife populations, hunter access, and healthy communities. It is not just land trust and government agencies that depend upon this. All types of charitable groups—Ducks Unlimited, Mule Deer Foundation, Pheasants Forever—depend on this type of legislation.

As much as I support this measure—as I said, it is my bill—as much as it is important to the country, the fact remains that it is not paid for. This is an incredibly popular bill. There has never been a time that we have introduced it when it hasn't had over 200 coauthors. As we know, during these divisive political times, it is hard to get 200 of us on this floor to agree on what time it is. This bill has over 225 coauthors this year, but, again, it is not paid for. The fact of the matter is that this, in combination with the other fiscally irresponsible measures that the committee has marked up, realizes an $825 billion shortage. It is not paid for.

I support the measure, but I don't support it in the fashion that it has been drafted. We need to pay for it, and we need to pass it. We need to do it right.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the chairman for his recognition and for his strong leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this legislation and specifically to highlight section 4 of the bill, which would make permanent the hugely successful conservation easement tax incentive.

When the time comes for families across our great country to decide the future of land that has been farmed for generations or is blessed with abundant natural resources, the choices should not be limited to simply selling that land or struggling to pay bigger tax bills to hold onto what are likely their most valuable family assets. The extremely difficult decisions families make about their farms and their property ultimately affect not only their lives but also the quality of life for their neighbors and the character of their communities. Conservation easements provide property owners with another choice when looking for an alternative to selling their land.

Before expiring at the end of 2013, modest-income property owners, family farmers, and other landowners utilized this Tax Code incentive to voluntarily protect millions of acres of land across the country. I have been fortunate to meet many of the families in my district who have been able to preserve their property thanks to the conservation easement deduction.

They are folks like Don Hawthorne, who in 2006 donated a conservation easement on 28 acres of his land to the Montgomery County Lands Trust in order to preserve an active Christmas tree farm, a fruit orchard, and a blueberry patch prized by the local community.

□ 1115

He expressed his support for making permanent the Federal Conservation Easement Tax Incentive this way:

> Knowing that farming will likely continue on this land long after I am gone gives me peace of mind. It really would be wonderful if the Federal tax incentive would be made permanent so other farmers who choose to preserve their land can benefit.

The Great Marsh area of Chester County has been part of Jim Moore's

family for many generations. It is the most biologically diverse wetland in southeastern Pennsylvania and home to 155 species of birds, 200 species of flowering plants, and perhaps, most significantly, the headwaters for Marsh Creek, which is the primary source of drinking water for Wilmington, Delaware.

Mr. Moore explained why conservation easements are important:

> Open space is really about the next generation. We preserved this land because we love it and want to share it . . . and the tax benefits from easement donations make it more feasible to do that.

This legislation before us includes language identical to a bill that I have been working on with my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON of California, to pass for a few sessions now.

Last session, our bill had over 300 cosponsors, and now has over 200 cosponsors here in the House this session, and for anybody to see that kind of consensus here in Washington, D.C., is noteworthy indeed.

I believe the conservation easement incentive enjoys broad bipartisan support in Washington because it works in our communities. Therefore, that is why I am urging our colleagues to support this important legislation today to provide property owners with the freedom, the opportunity, and the certainty they deserve when making critical choices about the future of their land.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to approving this permanent Republican tax break for Twinkies. That is exactly what this bill does. I think we should encourage charity, but also fiscal responsibility and accountability. This bill fails on both the latter two points.

A while back, there was a Texas official who often derided the war on poverty and Social Services in general by declaring: America is the only country in the world where most of the poor people are fat.

Well, in more recent years, we have come to understand that the challenges of obesity and poverty are different faces of the same problem, that diabetes and hunger sometimes go hand in hand. Disadvantaged neighbors, who too often lack enough to eat, too often make up for it with high, sugary, fatty foods that provide temporary relief from hunger, while making them more prone to disease.

According to the American Heart Association, 1 in 3 American children are obese or overweight. That is nearly triple the rate of 50 years ago, and 1 in 3 children will contract what was once called adult-onset type 2 diabetes.

Now, we can address these challenges through direct government expenditures like WIC, the Women, Infant and Children nutrition program, and we can address the challenges with tax expenditures like the one that is proposed here today.

I happen to believe that we need both of them, that we should be encouraging food banks and the businesses that donate to them—who do some excellent, some valuable work, we ought to encourage them to expand the work that they do. But when we tell a taxpayer that they don't have to pay the same taxes as their competitor if they donate for a good cause, we ought to be sure that that cause is good.

Just as we scrutinize the WIC program and other food security programs to ensure no misuse, no ineligibility—we want to see that every one of those dollars spent is spent efficiently—we need to do some of the same with reference to tax expenditures like that is proposed for permanent extension here.

We need accountability, and you lose that when this and the other provisions are extended forever and never carefully evaluated.

Now, the expenditure that is provided here for food donations is one that the law says is available for any food that is ''apparently wholesome food.'' The only problem is that apparently wholesome food includes much food that is not actually wholesome.

For example, some potato chips that have long since had their expiration date, they qualify. A can that fell off and was run over by the forklift and is very damaged, it qualifies.

Most particularly, if you have candy at Halloween and you overstocked and you have a significant amount of candy left—or for the Easter Bunny or at Christmas—the shelves at some food pantries overflow with these products.

Why is that? Because the business that donates the Twinkies or the stale potato chips is entitled to deduct not the cost of what they cost that business, but twice the cost of what it cost that business, and this bill makes that permanent.

Why should we at a time of great fiscal concern be paying twice the cost of stale potato chips and Twinkies and sugary nonwholesome and nonnutritious foods—why should we be paying for that?

It is a tax break that goes too far, that requires more careful evaluation. Indeed, one 2011 NPR report that was entitled ''Overburdened Food Banks Can't Say No to Junk'' because some of the same retailers that they rely on and count on for wholesome food dump the Halloween candy, dump the Easter eggs there, and they are available and treated just the way that wholesome food is treated.

I say, Mr. Speaker, let's encourage donating the good stuff, but let's not pay for the junk. We have the power to correct that problem by, instead of having a flawed permanent bill, having one that is available for evaluation on a more regular basis, just as we do with reference to these other provisions.

The cost of this bill is part of the overall cost and strategy to wreck our budget and reduce hunger programs in this country.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. The same Republicans that are advancing this include a group that have characterized as welfare Pell grants, school breakfast programs, senior nursing care programs. They want to lump all that as welfare, and they say we just can't afford that.

I don't believe that we can't afford to target public resources where they are needed, whether they are tax expenditures or direct expenditures, but we don't need a permanent tax break for Twinkies and stale potato chips.

Let's take the fiscally responsible, accountable approach, not the irresponsible approach that is being advanced today, and reject this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for introducing this important piece of legislation that is being supported by the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association, the Salvation Army, United Way Worldwide. All want to see the IRA charitable rollover which is contained in this bill made permanent.

The IRA charitable contribution incentive was established as a temporary provision of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, but the past 8 years, we have extended provision with strong bipartisan support.

Why? Because Republicans and Democrats have known that our Nation's charities comprise the most effective army of mercy and often are on the front lines of meeting the needs of our friends and neighbors when disaster strikes.

The war against poverty, homelessness, illness, and illiteracy is fought by our churches, private foundations, and the public charities in communities throughout the United States and around the world.

I have been working closely with one such organization, the Global Poverty Project, with my good friend, Hugh Evans, who has implemented a vision to eradicate extreme poverty, increase economic opportunity for women and children, and bring the developing world clean water, modern sanitation, and the health care they need.

It is organizations like this and the many public charities in my district—like the Boys and Girls Club of Bloomington-Normal, Peoria's Hult Center for Healthy Living, and the Community Foundation of Central Illinois—all of which stand to benefit from making this provision permanent.

In the first 2 years Congress made the option available, more than $140 million was donated to public charities in the United States. Since that time, hundreds of millions more have been committed.

In Illinois, one single charity, the Jewish Federation of Chicago, has raised more than $11 million just from 1,000 IRA contributions since 2006.

Every dollar that is voluntarily contributed on charitable work means one less dollar that U.S. taxpayers are forced to spend to meet the same basic human needs here in our communities.

Last year, charitable giving in the United States grew by 4.9 percent, topping $316 billion. Globally, the United States gives more to charitable causes than any other countries, according to the World Giving Index of 2013.

This provision helps accomplish that, and that is why it should be made permanent. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is sort of an Alice in Wonderland experience here. We deal on an ongoing basis with provisions in the Tax Code. We have routinely extended some, as has been referenced; but what we have attempted to do historically is work together to be able to weigh, to balance—in many cases, pay for—for a duration that is not going to have the fiscal discipline evaporate.

We need to be able to manage these provisions because they actually cost the Treasury money, and some are more valuable than others. There are tradeoffs.

My friend, the chairman, worked for years producing a deficit-neutral tax reform, which had much to commend it, and I commend him for his hard work. All of these elements were addressed in his tax reform, but they were dealt with differently. Not all were extended permanently. In some cases, they were modified, some were repealed, some were made permanent—as part of a deliberative process to evaluate the impact and to not break the bank.

He did it right. I appreciate it. I am sorry that it has not been introduced, and it was dismissed by the Speaker. I think that was a mistake.

Today, we are continuing an effort to abandon any semblance that this Congress is going to work on major accomplishments before we adjourn.

This week, we passed legislation that, if it were enacted, would kick into the next Congress our transportation bill, handing off that responsibility at least to the next Congress, probably the Congress after that.

We have found that they are giving up on deficit reduction, with budget-busting proposals roaring through here with no semblance of honoring their own budget rules under their budget resolution.

They have given up on tax reform because we are not going to be able to have meaningful tax reform if we are just willy-nilly going to rush all these provisions through, an avalanche of spending.

It takes away the tools that are necessary to make the changes we all know are necessary with the Tax Code and for what my friend, the chairman, worked on so hard.

Last, but not least, they have given up on the previous tradition of bipartisan cooperation. Republicans have forced responsible Members to oppose what they passionately support. Well, luckily, this bill will not be enacted. We will be able to work with the Senate.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This bill is not going to be enacted into law, and we will be able to pick up where it left off and, frankly, where Mr. CAMP left off, as we work with our friends in the other body.

My friend and fellow Oregonian, Senator WYDEN, the Chair, has already advanced some proposals we will be able to work with. It is a little more even-handed, and that is how ultimately we are going to go, but I am sorry for what this represents in terms of this Congress giving up.

I think we can do better. I hope people will vote against this, and we will commit to move forward on the things that we are all committed to in a way that is fiscally responsible, is bipartisan and thoughtful, working with the interest groups that deserve us to work together to get the outcomes we all want for them.

□ 1130

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the legislation, H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act. This is important legislation that is actually going to increase charitable giving for the benefit of individuals in need across the country while also assisting those vital charities and foundations that serve them in all of our Nation's communities.

These are bipartisan proposals, Mr. Speaker, and the bill will make many of these provisions permanent. It will improve a variety of tax rules governing charitable donations and charitable organizations, encouraging America's taxpayers to give even more generously and enabling charities to serve those in need even more effectively.

I would also like to address a provision specifically, Mr. Speaker, that I authored that reduces and simplifies the provision, the excise tax on private foundation investment income.

Now, private foundations make a world of difference in our communities. I look at Minnesota, my home State. We have 1,400 different foundations. In 2011, about $1 billion is what they annually would donate to those in need. Nationwide, we have got 81,000 foundations that donated almost $50 billion in 2011.

These are impressive numbers, impressive figures, but as impressive as those figures and statistics are, the reality is they could easily be higher. Unfortunately, the Tax Code is actually discouraging large and increasingly larger donations given by private foundations.

Today these institutions, these foundations face a very complicated two-tiered system of taxation, and there are actually perverse incentives built into the Tax Code for a foundation not to make a donation, not to give a contribution in times when those needs might be greatest, such as after a natural disaster.

This legislation eliminates that disincentive so we can make large donations in times of need and replaces the two-tiered system with a simple, flat 1 percent excise tax on all foundation investment income.

It also simplifies the tax planning process. Especially for smaller foundations, this is important so that they can spend their valuable resources not on expensive accounts, not on expensive or high-priced lawyers but, instead, providing grants to grantees. We need to ensure that charitable decisions are based on the needs of our communities, not based on the Tax Code.

This legislation is strongly supported by the Council on Foundations.

The bottom line here, Mr. Speaker and Members, is that every dollar that these organizations are either paying in taxes or they are giving to accountants or attorneys is one less dollar going to those in need. This bill makes compliance easier and ensures that more resources are available.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for his leadership. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

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

I cannot support $825 billion in unpaid for, permanent, and piecemeal tax cuts while other critical investments that help our most vulnerable citizens, like the long-term unemployed and working poor, go unmet.

I strongly support extending the IRA charitable rollover, tax incentives for property owners who protect natural resources through conservation easements, tax incentives for charitable contributions of food inventory, and improving the private foundation excise tax to allow a better response to communities during economic troubles and natural disasters, a bill which I introduced.

However, I oppose adding almost $1 trillion to the deficit that will imperil our economic recovery and the well-being of our citizens. I oppose leaving

behind other critical tax provisions that help the working poor, strengthen economically distressed communities, promote affordable housing, help cover transportation costs, incentivize businesses to hire hard-to-employ workers, and assist teachers with classroom expenses.

Many of these bills provide examples of smart Federal investment. For example, in the first 2 years the IRA charitable rollover was available, more than $140 million was donated to support charities, with the median gift just under $4,500.

I strongly support giving food to the hungry and helping the needy. However, I cannot vote in favor of this package of bills because of their fiscal impact and the lack of fiscal responsibility to balanced policy.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, for bringing this important set of charitable bills, the America Gives More Act, H.R. 4719, to the floor for a vote.

H.R. 3134, the Charitable Giving Extension Act, is a bill I introduced that would make a small change in the Tax Code but make a huge change in the lives of every American. This legislation would extend the yearly deadline for making charitable giving deductions from December 31 to April 15 of the following year so that all Americans can have an extra 3½ months to give to charity and include those donations in that year's tax returns. No longer would Americans be forced to complete their charitable giving by New Year's Eve.

Let me tell you, this is something that goes far deeper than that, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) referenced it. According to the World Giving Index, America is the most big-hearted nation in the world—in the world. All this is is an affirmation of who we are as Americans. Believe me, my friends, this charitable virtue that we have is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. This is who we basically are as Americans.

We look at what happens. I want to you think about any time there is any kind of a crisis or tragedy in the world. Who is the first responder? America, always America. It is just who we are. It is the very fabric of this Nation and what has been given to us.

We have been so blessed by God. And then the question becomes: Well, I would like to give a little bit more, but I didn't know by the end of the year that I was going to have that little bit extra to work with.

I am talking about guys and gals who get up every morning, the alarm goes off, they throw their feet out over the bed, and they want to do it for one reason: to put a roof over their family, food on their table, clothes on their backs, and prepare for their future.

Then they say at the end of that day: I have a little bit left over. I want to be able to give that to a charitable organization.

Is there anyplace else in the world where we see that happen, and happen on a regular basis, day in and day out?

Now this is not just thumping, ''I am proud of America.'' This is a humble pride that says, I thank our Lord and God for putting us in the position where we can actually share that which we have.

''From everyone who has been given much, much will be required.'' I understand that, but please don't turn this into a political argument when it comes to good policy. You know in the depths of your hearts where the American people are. You know what they have done year after year, in good times and in bad times. And we turn this into political theater when we talk about policy that is good, not just for every single American, but for every person they help.

Now, please, on the floor that sometimes seems so divided and wants to pick sides on who is doing the best job, I came here for one reason, and that was to serve the people from Pennsylvania's Third District who sent me here—both Republicans and Democrats, some that vote and some that don't vote—and to serve the needs of the American people.

Have we gone so far from those goals that we decide to make everything political? It is not just enough to agree with every single thing that comes forward, but then we use the hypocrisy, ''But wait a minute. This is not paid for,'' and the idea to pay for it is taxing people more.

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

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would hate to be in the position where I tell every American: You know what? We know how to spend the money better than you. We will make the decisions of how it gets doled out. In your heart of hearts, when you want to give to a charitable organization, forget it. We will make that decision. Send the money to Washington, because we have done such a wonderful job with it.

No, my friends, that is not America. That is not who we are. That is not who we will ever be. That is not the fabric of this great Nation.

So I ask you to look past your political ambitions and beating each other up, and look at what is good policy for every single American. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how much time remains on each side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a member of our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Over the last few weeks, the Ways and Means Committee has been bringing bill after bill to the House floor to make permanent changes to the Tax Code, but in a lot of the policy behind it, there is very little dispute and debate. It is the fact that they are bringing these bills to the floor without any pay-fors, without any offsets, and instead they are leaving this legacy of debt for future generations to have to contend with, or they increase our borrowing costs with China at a time when most of the discussion about this place has been about fiscal responsibility. It certainly must be an election year, because any limit to fiscal responsibility is out the door.

Here again today, we have got five bills that would make five permanent changes to the Tax Code, none of which is offset. One would extend the charitable deduction for firms that donate food from their inventories.

One would permanently extend the charitable deduction for donations of qualified conservation easements, a bill I have been particularly working hard to find a permanent fix in the Tax Code, having seen the good work that our land trusts in the Mississippi Valley Conservancy back home have been doing with those tax incentives in the Code.

Another bill would extend the tax-free exclusion from income of charitable contributions from the individual retirement accounts, the so-called IRA rollover charitable contribution, something that the chairman of the committee himself actually eliminated in his comprehensive tax reform discussion draft that was introduced earlier this year.

The Joint Committee on Taxation says you add all these five bills up, it is at a cost of over $16 billion. And again, not a nickel in it. There is no offset to pay for any of this.

At a time when long-term unemployment benefits have expired in the early part of this year, the cost of this bill here today alone would cover 35 times the cost of those emergency unemployment benefits for the duration of this year—35 times.

We are doing nothing to permanently change the so-called SGR, or the doc fix. We have sequestration hanging over our heads that is about to do more damage to our military and to the Federal budget, and no work is being done on that front.

Last week, we passed legislation, scratching and clawing, trying to find a little over $10 billion in offsets for a temporary extension of the infrastructure investment we have to be making in this country to keep the highway trust fund funded, and yet here we are with another five bills that will cost us $16 billion. Apparently, some in this

place don't even blink about spending that type of money. That is where we have got a problem—philosophically, I am afraid—as far as our approach to this.

There are better ways of doing this. I think one of the ways that could help jump-start this economy is working hard, making tough decisions, and moving forward on comprehensive tax reform to make our Code more competitive globally. And now we have got an emergency situation of more companies here in the United States trying to find some small entity overseas where they are foreign shopping for a low-tax jurisdiction to avoid taxation here in the United States, and this place is doing nothing about that.

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

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

Mr. KIND. I would submit that between these five bills, the nine bills that have already come out of committee at a total cost of close to $900 billion, if we move forward down that track, there is no way, no ability for us to come back and address comprehensive tax reform in a fiscally responsible manner.

I, again, commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, for the courage he has demonstrated by offering that discussion draft, but in doing so, he had to make some tough decisions on what expenditures, what loopholes we would have to go without in order to pay for a lowering of rates.

If we give the store away today and with the previous bills that were passed and what might be coming up tomorrow, there will be no ability for us to be able to seriously work on the comprehensive tax reform that our country desperately needs in order to put us in a more competitive position in this 21st century global economy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, for his work on this important legislation.

H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, is a package of bipartisan bills to improve or make permanent several tax rules governing charitable donations. Especially, I would like to speak to a provision in the bill concerning Alaska Native Corporations.

Alaska Native Corporations generally pay Federal corporate tax at the highest marginal rate but are not able to take advantage of many of the corporate tax credits like the other corporations.

□ 1145

Under the current Tax Code, the Federal Government provides favorable tax treatment for conservation easements donated by certain corporations owned by farmers and ranchers. Considering that in Alaska, Native corporation lands have high conservation value and lack access to many other corporate tax credits, it makes sense to extend these favorable tax benefits to Alaska Native corporations.

I must make it clear this provision does not mandate the creation of conservation easement, but allows Alaska Native landholders to determine themselves which lands will be best suited. I strongly support this provision and underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting. We talk about our good chairman's proposal for tax reform. If I remember correctly, that side of the aisle criticized that tax reform badly, and did not do it when they were in the majority. They passed ObamaCare, they passed cap-and-trade, they passed the stimulus package, and they passed Dodd-Frank. They didn't address this issue of being fiscally responsible. That amazes me.

Now I hear from that side ''be fiscally responsible.'' Well, what we are trying to do here is give an extension for those who want to give instead of going through this Congress. Let's let the private individual be the one that is able to help his neighbor, not through a bureaucracy. I mean, it is amazing to me how this changes, how somebody on that side can say, well, we need reform, we need reform, and it was criticized by that side of the aisle.

I want to compliment the chair again for his hard work, and especially my provision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder where the gentleman from Alaska was. I mean PAYGO existed under Democrats. We tried to pay for things, and we did not dismiss out of hand the tax proposal.

The ones who are throwing it to the winds are Republicans. It is the Republicans. You are throwing fiscal responsibility to the winds. You are throwing any kind of prioritization to the winds. You are coming here and just saying, do anything and pay nothing.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is there now on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining. The other gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the America Gives More Act because it encourages charitable giving. This bill includes the Conservation Easement Incentive Act, which is very important to the people of Montana.

Rising property values and estate taxes make passing down working lands to future generations very, very difficult. In fact, in 2010, the Leep family, a family that has farmed in the Gallatin Valley, my home county, since 1926, faced the challenge of transferring a family farm to the next generation. Because of this incentive, the Leeps were able to donate land to the Gallatin Valley Land Trust, an organization that works on conserving working lands and other areas valued for wildlife habitat and for outdoor recreation, and kept the land in production and in the family's ownership.

The America Gives More Act makes this provision permanent and gives landowners the assurances they need to make long-term estate planning decisions. It is a commonsense, smart tax policy that makes a real difference in the lives of Montanans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this measure.

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

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, Mr. CAMP, for his leadership on this issue. And I also want to thank and recognize Representative GERLACH of Pennsylvania. Over several terms here during his time in the United States Congress, he has been a constant advocate for so many important issues, including the conservation easement tax program which has helped a lot of people. And while this is another extension, what we really need is that it be made permanent in tax law.

Even with the temporary extension, so much good has been done. I remember coming here in 1999, while serving as a local elected official, a Bucks County commissioner. I was asked to testify before the United States Senate on this topic on the Federal Government helping to preserve land throughout our great Nation. And in those 15 years since, in my community of Bucks County, we have preserved over 10,000 acres of farmland, parkland, and critical natural areas.

It is important for so many different reasons, not just for good land use, planning, and quality of life, but also creating food security for our Nation. It reduces the cost of providing local government services.

So much good has come of the conservation easement program and this incentive act, which is part of the greater America Gives More Act we are debating today. It is not only good tax policy, but it is good environmental policy. These are issues that can bring us together as Democrats and Republicans in this House.

So by permanently removing the uncertainty for those communities who would set aside land for conservation easements, we are going to help ensure that we can pass on open spaces and

wild places to future generations of Americans yet to be born.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this legislation will pass the House today, it will proceed swiftly through the United States Senate, and we can come together around an American ethic of preserving and conserving our open spaces and get this bill to the President's desk.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Conservation Easement Incentive Act as well. Conservation easements are a cost-effective way of protecting valuable open space and farm and ranch land in the West, including in my home State of Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, easement conservation is an alternative to government landownership and allows our local land stewards to continue the best management practices on private land.

The expiration of enhanced tax incentives for landowners discourages modest-income and working ranchers and farmers from participating in a program to permanently protect their land resources and their way of life. While these enhanced tax deductions have been extended multiple times, their on-again, off-again eligibility makes business and tax planning difficult for donors, especially since they are often delayed by the Federal Government's timeline.

Mr. Speaker, conservation easements leverage ranchers' and farmers' love of their land and allows them to maintain operations that are beneficial not only for agriculture, but for habitat, recreation, and our landscapes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the Ways and Means Committee chairman, for this time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3 minutes remaining. The other gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to rise today for this whole package but in particular H.R. 2807, which permanently extends conservation easement tax incentives. This worthy provision incentivizes property donations to groups who maintain the property for conservation purposes, encouraging good stewardship of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the area in Illinois that you and I represent, suburban Chicago and areas outlying, are incredibly significant. There are beautiful places in the five counties that I represent and the many counties that you represent, Mr. Speaker, and this is an opportunity for the Tax Code to work in favor of land preservation and open space and to do it in a way that is thoughtful, to do it in a way that is inclusive, and to do it in a way that ultimately saves and preserves these precious natural resources and uses them not just for our generation but for the generations to come.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a severe case of losing the forest for the trees. This is not about the benefits of charity. This is not about the benefits of foundations. It is not about the benefit of conservation easements. This is a dramatic challenge to Republicans in terms of fiscal responsibility and fiscal priorities.

They passed a budget that cuts severely into needed programs, and then they come here and say, let's pass provisions that would add up to close to $1 trillion and not pay one dime.

I don't think anything can be more fiscally irresponsible and hurt the priorities of this country. Maybe they do this because they know it is a dead end in the Senate. So they think somehow they can use this to their political advantage. But it is reckless, and it is to the harm of the Nation, and I think the process is on a bipartisan basis of this institution.

I urge everybody to vote ''no''. There is so much a better path than this reckless one.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the provisions we are talking about today, the policies, whether it is donations to food inventory or IRA contributions, excess dollars from an IRA, or whether it is a conservation easement, these are all items that have been extended unpaid for, if you will, time and time again.

We have heard a lot about the cost from the other side. But if charities, religious groups, foundations, food banks, if we can make these permanent—because, right now, these three are expired. They can't be used. But if we can make these permanent, we will see an increase in charitable giving—850 organizations have written us and said that would happen, all of them who serve the poor, who serve the needy, who serve Americans in trouble.

Also, it doesn't go through the government. What these charities do, what these religious groups do, and what these foundations do is beyond the power of government to give. Let's make these permanent. Let's extends these provisions. Let's increase charitable giving in the United States, and let's help people help themselves.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 4719, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2014.

The legislation before us today is another in a long line of picking and choosing which tax extenders to make permanent. Instead of looking at all of the tax extenders comprehensively we are again picking the extenders that many Members may find easy to approve, and making them permanent. I find it ironic that Representative CAMP has continued to bring permanent extenders to the floor, some of which he chose not to extend at all when he released his plan for comprehensive tax reform earlier this year.

But that aside, what is truly at issue here is again the unwillingness to find a way to pay for these tax expenditures. This package of five bills would increase the deficit by $16.2 billion over 10 years. With the passage of this package today the House will have approved $534.4 billion in tax breaks over ten years. This is more than the entire non-defense discretionary budget for all of this year. Republicans say that we do not have enough money to pay for an extension of unemployment insurance or to feed the most vulnerable in our society, yet here we are spending money they have said over and over that we do not have.

I support some of the individual extensions in this bill such as the Conservation Easement Incentive Act which allows for family farmers, ranchers and forest land owners to receive a tax break for setting aside areas of their land for conservation purposes, which is a noble and well intentioned goal.

However, I cannot support this legislation without considering the cost. We cannot continue to blindly pass permanent tax breaks, even if the outcome of such breaks would benefit charitable organizations.

I have seen firsthand what happens when we take that approach. We did that under President Bush and went from budget surpluses to budget deficits. Deficits that have pushed Congress to reduce investment in our country in recent years.

I look forward to Congress addressing the tax extenders that require action by the end of the year in a serious way, not the way in which they have been brought before us thus far.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 670, 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. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4719 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, strike lines 7 through 9 and insert the following:

(a) TWO-YEAR EXTENSION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 1, starting at line 12, strike ''by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv)'' and insert ''by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively''.

Page 3, line 16, strike ''(v)'' and insert ''(vi)''.

Page 4, line 7, strike ''(vi)'' and insert ''(vii)''.

Page 5, strike lines 15 through 21 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 408(d)(8)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 6, strike lines 1 through 10 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS EXTENDED AND MODIFIED.

(a) EXTENSION.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Section 170(b)(1)(E)(vi) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(2) CORPORATIONS.—Section 170(b)(2)(B)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 7, after line 23 insert the following:

''(iv) TERMINATION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to any contribution made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.''.

Page 8, line 23, strike ''after the close of a taxable year'' and insert ''after the close of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015''.

Page 9, striking lines 16 through 22 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''(1 percent in the case of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015)'' after ''2 percent''.

(b) REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940(e) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) COORDINATION WITH TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF RATE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015.''.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 8. TAX BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASE OF INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an inverted domestic corporation, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of, and amendment made by, this Act had never been enacted.

(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ''inverted domestic corporation'' means any foreign corporation—

(A) 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

(B) 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

(C) 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.

(2) 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 regulations under 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 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.

(3) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) 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.

(B) 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.

(4) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

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

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

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

(D) 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 paragraph (3) 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.

(5) EXPANDED AFFILIATED GROUP.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''expanded affiliated group'' has the meaning given such term in section 7874(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. CAMP (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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

□ 1200

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit does two things. First, it ensures that the charities we support, we support in a fiscally responsible manner by extending these incentives for 2 years, rather than permanently in order to, number one, give taxpayers clarity, but also to give this Congress time to work together on tax reform without piling up huge new deficits.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday in the Budget Committee, we had a hearing on the long-term deficits. Our Republican colleagues said they worry about the long-term deficit picture, and yet, in the last 6 weeks, they have added over $500 billion to the deficit, in violation of their own budget, including what we are doing today. So let's do this extension for 2 years and in a fiscally responsible manner.

The second thing this motion does is it denies the benefits of this legislation to any corporation that effectively renounces its U.S. citizenship and reincorporates overseas to avoid taxes. These so-called corporate inversions are generating outrage among families and small businesses around the country who can't simply tell the IRS they have moved their residence to some tax haven country because they don't want to pay their taxes.

In recent months, we have seen corporation after corporation jumping on this bandwagon. In fact, the financial press reports that Walgreens, the drugstore chain that has almost all of its

stores right here in the United States, is thinking about moving to Switzerland.

Now here is the catch: Walgreens' management doesn't want to do it, but they are being driven by outside hedge fund stockholders to do this simply for tax purposes, so we have a situation where the management of an American company is being forced to decide between pressure from hedge funds to exploit a tax dodge and loyalty to the United States of America, the country where Walgreens was built into a company and where its customers are.

Just on Tuesday, Secretary Lew wrote to Congress expressing urgency to stop this fled of inversions now as we deal with broader tax reform. He called for a new sense of economic patriotism, and I couldn't agree with him more.

The ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN, and others have worked together to do this. We have got to get it done. The respected reporter, Alan Sloan, just wrote about this in Fortune magazine this month and said he was angry about this.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be angry. We should do something about it. We have already voted to say, on appropriations bills, that you shouldn't benefit from contracts if you are just going to move your residency overseas.

We should say the same thing with respect to tax benefits. You shouldn't get a tax benefit if you are renouncing your U.S. citizenship and deserting U.S. taxpayers and the country for tax-avoidance schemes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

To listen to the histrionics from the other side here today, you would think that we could run the Pentagon through charitable giving. You would think that if there was just a deduction for charitable giving, we would have people volunteering to give their money to the Pentagon.

The reality is that, in this institution, we have had time for Benghazi. We have had time for the IRS, and guess what, next week and the week after, we are going to find time to sue the President of the United States, but we don't have time to address the American Tax Code where, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN has just described, 40 companies are lined up to leave.

Yesterday, the acting head of the VA said we are going to need $18 billion to straighten out the VA, based upon the men and women who have honorably served this Nation.

Mr. CAMP said yesterday, in an email to The Wall Street Journal:

> Our Tax Code is dysfunctional.

Let me refer to what the gentleman from Alaska said just a few moments ago. He blamed Democrats in this Chamber for thwarting tax reform. I guess he didn't vote for the Speaker of the House because the Speaker of the House looked at the issue and said ''blah, blah, blah'' about tax reform—even as $20 billion, in terms of base erosion, is about to abandon the United States.

If you want to do something about charitable giving—and everybody in this institution honors Tocqueville's description of what is known as habits of the heart, we do it naturally. It is the third largest expenditure in the American Tax Code.

Nobody is talking about disarming charitable giving. What we are saying is that Mr. CAMP is correct in his email to The Wall Street Journal yesterday. The Tax Code is, in fact, dysfunctional, and we should be addressing it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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 point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this motion would create chaos for the charitable community. Americans are more generous than any other nation in the world. What we need is certainty in our Tax Code—certainty for those who want to donate food to food banks, certainty for those who want to make excess contributions to IRAs, and certainty for those who want to preserve fragile land for future generations.

This motion makes it much harder to help those in need, and God knows, we have a lot of Americans in need with a contracting economy and the worst recovery since the Great Depression.

We are the only nation in the world with temporary tax policies. Some of these provisions have expired and have been renewed time and time again, and we need to admit it and make them permanent.

Let me just say, when it comes to inversions, the administration agrees with me that the best way to address this issue is through lower rates and through comprehensive tax reform, and we should be doing that, but this motion actually creates a perverse incentive for American companies to pack up and move overseas. That is the worst thing we can do for American workers.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this motion to recommit and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying legislation.

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. VAN HOLLEN. 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 185, nays 227, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—185

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
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
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
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
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
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—227

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

NOT VOTING—20

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Coble
Conyers
Cuellar
DesJarlais
Gibson
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Whitfield

□ 1234

Messrs. LUETKEMEYER, SENSENBRENNER, POSEY, and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 130, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—277

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

NAYS—130

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Gabbard
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Byrne
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Coble
Conyers
Cuellar
DesJarlais
Gohmert
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Nunnelee
Quigley
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Whitfield

□ 1241

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1245

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader-elect the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, 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 Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow and which, I am proud to say, will include additional bills to combat human trafficking.

In addition, the House will consider two bills to support innovation and enhance financial counseling in higher education: H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, authored by Representative MATT SALMON; and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, authored by Representative BRETT GUTHRIE.

The House will consider H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. It is a bipartisan bill, authored by Representatives DIANE BLACK and DANNY DAVIS, to ensure a simple and fair Tax Code so that students and families can afford a college education.

The House will consider H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, authored by Representative LYNN JENKINS, to help low- and middle-income families save for child expenses.

Finally, the House will also consider legislation to address the growing crisis on the border and the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

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

He mentioned, in closing, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. As the gentleman knows, that bill did not come to the floor this week as we may have thought it would. We think this bill is a very, very critically important bill that needs to be addressed before it expires at the end of this year.

As the gentleman probably knows, the Senate is expected to vote on the passage of their bill, as I understand it, today. I expect it to be a bipartisan vote, as TRIA has been a bipartisan vote in the past. I hope that we can follow suit with that quickly, so I am pleased to see that the gentleman says that that may well be on the agenda for next week. I don't know whether the gentleman wants to make any further comment, but we believe that is a very, very important piece of legislation for us to move.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

I did say ''may'' come up. We would always like to work together on any capabilities that we can on legislation that we move forward, and 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. Again, I hope that we can do that as soon as possible. To the extent that we pass it before the August break, I think that will give confidence to the construction industry and confidence to municipalities in areas around the country. Hopefully, we can do that, as I said, sooner rather than later.

There is another matter that is critically time sensitive, in my view, Mr. Leader. As we all know, we have a humanitarian crisis on the border, and addressing this crisis is very necessary for us to do in a timely fashion. I think almost everybody agrees on that. The supplemental is not on the schedule for next week, but I am wondering whether or not you contemplate that supplemental. The Speaker had said we ought to do something before the August break. We have 3 weeks left to go, and I am wondering whether you could give us some insight into the progress of that supplemental that the President has requested.

I yield to my friend.

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

As I mentioned, in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for the possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. Once again, 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 for that news. That is good news. Hopefully, we will be able to move on this next week because it is very important that we get this done as soon as possible because the crisis is posing immediate demands on our resources.

I would say to the gentleman, can he illuminate at all whether or not that supplemental will be limited to the resources necessary to confront the crisis?

I have heard some comments that there may be changes in the underlying law with respect to how individuals at the border are treated depending upon where they come from. While I think that both the administration and others have indicated that that matter ought to be considered, there is no doubt that it will be more controversial than, I think, the supplemental will be.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he expects the supplemental to include attempts to amend existing immigration law, or whether or not we can consider changes to immigration law in a more either comprehensive form or in an individual bill form and, perhaps, in conjunction with the border security bill that has passed out of the Homeland Security Committee in this House, as I understand it, on voice vote? I don't know whether it was unanimous, but I don't think there was opposition to it.

I yield to my friend.

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

As the gentleman knows, there has been ongoing consideration of this.

As the gentleman knows, from this side of the aisle, many of our Members, including on your side of the aisle, have been to the border to see this crisis, and it is the intent that we solve this problem and solve it for the long term. So, as I did mention in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should still be prepared for the possible consideration of the legislation to address the ongoing border crisis, and we will keep you posted.

Mr. HOYER. Again, I would just reiterate that I think we both feel that we need to act on this, but I would urge the gentleman to urge his committees and his side of the aisle to bring the supplemental—and I talked to Mr. ROGERS about bringing the supplemental—whatever that supplemental may entail, on the resources necessary to deal with the crisis and not to try to also deal with the legislative issue, which, I think, is a substantive issue. As you point out, on both sides of the aisle, people have raised this issue, but there is no doubt that that will slow down considerably the passing of a supplemental for the emergency money that is necessary today.

So I would hope that he would keep that in mind and that he would, hopefully, urge his party and his committee—the Appropriations Committee—to report out a clean bill at whatever levels they believe are appropriate for whatever objectives they believe are appropriate and let us deal with the resources now and the policy in a more considered way after hearings. I will be glad to yield if you want to respond.

Lastly, Mr. Leader and Mr. Speaker, we have talked about a Make It In America agenda. As the gentleman knows, there are some 70 bills that we have suggested as part of that agenda. We believe this House needs to focus on jobs, and it is still the main concern of the American people.

I know the gentleman, in telling us the schedule, indicated there are some bills on there that are trying to deal with jobs. It is my understanding that Representative SWALWELL's bill will be on the calendar next week as a suspension bill. I want to thank the gentleman for putting that on the suspension calendar, and I hope that I can work with him.

Mr. CANTOR and I had discussed some of the Make It In America bills, and I hope that I can work with him on these bills, which I think are bipartisan. Every Member of this Congress wants to see more jobs created and more stimulus to create jobs provided.

There is a particular bill that was going to be on the suspension calendar some months ago, and it has not yet made it. The gentleman and I have discussed it. Mr. LIPINSKI has a bill which deals with a plan for making America as competitive as it can be. That bill passed out of the last Congress unanimously out of committee, and it passed this House with over 350 votes. It has again passed out of committee overwhelmingly. I don't know whether there was a recorded vote or not, but it

overwhelmingly came out of committee, and I would hope that the gentleman would, with his staff, review and consider adding that bill as well to the suspension calendar at some time in the future.

I yield to the gentleman.

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

Yes, we have had those conversations, and I appreciate the continual conversations.

As the gentleman knows, the Science Committee has several manufacturing and jobs bills before it, and I am confident they are reviewing and giving all due consideration. The bill that you speak of that passed out of the last Congress was changed within this Congress, and I know the process in which it is going. I do not anticipate any coming up next week, but we will certainly notify the Member of any consideration in the House in the future.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his comments.

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

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 701 of the Senate amendment (relating to the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise today in strong support of the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, which was passed by the Senate 93–7 on June 11 of this year.

This critical piece of legislation is one that must be implemented immediately to provide solutions to the many problems that have been discovered at the Department of Veterans Affairs and to provide the necessary care and assistance that our veterans deserve. We must move immediately on an agreement with the Senate and not further delay the long overdue care that our veterans need and have earned.

The most expeditious way to do this would be to move forward with the Senate bill, one, as I said, that was supported by 93 Senators—Republican, Democrat, and Independent alike. I know that my colleagues in the House and Senate are committed to serving our veterans. Services for our veterans, I am pleased to say, is an issue of great importance and is one that continuously receives strong bipartisan support in both Chambers.

I want to applaud Chairman MILLER and the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their hard work in bringing to light the many problems and the terrible corruption that we have discovered in the VA, and for working to improve the care for our veterans.

I am here to fight for the veterans and the military families in my district and for those across the country. Mr. Speaker, this is a deeply personal issue with me. My father was a veteran of World War II. He joined the Army Air Corps, and probably lied about his age so he could go serve his country.

□ 1300

He served in World War II. He went on to serve in Korea and Vietnam, and when he left the Air Force, he extensively used the services of the veterans administration.

Were he alive today, I know he would be enraged by what has been discovered about the neglect, misconduct, and manipulation of the VA waiting lists, so that top executives could receive financial rewards and bonuses.

The 85,000 veterans I work for in southern Arizona—and countless more nationwide—deserve better from us and from the Department of Veterans Affairs than they have been getting.

I have been pressing for better access to health care for our veterans since I first came to Congress in 2012. One of the first bills I introduced was the Veterans Health Access Act, to ensure that veterans could get the health care they needed in their communities, without long commutes and even longer wait times, and I am pleased that the House and Senate are now working to address this issue.

We must improve the quality and timeliness of care to our veterans, and that is why, today, Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate to support the Senate bill that increases access to care and takes many more steps to improve services and support for our veterans and their families.

Included in the Senate-passed bill is the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship, so that surviving spouses may have a chance to further their education and take care of their families.

The Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship is a current education benefit for the surviving children of our fallen military servicemembers. It has sent many sons and daughters of fallen heroes to college and given them the opportunity to get the American Dream.

However, it is important that we also offer this benefit to the spouses who are left widowed and must singlehandedly care for their families. This scholarship could provide many spouses an opportunity to get the education they need and the jobs that will help them succeed and support their family.

This scholarship was originally created in memory of John David Fry, who was a leader of marines from Lorena, Texas. Gunnery Sergeant Fry, a member of the explosive ordnance disposal community, demonstrated true service to his country and to his fellow marines in Iraq.

With only 1 week left on his tour in 2006, he injured his hand and was given the option to return home early with a Bronze Star. Fry declined the offer and volunteered to go on one last patrol, to defuse bombs for his fellow servicemembers.

Sadly, Gunnery Sergeant Fry was killed that day by an improvised explosive device in Anbar province, Iraq, leaving behind his wife and three small children.

Mr. Speaker, this type of courage and sacrifice has been witnessed countless times in the past 13 years by our men and women in uniform. For example, just recently, on May 12, a soldier from my district with 29 years of military service succumbed to the wounds he received in Afghanistan.

Command Sergeant Major Martin R. Barreras of Tucson was the enlisted leader of his infantry battalion in Harat province and was on his sixth deployment to Afghanistan.

While on patrol with his soldiers, Gunny—as his family likes to call him and remember him—was fatally wounded by small-arms fire while leading his troops into battle.

This was not the only time this respected leader saw combat. In 2003, Sergeant Major Barreras helped rescue former prisoner of war Jessica Lynch from an Iraqi hospital. At the time, he was the enlisted leader of the Army battalion that conducted the mission.

He personally handed Lynch to another soldier to transfer her to the helicopter that evacuated her from the area and to safety. According to reports, he then fended off multiple attacks to retrieve all nine bodies of the other U.S. soldiers missing in action.

Everyone in our country owes all of our fallen heroes, such as Gunnery Sergeant Fry and Command Sergeant Major Barreras, a debt of gratitude for their service and their courage, but we must also remember the silent courage of spouses of our servicemembers who must cope with the rigors of military life and who must live with only the memory of their fallen husband or wife.

These unsung heroes are the ones who maintain the homefront for our deployed men and women in uniform. They are the ones who maintain the

morale of our troops. They are the ones who unite with other military families to develop a support network for those spouses and children while their loved ones are in harm's way.

They are the ones who live with constant worry of their servicemember's safety, and they are the ones who must bear the burden in the absence of their husband or wife.

Our military spouses play a pivotal role in our Nation, and it is one that we must never forget. This is a good way to honor that service, by providing a scholarship in memory not just of Gunnery Sergeant Fry and Command Sergeant Barreras, but all of the servicemembers who died for our country and have left behind a loving family.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to instruct, to support the expansion, with no limitations, of the Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship.

I further urge swift passage to pass the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 in its entirety. We must act now to enact this legislation and get our veterans the care that they deserve.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have already heard, the motion to instruct would require the House to recede to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3230.

Solving the problem of timely access to health care and imposing the rule of accountability is absent at VA, and I think that is our first and most important obligation because it is the source of many of the problems that exist within the Department, many of the problems that were uncovered because of the oversight from both Republicans and Democrats on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We are making good progress with our negotiations with our Senate colleagues, and now is not the time to try to tie the hands of the negotiators with what I believe is a partisan ploy.

Moreover, yesterday, Senator SANDERS indicated that he wanted to expand the scope of the conference committee's work far beyond what the Senate bill itself had encompassed, by adding VA's request for an additional $17.6 billion into the mix.

So today, I say to my colleagues I am not even sure that the Senate could recede to the Senate amendment because they keep moving the goalposts.

As I said yesterday, on the last motion to instruct, the inspector general and the GAO have both stated on multiple occasions during our hearings that they do not have confidence in VA's numbers.

Moreover, at every VA budget hearing, the Secretary has been asked: Do you have the dollars you need to take care of the veterans that you are tasked with taking care of? Invariably, we get the answer, every single time, yes.

So why should we believe that, suddenly, VA sees the need to add an additional $10 billion to hire 10,000 new clinical staff and $6 billion in new construction without having those numbers vetted?

When our staff was briefed yesterday on this request for $17.6 billion—actually, I don't even know if it is a request yet, but when the Secretary talked about it, they came to brief our staffs, and they brought three sheets of paper to justify a $17.6 billion number.

To the Members on both sides of the aisle, I caution that, despite the urgency of the current crisis, we have got to root out the cause that has been affecting timely access to care and accountability, not secondary issues, many of which we all support, including the Fry Scholarship fund expansion.

If we don't, those of us fortunate enough to be here years from now will be right back where we are, debating, once again, how things went wrong at the VA.

I would point out again, as I did yesterday, there are dozens of bills sitting, languishing in the Senate, including the authorization of 27 clinics. The motion to instruct yesterday talked about receding to the Senate bill that had 26 clinics.

The House bill was passed in December of last year—27 clinics. If the Senate would just bring it up, pass it, send to it the President, we could immediately make a difference.

I also talked about the expansion of the Fry Scholarship program. That is something that we certainly should look at, but it will do nothing, nothing to increase the care and break the backlog, the lines that our veterans are waiting in now to get the health care that they have earned.

So I would ask the Senate to pass the dozen bills that sit over there on their side, send them to the President today, and I would also point out that I am willing to discuss—and I think most Members on our side—the Fry Scholarship issues, but we don't think that they are in the scope of the emergency that exists today.

Part of the reason that I believe that, section 701 of the Senate bill does not address timely access to care or the cultural corruption that exists within the Department.

A surviving spouse—as my colleague, Mr. BARBER has already said—who has a spouse that was killed on active duty is already entitled to receive financial benefits that include 45 months of GI Bill-type education benefits, $500,000 in death benefits, and $1,215 in monthly dependency and indemnity compensation benefits.

In short, I don't believe it is time for us to be talking about expanding the benefits without expressing them through regular order here on the House floor, especially in the face of what I now understand is the Senate's new effort to move the goal line in our conference committee work.

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, could you advise me on how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce a series of Members who would like to speak to this issue, but before I do, I would just say this: I have been here now a little bit more than 2 years, and I have learned a few things.

One of those things I have learned is that, when you have the public's attention and when you have this Chamber's attention and when you have the Senate's attention on an issue of importance like this, you act, and you do as much as you can to not only take care of the corruption, the systemic problems within the VA, but other issues that have been pending for a long time. To that end, I hope that we will, in fact, recede to the Senate version of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK), ranking member on the Oversight Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has been a strong fighter for our veterans her entire time in Congress.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I support this motion to instruct the conferees. The Senate amendments go beyond a short-term solution to solving the patient access crisis at the VA.

As a member of the conference committee, I continue to push for the provisions in the Senate amendments because they are good for veterans and their families.

We must seize this opportunity to pass meaningful reforms at the VA. Our veterans and their families deserve better than piecemeal, short-term fixes, especially with report after report of veterans struggling to receive timely care and benefits and struggling to find good-paying jobs.

One provision in the Senate amendment will give post-9/11 GI benefits to surviving spouses of servicemembers who have given the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

We cannot forget about surviving spouses. A surviving spouse struggles with the loss of a loved one and often struggles with a financial loss that can make it difficult to provide for the family left behind.

Servicemembers are able to transfer GI Bill benefits to their spouses and children, but the benefits and the ability to transfer this benefit are based on time served on active duty.

We can all agree that surviving spouses should not be cut out of receiving full bill benefits if they lose a loved one before that loved one has served 36 months on active duty.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill will give surviving spouses the opportunity to receive education and training so they

are better able to provide for themselves and their families. It would be wrong of the conference committee and Congress to pass up this opportunity to give surviving spouses this benefit.

We cannot delay passing meaningful veterans legislation. If we do not take this opportunity now, then Congress will once again fail all the American people, veterans, and their families by refusing to act.

□ 1315

Passing VA reform legislation in a meaningful way that gives GI Bill benefits to surviving spouses should be an easy decision for every Member of Congress.

For those who are holding up the progress of this legislation, how will you go home to your district in August and explain to veterans and constituents why Congress was unable to pass something as simple as giving GI benefits to surviving spouses?

I know that all of my colleagues sincerely wish to help veterans and their families, but it is not enough to pay lip service to our military and veterans. Congress must act now. At the very least, the conference committee should agree to this provision in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the last speaker did not imply that anybody on the conference committee from the House was trying to delay the progress on this particular bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada, Congresswoman DINA TITUS, a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has introduced legislation here in the House, H.R. 3441, the Spouses of Heroes Education Act, which would expand this scholarship.

As a university professor at UNLV for more than 30 years, Congresswoman TITUS understands the importance of education and has been a strong leader in education issues both in Nevada and here in Washington, as a former member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a provision that has been highlighted by my colleague from Arizona in his motion to instruct and was also discussed by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

As a member of that committee, I am working hard to ensure that our veterans in Las Vegas and throughout the country have access to high-quality health care in a timely fashion. So it is critical that this conference committee quickly finishes its work so we can send a reform package to the President for his signature.

The gentleman from Arizona's amendment highlights a critical piece of the Senate proposal, which is identical to the legislation I introduced along with Senator JEFF MERKLEY from Oregon just last year, H.R. 3441, the Spouses of Heroes Education Act. Our important legislation amends the post-9/11 GI Bill to expand the Fry Scholarship, which you have heard described most eloquently by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER), by making surviving spouses of the members of the armed services eligible for this education benefit program.

The scholarship provides full instate tuition, fees, a monthly living stipend, and a book allowance to children of servicemembers who have died in the line of duty. Our change would allow spouses to receive those same benefits.

When a servicemember tragically loses his or her life on the field of battle, we owe it to their spouses to do all we can to support them and their families—not just in the immediate aftermath of the tragedy, but going forward. We can ensure that they have all the educational opportunities they need because this will enable them to further their careers and increase the financial stability of that family.

I was pleased that the Senate included this bicameral, bipartisan legislation in the McCain-Sanders agreement that passed 93–3, and it is very important that our conferees continue to fight to maintain that provision. I was also very glad to hear the chairman say that he is so supportive of our looking at that provision here in the House as a stand-alone bill, and I hope to see that move also. So I thank them for their work on this important issue.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman KYRSTEN SINEMA. If you know Congresswoman SINEMA, you know that when she gets her dander up, she fights like hell for whatever the issue is, and that has certainly been true in the fight that she has waged on behalf of our veterans.

As you know, the first evidence of corruption and misdeeds was discovered in Arizona at the VA in Phoenix, and from the very beginning, Congresswoman SINEMA has been on that issue. So I am very proud and pleased to yield to her to speak on this bill.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for offering this motion to instruct and for his leadership and work on behalf of veteran and military families in Arizona.

This motion urges conferees to expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to include spouses of fallen servicemembers. Currently, the scholarship covers the children of servicemembers who are killed in the line of duty. After their tragic loss, the surviving spouse is frequently left to provide for her or his family. It is important that Congress take action to expand this benefit to spouses and to help these military families begin to rebuild.

It is also important that Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs take action to get veterans the care they need. Veterans in my district, which is home to the Phoenix VA, are still waiting for Congress to produce a bipartisan VA reform bill to send to the President's desk. But in Arizona, we are not waiting idly for Washington to take action; we are doing it ourselves.

In Phoenix, we have established a working group of community providers, veterans service organizations, and the local VA to work together to improve access to services. We also recently cohosted our Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans in a variety of ways. Approximately 400 veterans and their families attended and got the care that they earned and that they deserve.

These are examples of the good that results when we set aside partisanship and focus on putting veterans first to help meet their needs, but more action is required.

I appreciate the bipartisan leadership and work the House—especially Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD—has done on this issue, and I call on the conferees to move quickly to produce a bipartisan bill and get it on the President's desk. By working together, we can address this crisis and create a VA system that our veterans deserve.

Let's get this done for our veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to whether or not the gentleman from Arizona has any further requests for time?

Mr. BARBER. I have no further requests for time, but I do have some closing remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, I would urge my colleagues to not support this motion to instruct. And I would also remind my colleagues that even though the number 93–3 has been used for the passage of the Senate bill, the House bill, itself, which was much more narrowly tailored to actually deal with the crisis that exists today, with access to care, passed unanimously, 426–0, in this House. Just prior to the final vote, there was a motion to recommit that did, in fact, want the House to recede to the Senate amendment.

The problem is, again, the goalposts are changing. The House has been working with the Senate. We have made an offer on our particular side. We are waiting for the Senate to return a counter. Things changed yesterday, unfortunately, because of the additional $17.6 billion that was brought forward by the Department themselves.

So we continue to stay focused. Our intent is to complete this bill and get it to the President's desk before we leave in August.

I appreciate my colleague's comments today.

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, could I ask for the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, let me just close with these thoughts.

I came here, as you well know, following the resignation of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, for whom I worked, when she was a Member. Her commitment to veterans was complete and deep. I am pleased to have picked up that mission and have tried to move forward with it in every way possible.

I also came here in the spirit of bipartisanship, looking for partners on both sides of the aisle to move important legislation for our country, and I am very pleased to say that I have found bipartisanship in full measure in the manner with which we have worked together to ensure that our veterans are properly served. Now I call on my colleagues, the conferees, to move quickly to bring our two bills together, to strike now while the opportunity presents.

Back home, when I meet with veterans, they say, What are you waiting for? We need you to act, and act now.

I urge our colleagues to adopt the motion to instruct so that we can get this job done expeditiously and in full measure.

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

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, July 22, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business.

JOBS BILLS STUCK IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 5 million Americans have given up on their search for a job. For 59 months straight, invisible unemployment has remained above 10 percent. The number of long-term unemployed Americans is double the prerecession figure.

Mr. Speaker, among the 294 bills the Democrat-controlled Senate has failed to act on are over 40 House-passed bipartisan pro-jobs bills that would help put Americans back to work. We have passed legislation to help the long-term unemployed get training for new jobs, a measure to restore hourly wages cut by the 30-hour workweek mandate, and regulatory reform bills to cut the red tape holding back key energy and construction projects that will help create jobs and boost our economy. These measures are commonsense solutions that our country needs right now, policies that reward hard work and provide opportunities for Americans to be self-sufficient.

Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs bills? We hear that over here on the other side of the aisle. You can find them over in HARRY REID's dusty desk drawer waiting for action in the Senate. However, the Senate has refused to vote on them, has refused to take action to help our economy, and has refused to consider any approach but bigger government.

It is time for the Senate to get to work and take action on the jobs bills Americans need.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, last week's Energy and Water Appropriations bill provided another glaring example of an opportunity squandered. We could have invested more in clean energy and certainly weaned our Nation off its heavy dependence on fossil fuels. We could have heeded the warnings of the scientific community and taken greater steps to reduce emissions and adapt our dams and ports and coastal infrastructure to new conditions. We did neither. Even worse, the bill contained riders to prevent the modeling and study of climate change.

The climate deniers are condemning us to a future of crisis management. Organizations, including global manufacturers, governments, aid organizations, and the insurance industry are examining risks to key infrastructure of supply chain disruptions, water shortages, and increased political unrest.

Instead of suing our President for taking action, we should be joining him and organizations around the world in the effort to understand and meet this formidable challenge. Failure to do so will be costly, and failure to do so will be tragic.

We must do better. We should start by doing something.

□ 1330

GAZA

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with our good ally and friend, Israel, as it defends its people from Hamas' deadly rockets.

Every nation, Mr. Speaker, has the right to defend its citizens; indeed, it has a moral obligation to do so. And no people ever ought to live in constant fear that their homes, schools, businesses, places of worship, and hospitals might be the target of terrorists' rockets.

Mr. Speaker, there is a town in southern Israel whose name is Sderot which has been the target of over 6,300 rockets since 2007. Mr. Speaker, I have been to Sderot, and I have talked to some of the families there. As the rockets fall, they gather their children in bomb shelters and sing them songs. I have been in the recreational gymnasium. It is itself a bomb shelter. Preschoolers learn to run for cover before they learn to read and write.

If American communities were subjected to what the residents of Sderot—and now cities even as far north as Tel Aviv and Jerusalem—have had to endure, I doubt very seriously whether we would show as much restraint as Israel has shown.

There are two major challenges I hear to Israel's exercise of its legitimate self-defense, and I want to address both of them. First, undertaking this necessary response was not an easy choice for Israel, nor was the decision to agree to a cease-fire on Tuesday. Israel abided by the cease-fire without any commitment from Hamas, and Prime Minister Netanyahu even fired—removed—his deputy defense minister for questioning that decision, so committed was the Israeli Government to trying to reach a cease-fire and cessation of danger to Israelis and to Palestinians.

Tragically and appallingly—but I suggest not so surprisingly—Hamas not only rejected the cease-fire, but continued to rain missiles upon Israeli communities even while Israel had unilaterally stopped its defensive strikes. Secondly, Israeli forces have continued to do everything possible to prevent civilian casualties as they strike Hamas' leadership and its rocket launchers.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that Hamas' reign of terror extends not only

to Israelis, but to their own people, the Palestinians in Gaza, where Hamas continues to use innocent civilians as human shields while firing rocket after rocket after rocket after rocket at Israel.

Prime Minister Netanyahu summed up his country's struggle earlier this week in the following way:

We (meaning the Israelis, and I am quoting Prime Minister Netanyahu) we are using missile defense to protect our civilians, and they are using civilians to protect their missiles.

We are using (the prime minister said) missile defense to protect our citizens, while Hamas is using its own citizens to protect its missiles.

How sad. Just today, while Israel was observing a 5-hour cease-fire to allow humanitarian supplies to reach Gaza, we have seen news reports that Hamas continued firing mortar shells into Israel, in violation of that truce.

This week has seen bitter tragedy for both Israelis and Palestinians. You have to listen carefully to the words of Rachel Fraenkel, the mother of one of the three murdered Israeli teenagers. When she learned of the brutal killing of a Palestinian teenager, Mohammed Abu Khedair, she said this:

There is no difference between blood and blood.

Of course, what she meant by that was the loss of her son and the loss of the Palestinian young man was an equal tragedy. He was gunned down by angry people motivated by the acts of terrorists to seek revenge on innocent noncombatants, in this case on children.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas has the power to end this violence. I call on them to do so before more innocent blood on both sides is shed. The United States, of course, will continue to stand by its ally, Israel, and we will continue to hold in our hearts all of the families, including Rachel Fraenkel, and the family of Mohammed Abu Khaber, who are grieving the loss of loved ones as a result of Hamas' reprehensible and criminal actions.

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

IRAQ PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying the obvious. We are living in a chaotic and dangerous world. But contrary to what some in this Chamber suggest, the solution to every problem is not expanding the U.S. military footprint. There are many of us who are deeply concerned about our renewed military involvement in Iraq. We believe we need a debate. We believe we need a vote. We believe the Congress ought to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by a couple of my colleagues here today who share those concerns and who want to express their beliefs about how we should proceed on this issue. I would like to first yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who has been a leader on these issues. I yield her as much time as she may consume.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for your tireless leadership and for hosting this Special Order today. For many years, you have been raising the level of awareness with regard to the responsibilities of Congress, our duties as it relates to war making, as well as the impact of these tragic wars on our brave men and women. So thank you for once again coming forward with now a privileged resolution that directs the President to remove all United States military forces stationed in Iraq within 30 days or by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very reasonable resolution. It is very consistent with what I believe the American people—we know, based on what the American people have said over and over and over again, they are war weary. And Mr. MCGOVERN has really given us an opportunity to vote the views of the American people.

This resolution exempts, of course, troops necessary for the security of the United States diplomatic post and personnel.

We are all familiar with the reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place. We hear many of the same voices who championed the unnecessary war in Iraq once again beating the drum for a renewed war in Iraq today. So we must not let history repeat itself. We must remember history. We must not be dragged back into a war in Iraq. This must be rejected.

Many of my colleagues agree. And I want to remind us that over 100 Members of Congress now from both parties have signed a letter, Congressman MCGOVERN, myself—many—SCOTT RIGELL from Virginia, we are calling for the President to come to Congress for debate on an authorization before any military escalation on Iraq.

Last month, during the consideration of the 2015 Defense Appropriations bill, over 150 bipartisan Members supported our amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were inflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides. The change that Iraq needs must come from Iraqis. They must reject violence in favor of a peaceful democracy that represents everyone and respects the rights of all citizens.

The future of Iraq is in the hands of the Iraqi people. Our job is to continue to promote regional and international engagement, recognition of human rights, women's rights, and political reforms. Only through these actions can Iraq and, of course, the United States, and the rest of the world, begin supporting a process of reconciliation and help the Iraqis secure long-term national stability.

Mr. Speaker, after more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives, and billions of dollars, the American people are rightfully war weary. The American people are looking for Congress to act. We must heed their call and bring this privileged resolution to the House floor for an immediate up-or-down vote.

As our President told the American people in May:

United States military action cannot be the only, or even primary, component of our leadership in every instance.

This is one of those instances.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq. But we must vote on this resolution immediately because I think this would give the American people a clear understanding of what this administration and Congress intends to do, and that is remove all military forces stationed in Iraq.

So I want to thank, again, Congressman MCGOVERN for his leadership for bringing this forward. It is time that we have a clear up-or-down vote on this. I want to thank Congressman JONES for cosponsoring this.

Also, I will finally conclude by saying sooner or later—sooner or later—we have got to go back and repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force which has become a blank check for this war this past decade. It sets the stage for perpetual war. We need to repeal it. The American people deserve a vote on this resolution, and they deserve a vote for repealing this authorization.

So thank you again for your leadership, and let's move forward and vote the will of the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent words and for her leadership on this issue in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here with my colleagues, Congresswoman LEE and Congressman JONES, to talk about I think an issue that deserves a lot more discussion than it is getting. We need to take a look at the recent return of the U.S. military to Iraq.

Iraq is a complicated country with a long history of ethnic and religious divisions. It is now facing a crisis of governance and a crisis of invasion by extremist militant forces. Sadly for Iraq, the two are closely intertwined.

In large measure, Iraq is falling apart because of its sectarian government currently led by Prime Minister Maliki that excludes and represses most Sunnis, Kurds, and other ethnic and religious minorities; and an army that

thinks more about saving its own skin than protecting the Iraqi people. This is what has laid the foundation for extremist forces, namely ISIL, to enter Iraq and take control of disaffected communities and territory.

I do not believe we can fix this. Only the Iraqi people can fix this. And I certainly don't believe our brave and stalwart military men and women can fix this.

I believe that we should never have invaded Iraq. I also believe it is foolish to once again commit U.S. troops to try and save an Iraqi Government and army that cannot stand on their own.

As Joseph Cirincione wrote last month in ''Defense One'' magazine:

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion in Iraq in 2002 and 2003.

This is not to say ''we told you so'' but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work, and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the entire Defense One article.

[From Defense One, June 12, 2014]

DON'T BE SUCKED INTO WAR WITH IRAQ, AGAIN

(By Joseph Cirincione)

We never should have invaded Iraq. It would be folly to recommit United States forces to save an artificial Iraqi government and army that cannot stand on its own.

Ten years ago, U.S. forces battled Sunni insurgents in the very same cities that are falling to anti-government fighters today. Hundreds of American lives were lost in the 2004 battles for Mosul, Fallujah, Karbala, Ramadi, Tikrit, Najaf and Samarra. The U.S. spent tens of billions of dollars to train and equip an Iraqi army that was supposed to protect the government we formed to replace the deposed dictator, Saddam Hussein.

This week, that army collapsed. In Mosul, The Guardian reports, ''two divisions of Iraqi soldiers—roughly 30,000 men—simply turned and ran in the face of the assault by an insurgent force of just 800 fighters.'' In other cities, Iraqi troops simply handed over their American-supplied uniforms, guns and armored fighting vehicles to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, or ISIS, fighters, then scattered. ISIS has seized more than $450 million from the banks in these cities, making it perhaps the richest and best equipped insurgent group in the world.

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion of Iraq in 2002 and 2003. The very first sentence of Tom Ricks' 2006 masterpiece, Fiasco, warns, ''President George W. Bush's decision to invade Iraq in 2003 ultimately may come to be seen as one of the most profligate actions in the history of American foreign policy. The consequences won't be clear for decades.''

Well, they are becoming much clearer now. Ricks' concludes his book—which should be read by anyone searching for a solution to the current debacle—with this:

''So while there is a small chance that the Bush administration's inflexible optimism will be rewarded, that the political process will undercut the insurgency and that democracy will take hold in Iraq, there is a far greater chance of other, more troublesome outcomes: That Iraq will fall into civil war, or spark regional war, or eventually become home to an anti-American regime, or break up altogether. In any of these forms it would offer a new haven for terrorists.''

He was not alone. I wrote, with my colleagues at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications, an anatomy of the false intelligence supplied to justify the war:

''It was almost inevitable that a U.S. victory would add to the sense of cultural, ethnic, and religious humiliation that is known to be a prime motivator of al Qaeda-type terrorists. It was widely predicted by experts beforehand that the war would boost recruitment to this network and deepen anti-Americanism in a region already deeply antagonistic to the United States and suspicious of its motives. Although this may not be the ultimate outcome, the latter has so far been a clear cost of the war. And while a successful war would definitely eliminate a ''rogue'' state, it might—and may—also create a new ''failed'' state: one that cannot control its borders, provide internal security, or deliver basic services to its people. Arguably, such failed states—like Afghanistan, Sudan, and others—pose the greatest risk in the long struggle against terror.''

This is not to say, ''We told you so,'' but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Rep. Paul Ryan, R–Wisc., played the game well in his speech at the Center for New American Security conference, in Washington on Wednesday. He blamed the chaos in Iraq on the failure of the Obama administration to negotiate a status of forces agreement, pulling the troops out too soon and for not intervening in Syria. In other words, for failing to double down on the military policy that created the mess in the first place.

Sen. John McCain, R–Ariz., goes even further, calling on the entire Obama administration national security team to resign. McCain went ''roaring onto the Senate floor'' on Thursday, claiming ''Could all this have been avoided? . . . The answer is absolutely yes.''

Part of this is the normal partisan attack on Obama. His political opponents squeeze everything he does into their preferred frame: he is weak, naive, dangerous, doesn't really care about American security, may not even be an American.

Part of it, however, is the way Washington looks at national security issues: focused on the immediate, ignoring or twisting history. So, the Iraq debacle is something that has happened only now, with perhaps one or two years of prelude. The policy fix should address what can be done today, looking forward a year or two. There must be an immediate solution: bomb, invade, supply, sanction. The so-called ''defense Democrats'' jump in, too, wanting to prove their toughness by advocating one or another military solution.

The Washington Post, which played a key role in convincing policy makers to go to war with Iraq, picks up the pro-war line of attack in its editorial: ''For years, President Obama has been claiming credit for ''ending wars,'' when, in fact, he was pulling the United States out of wars that were far from over. Now the pretense is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain.''

In other words, the problem is not that we started the war, it is that we never should have ended it.

None of these critics have the slightest self-awareness. None take responsibility for their previous policy pronouncements. It's like the driver of a car that has plowed into a crowd of pedestrians blaming the emergency medical technicians for not saving the lives of those injured.

Nor do the defense Democrats want to go back to this debate, preferring to be seen as positive and forward-looking. They want to talk about robotics or new paradigms. They want to get away from any hint that they once were against the war, or hide their own shame that they were once for it.

I understand. But we have to go over this again. The American public long ago decided that the Iraq War was a mistake, that Iraq is not worth fighting for. It is the Washington elite that doesn't seem to have made up their minds. It is the Obama administration that, after being blasted by Republicans for always ''blaming Bush'' whenever they talked about the multiple crises they inherited, stopped drawing the lines from the failed policies of the past to the current dilemmas.

Well, it is time to draw the lines again. It is vital that we not be bullied into squandering more resources into a futile effort. We cannot let politics and ideology and short-term thinking again trick the nation into making a bad situation worse.

There is not a quick fix to this problem. The hard truth is that, like the collapse of the Diem government in South Vietnam a generation ago, there is little we can do to prop up this government. As military expert Micha Zenko tweeted, ''Unless the US has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into PM Maliki, airstrikes in Iraq would be pointless.'' We may have to revisit then-Senator Joe Biden's strategy from 2006 that the only way to stop the killing and salvage the situation was to scrap Iraq's artificially-imposed boundaries and partition the country into three ethnic regions.

Gen. Colin Powell famously invoked the ''Pottery Barn rule'' about Iraq, but he got it slightly wrong. It is not, ''You broke it; you own it,'' but ''You broke it; you pay for it.'' We broke Iraq. We paid a huge price in lives, treasure and legitimacy. It is time to stop paying.

□ 1345

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Obama has done the right thing to send U.S. forces to Iraq to increase the security and help protect our diplomatic facilities and personnel.

So far, he has sent two contingents—the first of 275 military troops on June 15 and a second deployment of 200 additional troops on June 30. With respect to the second deployment, he noted that they would also be used to reinforce the security of the Baghdad International Airport.

They would consist of additional security forces; rotary wing aircraft; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support. The President specifically noted that they are equipped for combat.

In between these two deployments, the President announced on June 19 and notified Congress on June 26 that he was sending 300 military troops to

train, advise, and support Iraqi security forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces, so we could share intelligence and coordinate plans on how to confront the threat of ISIL. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, this deployment concerns me deeply.

In each of these three deployments, the President has rightly formally informed Congress consistent with the War Powers Resolution. The only reason a President has to inform Congress about such overseas deployments—the only time it applies is when the President—and I am quoting now from the War Powers Resolution—has introduced ''United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include for the RECORD the three notifications the President has sent to Congress on deployments of troops to Iraq.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 16, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) Starting on June 15, 2014, up to approximately 275 U.S. Armed Forces personnel are deploying to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 26, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

I have since ordered further measures in response to the situation in Iraq. Specifically, as I announced publicly on June 19, I have ordered increased intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance that is focused on the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). I also ordered up to approximately 300 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel in Iraq to assess how we can best train, advise, and support Iraqi security forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces to share intelligence and coordinate planning to confront the threat posed by ISIL. Some of these personnel were already in Iraq as part of the U.S. Embassy's Office of Security Cooperation, and others began deploying into Iraq on June 24. These forces will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that they are no longer needed.

This action is being undertaken in coordination with the Government of Iraq and has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 30, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I previously reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

In light of the security situation in Baghdad, I have ordered up to approximately 200 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Iraq to reinforce security at the U.S. Embassy, its support facilities, and the Baghdad International Airport. This force consists of additional security forces, rotary-wing aircraft, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support.

This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think the President did the right thing to inform Congress because I believe that our troops have been introduced into a situation in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. In fact, more simply put, if Iraq wasn't engaged in hostilities in a moment of crisis, we wouldn't have sent troops over there.

This is why last Friday, on June 11, my good friends and colleagues, Representatives WALTER JONES of North Carolina and BARBARA LEE of California, introduced 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.

We don't know what might happen next to those troops or to yet another deployment of additional troops, but we do know that Congress should debate it. We do know that Congress should vote on whether to authorize it or not.

That is what the Constitution of the United States demands of Congress. That is what the Constitution demands of us. Now is the time for Congress to debate the merits of our military involvement in this latest Iraq conflict—openly, 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 started a process to hold a debate on our engagement in Iraq in the coming days, 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 the House for a clean up-or-down vote. Frankly, I wish that were happening, but I have not heard that such an authorization is even under discussion, let alone being prepared for debate.

I regret to say that I only hear how we can avoid having such a debate. So my colleagues—Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and myself—we introduced this concurrent resolution because we strongly believe that 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.

The time for 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 back an ISIL-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 Maliki government or

whatever government is cobbled together should 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, Mr. Speaker, before we are forced to fire our first shots, launch our first missiles, 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 administration has tacitly signaled when it notified Congress that our troops have been sent to a place where the threat of hostilities is imminent.

The longer we put off carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, the easier it becomes to just drift along, and this is what Congress has done over and over. We just kind of drift along, and it has to end. It has to end, Mr. Speaker. Congress must speak. Congress must act.

This resolution, should it pass, would direct the President to bring our troops home from Iraq within 30 days—or should the President determine that such a rapid withdrawal would pose a security question, then no later than by the end of the 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.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take up this resolution. We need to debate our military engagement in this latest war in Iraq. We need to have a clean up-or-down vote, whether we stay in Iraq or whether we bring our troops home.

We owe that much to our troops and their families. We owe that much to the American people, and we owe at least that 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, at this time, it is my privilege to yield to the conscience of this Congress on issues of war, a man I have great admiration for, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to thank him for being a leader on bringing to the floor of the House not only this resolution asking for a vote about bringing our troops home from Iraq, but also the way that he speaks about the fact that 17 million American children go home at night hungry. That is another issue, I understand that, but it all ties in.

When we continue to not debate whether we should be sending our young men and women to die, we are shirking our constitutional responsibility that we, in this Congress, have raised our hand to swear that we will uphold the Constitution of the United States, but we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to war, and I blame myself.

In 2003, I bought the lie that was told by the previous administration about the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein had and how he was going to use that against the American people.

That misinformation that was given by the previous administration caused us to go into Iraq, and I voted to give the President at the time—President Bush—the authority to bypass the Constitution.

It is called the AUMF, the Authorization for Use of Military Force, and I regret that and will until the day I die because I gave up my constitutional responsibility to debate and to vote on whether we should go to war or not, and that was the constitutional responsibility of this Congress and of me being a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a funeral. It is a military funeral where a soldier has given his life for this country. His wife is there with her sunglasses on, holding the hand of her little girl who can't quite understand why her daddy is dead, why her daddy is in a flag-draped coffin.

That is why we need to be on this floor, as Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE have said, to debate whether we continue to allow the President—in this case, President Obama—to use the War Powers Act to send our troops into Iraq, and yet, we sit here idle.

We don't even hardly debate the issue of war when we are going to pass millions and billions of dollars to be spent by our military overseas. It does not make any sense.

I want to say about my own side, I regret that my side, the Republican Party, we have become the war party now. It is not so much the Democrats who were the war party during the Vietnam war. Now, it is the Republican Party.

I am a great supporter of Pat Buchanan. I love his position on foreign policy and his many articles. This is from a recent article that he wrote. Pat Buchanan says:

> It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp their war powers to march into Syria and back into Iraq. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

This is what Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE and I are trying to say. It is time that this Congress start speaking out. We listen to the American people when it comes to war, and the American people are tired. They are worn out.

A recent survey actually said that 71 percent of American people said that the first intervention in Iraq was wrong. It was a mistake. It should never have happened, and yet that is why I admire you, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE and the others who are willing to speak out on this.

Just a couple of other points I want to make—people always say those who wrote the Constitution, they maybe really better understood more than we do, and yet they didn't have the sophistication that we have today in the wars that we fight, but that brings me to a letter from George Washington to James Monroe:

> I have always given it as my decided opinion that no nation has a right to meddle into the concerns of another, that everyone has the right to form and adopt whatever government they like best to live under themselves.

That is George Washington in 1796, in a letter to James Monroe. Again, I think about the fact that I, along with other Members of Congress, gave away my constitutional right to declare war when we gave to President Bush the authority to use military force.

That in itself is something, again, being repetitive for just a moment, I will always, always regret.

Another quote, this one by James Madison, and this is Mr. MCGOVERN's point:

> The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.

We are the legislature. It is our responsibility to meet our constitutional duties. Mr. MCGOVERN, I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families in this country since we went into Iraq because I have asked God to forgive me for listening to the misinformation and the distortions by the previous administration to go into Iraq.

That is my pain, and I will live with that pain.

□ 1400

I am on the floor with you today—and Ms. LEE who has already spoken—to say thank you for taking the lead in trying to force this Congress to have a debate.

I am not going to restate what Pat Buchanan has said, but I will say to my own side many times: Why do you sit idly by when you complain about Mr. Obama and spending, spending, and we have already spent $1.5 trillion in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we are still spending money in Afghanistan?

We will for 10 more years because of a bilateral strategic agreement, but what we are trying to do today is to say that we are not going to make another mistake in Iraq.

That is why I am pleased to join with you today in this effort to make the American people aware that we do care. We want the American people to contact the Members of Congress and say join in this concurrent resolution, this privileged resolution, to bring a debate to the floor of the House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I look forward to a continued exchange on this issue with my colleague. I want to thank him for

his passion on this issue and for reminding not only our colleagues, but the American people that there are really consequences to war.

One of the things that has frustrated me is that, for too long, we have avoided talking about the wars in this Congress, not just Iraq, but also Afghanistan.

My colleague, Mr. JONES, and I had an amendment to the defense authorization bill a few weeks back, which said that President Obama had mentioned a couple of years ago that we would be out of Afghanistan by 2014. Clearly, that is not going to be the case.

The amendment said that the President had to notify Congress of what our military plans were going to be in Afghanistan and that Congress should consider that and vote up or down on whether we should continue our military involvement in Afghanistan.

That is hardly a radical bill. It is simply a bill that says: Congress do your job, you have an obligation—a constitutional obligation when it comes to war.

This amendment, which was germane, it was in order—on the defense bill, no less—at the last minute, we were told we could not offer it, it would not be made in order because the leadership of this House didn't want that debate, they were afraid it might pass.

Well, that is the way democracy is supposed to work. If a majority in this place does not want to continue an endless war in Afghanistan or does not want to start another war in Iraq, then that ought to mean something.

My criticism right now is not with the White House. I may have some disagreements with the President in terms of what his policy on Iraq might be, but he has done his job, he has notified us, he has sent letters up to Congress that have announced the deployments that he is making, and it says—consistent with the War Powers Resolution, so this is not a complaint about the White House. We may disagree with their policy, but they did what they were supposed to do.

Our complaint is with this institution, that we are not doing what we are supposed to do. The Foreign Affairs Committee, in consultation with other relevant committees, ought to bring a resolution to the floor if they want to authorize the use of additional force in Iraq.

I would vote ''no.'' There are some in this Chamber that would vote ''yes,'' but there ought to be a debate. We ought to go into any new deployment—any new military intervention with our eyes wide open. We have lived through enough deception. We have been lied to over the years too many times. It is time for us to demand some truth when it comes to war. People ought to know what we are getting into.

By the way, one other thing that has troubled me greatly about these wars that we have been involved with is that we don't pay for them. We all complain about the deficit and the debt, and we have to dig ourselves out of this hole of debt. Trillions of dollars of that debt are directly related to these wars. We don't pay for these wars. We put them on a credit card.

I offered a bill a few years ago calling for a war tax, saying that if we are going to go to war, then we ought to pay for it—the American people ought to pay for it, and if the American people don't want to pay for it, maybe we ought not go to war.

This notion of going to war and putting it on a credit card and making believe like it is not a big deal has to stop, has to stop. The first George Bush, when he went to war in Iraq when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait—I wasn't for that war, I wasn't in Congress then—but nonetheless, when he went to war, he got the cooperation of all the Arab states in the region to pitch in to pay for it.

What wasn't paid for, Congress paid for, but it wasn't added to our debt. Now, it has become commonplace, and we don't even question it.

There are huge costs to these wars, not only in terms of blood, but also in terms of treasure. We nitpick on this House floor over whether or not we are going to feed hungry children or make sure people have adequate housing.

We say we don't have enough money, but when it comes to these wars, the sky is the limit—whatever you want, you can get.

Here is the deal: I would argue with you that that money has not been spent wisely. Notwithstanding the incredible service of our men and women, we are in Afghanistan right now propping up one of the most corrupt governments in the world, in the world.

In Iraq, we are now reentering a situation where even our own administration is saying the Maliki government is lousy, and we obviously hate this extremist group called ISIL, so we are going right in the middle, and I worry that we are going to be target practice for both sides.

One other thing—the Iraqi Army, as I mentioned earlier, has been trained by the very best of American military personnel. They have the best equipment, they have the best weaponry you can imagine.

They outnumber, overwhelmingly, these extremist groups that are now attacking Iraq. We read in The Washington Post last week that commanders of the Iraqi Army in areas that come under fire decide to leave—they basically desert—and so do the troops.

If they are not willing to fight after all that we have sacrificed, why the hell are we going back in there and thinking of fighting this? Now, this is the beginning—this is the very beginning of our reentry.

As Mr. JONES and I have said, we hope that it doesn't go any further than this, but this is the time when we ought to have a debate about what might happen and what we are prepared to do.

I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. Mr. MCGOVERN, thank you very much.

I want to pick up on a few things you said just a few minutes ago.

Iraq is in total chaos. It is kind of ironic. In 1983—I found a photograph of Donald Rumsfeld who was a special envoy sent by President Reagan to thank Hussein for what he had done to try to defend Iraq against the Iranians.

That brings me to where we are today and why this resolution that you have sponsored is so important. I have the former Commandant of the Marine Corps who, for the last 6 years, has been my adviser on Afghanistan, simply because I don't have the military background, and he is a very dear friend of mine.

I emailed him a week ago and asked him:

> What do you think about all of these advisers going to Iraq, something you were just talking about?

He emailed me back and he said:

> We should not put boots on the ground.

He further stated:

> It is a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution, not more troops.

That is why, again, your resolution, and our resolution needs to be debated.

A couple of other points, very quickly—after I found out that I had been misled with the first war in Iraq, I contacted Lieutenant General Greg Newbold because he wrote an article for Time magazine. I want to read just a little bit of it very quickly.

General Greg Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 2000 to 2002 and describes himself as ''a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war''—Mr. MCGOVERN, unnecessary war.

He wrote an insightful editorial for Time in April 2006 titled, ''Why Iraq was a mistake.'' I want to share a paragraph from his article because it is so appropriate of what we are trying to do today and what we are trying to do with this resolution to force Congress to meet its constitutional responsibility about sending our young men and women to die.

> In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar anthem ''Won't Get Fooled Again.'' To us, its lyrics invoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.

He further stated:

> Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

We were fooled to go into Iraq.

I am with you. I know Mr. Obama came out against the Iraq war—and I want to thank him for doing that—when he was a Senator, but you are right, it is not the administration we are talking about today. It is the role of Congress and our lack of fulfilling our constitutional duty.

One last point, very quickly—four weeks ago, I went to Walter Reed hospital. I was told that two marines from Camp Lejeune in my district had been severely wounded, so I went to Walter Reed hospital.

As I go into the area where they teach them how to walk without legs, on prosthesis—they teach them how to use the artificial limbs to pick up a spoon—I met three Army guys from Fort Bragg, which is not in my district, but in North Carolina. All three had lost one leg each, each one of them.

Then, Mr. MCGOVERN, when I went over to meet the young marine from Camp Lejeune, 23 years of age, and he is on what they call an exercise mat about 3 feet off the floor—he has lost both legs and an arm. I never will forget his father's eyes.

They were the saddest eyes I have ever seen on a man in my life. I saw pain. I saw worry. Here is his son, both legs gone and one arm gone, 23 years of age.

The second marine that I saw from Camp Lejeune had lost both legs by stepping on a 40-pound IED in Afghanistan.

The more that we have troops in Iraq, the longer they stay, there will be someone killed or wounded before it is over.

That is why your resolution—that is why it is necessary for my party, the Republican Party, to stop being the war party and being the party that wants to defend the Constitution. My party needs to allow us to have this debate that you have introduced.

As I leave, I want to thank you for giving me a little bit of this time today. I want to thank you for your friendship. I want to thank you for what you do for America. I want to thank you for what you do for our military. I want to thank you for what you are trying to do for the House of Representatives to say we have an obligation.

No kid should ever die again if the Congress is not willing to follow the Constitution and demand a declaration of war and have that debate and that vote, so I thank you so much for giving me this time, and may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks. I want to associate myself with every single word that he has said.

I believe deep down that the President of the United States does not want to get involved in another endless war in the Middle East, but sometimes things have a way of happening and sometimes things have a way of spinning out of control, and that is why this debate is so important and so timely now.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war has already claimed 4,500 American lives. 4,500 Americans have already been killed in the Iraq war. According to one study, over 500,000 Iraqis have also perished over the past decade of war. The UNHCR states that over 1 million additional people have been displaced in Iraq this year alone.

Linda Blimes, an expert in public finance at Harvard University, estimates that the total cost of the Iraq war for the United States will be $4 trillion when we take into account the long-term costs of health care and benefits for the veterans of that war.

The human and financial costs for us and for the Iraqis have been severe.

Let me just quote a few experts on military and foreign policy about this possibility of reentering the Iraq civil conflict.

Gordon Adams, a former senior White House budget official, said in mid-June:

> What is happening in Iraq right now is both a cautionary tale and an unfolding tragedy. The caution is about the blithe American assumption that the United States is omnipotent, and that with enough money, goodwill, expertise, equipment and training, Americans can build foreign forces and bring security to troubled areas around the world. The tragedy is that what the U.S. does, and has done, leads down the road to failure.

Retired U.S. Army Lieutenant General Robert Gard, Jr., stated, on July 6:

> The collapse of the Iraqi Army was not due to a shortage of trained Iraqi troops or the inferiority in firepower or equipment. The case was their lack of confidence in, and commitment to, Iraqi national institutions and leadership, both military commanders and political authorities. This intangible but essential element in combat effectiveness depends upon legitimate governance, not admonitions from foreign military advisers.

Retired General Barry McCaffrey, on June 12, said:

> At the end of the day, if your army won't fight, it's because they don't trust their incompetence, corrupt generals, they don't trust each other. This is an enduring civil war between the Shi'a, the Sunni, and the Kurds. So I don't think we've got any options, and we'd be ill-advised to start bombing where we really can't sort out the combatants or understand where the civilian population is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the United States should be involving itself militarily in a civil war, a sectarian war, a religious war, a struggle for power that has been going on for generations. We shouldn't be taking sides in this conflict.

I do believe that a region in turmoil is not in the best interest of the United States. But as so many have said, including the President, this requires a political solution and it requires the political will of all the key actors in the region, not just outside actors like the United States and the Europeans, but those in the region. The countries and leaders in the region need to step up to the plate and actually lead on finding a political solution or watch their neighbors go up in flames and hope the fire doesn't jump to their homes and destroy them as well.

This is why we need a full debate on what is happening in Iraq, in the region, what our options are, and whether or not we should keep sending troops to Iraq or not.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the bipartisan Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I cochair with my good friend Congressman FRANK WOLF, held a briefing on the human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq. We had witnesses from the administration, the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees Office, and several NGOs.

The situation on the ground in Iraq that they described is horrifying, but it stretches back over a year. The human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq did not begin with ISIL coming back into Iraq, but that certainly has worsened and accelerated the decline in security, protection, and basic rights for the civilian population.

Yesterday, Antonio Guterres, the head of UNHCR said:

> There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions.

He urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this is where we should be putting our energy, not trying to find some sort of military path to civility in Iraq, because there is none.

I will enter into the RECORD today's Washington Post article on UNHCR's assessment of the humanitarian crisis in Iraq.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 2014]

REFUGEE CHIEF URGES POLITICAL DEAL IN IRAQ

(By Abigail Hauslohner)

BAGHDAD—The head of the U.N. refugee agency said Wednesday that he was increasingly frustrated with Iraq's skyrocketing number of displaced people—and with governments worldwide that expect humanitarian aid organizations to ''come clean up the mess.''

''There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. There is no humanitarian solution for the Syrian crisis,'' António Guterres, the U.N. high commissioner for refugees, said in a closed briefing with reporters here in the Iraqi capital.

''It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions,'' he said.

Iraq's Political factions are negotiating the key positions in a new government that they hope will guide this fractured nation out of its worst crisis since U.S. troops pulled out in late 2011.

In recent weeks, Iraq has come dangerously close to breaking apart as Sunni militants calling themselves the Islamic State have seized control of a vast swath of territory stretching from Syria to central Iraq.

The Shiite-led government has fought back with the help of militias, raising the specter of sectarian war as violence—including airstrikes, bombings, and executions of Shiites by Sunnis and vice versa—racks many parts of the country.

Iraqi Kurds, meanwhile, are pressing for a referendum on independence in their largely autonomous—and relatively stable—region in the north.

On Wednesday, Guterres urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

He said about 1.1 million Iraqis have been displaced since the start of the year, when serious violence first broke out between government forces and Sunni insurgents in the western province of Anbar.

At least half a million have fled their homes in the past five weeks alone, Guterres added.

During his weekly televised address Wednesday, embattled Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki congratulated the Iraqi parliament on electing a new speaker. The vote Tuesday was a crucial step toward forming the desperately needed new government.

''I hope that they will work in harmony and to agree on running the parliament . . . away from all differences and calculations,'' Maliki said, according to the Associated Press.

But the parliament still needs to vote on a president and a prime minister. Maliki is facing growing pressure to step down, and his reluctance to do so has been the main cause of Iraq's political deadlock.

In his address Wednesday, however, he did not comment on whether he would seek a third term.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have come to this floor because we are worried. We are worried because we have lived through the last many years of war and we have seen how things have gotten out of control.

I remember when the war in Iraq began. Then-Vice President Cheney was on all the news shows saying that it will be over in a few weeks or few months. No big deal. Don't worry. That was in addition to being told that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, which we all know now was a lie.

But the fact of the matter is all those rosy predictions did not come true. We were involved in Iraq for many, many years, and there was a high cost in terms of blood and treasure. Afghanistan, we were told that it would not be an endless conflict, and here we are today still involved in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

I hope that history doesn't repeat itself, and I know President Obama does not want history to repeat itself. I know he deeply wants to find a political solution. I know he does not want to see more troops be involved in the Iraqi civil war, but the fact of the matter is none of us know what is going to happen.

In a couple of weeks, this Congress will adjourn for several weeks of our summer break, and then we come back for only a couple more weeks and we adjourn again for many more weeks for the campaigns. I don't want to come back to a situation and have to react to a situation that is engulfed in an all-out mess, quite frankly.

I think we ought to be debating these issues now. We ought to be debating these issues with open eyes. We ought to have a transparent system, and we ought to live up to our constitutional responsibilities.

What happens when there are the first American casualties in Iraq? What happens? What is the reaction?

Some say maybe we don't have to send military troops; maybe we will just bomb them. We will send drones. We will send missiles.

As military expert Micah Zenko tweeted:

Unless the U.S. has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into Prime Minister Maliki, air strikes in Iraq would be pointless.

And imagine the civilian casualties that would be associated with that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Earlier, you made a statement about there being no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I would respectfully ask the gentleman to maybe rephrase that. There are mass graves in Iraq. As somebody who——

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

The Vice President of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of State came to Congress and told us there were weapons of mass destruction, implied there were nuclear weapons of mass destruction. And the deal was, it was a lie.

4,500 Americans died; 5,000 Iraqis died. We need to pay for the war. We didn't pay for the war. The brave men and women who served our country paid, their families paid, and the rest of us were asked to do nothing.

What I am suggesting to everybody in this Chamber now, whether you want to go back into Iraq or not, that is almost beside the point for the purpose of this debate. The issue is we ought to do our job in Congress. We have a constitutional responsibility that we seem to waive, that we seem to ignore.

We are bombing in Pakistan. We are bombing in Yemen. We had a military incursion in Libya. None of that was authorized by Congress. We are relying on these vague AUMFs that were negotiated over a decade ago to justify more military involvements in different parts of the world. What is wrong with debating these issues?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. You have tens of thousands of people in mass graves as a result of chemical weapons in Iraq, killed directly by the regime of Saddam Hussein. When you continue to perpetuate this idea that there were no weapons of mass destruction, WMD includes chemical weapons, biological weapons.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, as the gentleman knows, that is not what the Vice President or the Secretary of State or the head of the National Security Council or the President of the United States were talking about. He knows that.

What was presented to us was not truthful. It was not truthful. We were deceived. The Vice President of the United States said the war was only going to last a couple of months. He said that on TV, on news shows. That was a lie. It was a lie, and I am sick and tired of being lied to.

One of the lessons that I think we should have learned from our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan is that we need to ask the tough questions before we get involved—not in the midst of a conflict, not later on in the conflict.

We have a responsibility. Read the Constitution of the United States. The notion that the President of the United States—and, again, I don't believe he wants to get involved in a lengthy, unlimited, endless war in Iraq. But there is the notion that we are ramping up the number of troops, and those in Congress here are saying nothing. The leadership in this Congress says nothing. There is no authorization.

I guess it is easy to sit back as an elected official and not have to vote years from now. It is a lot easier. You don't have to take responsibility. If things go well, you can say, ''Hey, that was a good idea.'' If things don't go well, ''Gee, I would have been opposed to that.'' But we are not doing our job here. We are not even paying for these wars.

To my friends on the Republican side who complain about debt, where is the outrage on the fact that we don't even pay for these wars? I can't quite understand why people approach war in this Chamber with such indifference.

My colleague Mr. JONES and I tried to bring an amendment to the floor, as I said earlier, to debate whether we should stay in Afghanistan longer. We were not even allowed a vote. The amendment we offered was germane, was relevant, and the leadership of this House said you can't even debate or vote this.

The defense bill. We are at war. What can be more important than debating whether we should be involved in this war?

So this is the time. What Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and I are saying is that this is the time to debate this, before the first soldier comes home in a body bag.

The major proponents of a new war in Iraq are those who disastrously got us involved in the first place; people like Dick Cheney and John Bolton, Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM.

We were deceived, and we should never let that happen again. We should never let that happen again. We should demand the truth. Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq again.

That is what this privileged resolution that Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have suggested that we vote on. I don't know why that is such a controversial issue, but for some reason in this Congress big issues like that don't ever seem to make their way for debate on the House floor.

This should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. In fact, there are Democrats who disagree with my position. There are some Democrats who believe we ought to continue to send more military aid and potentially more troops to Iraq, and there are Republicans who agree with me that we ought not to. So this is a bipartisan concern.

□ 1430

I will close by simply saying to the Speaker of the House: Give us a vote. Let us debate this issue.

To my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle: Live up to your constitutional responsibility. Demand a vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROVIDING FOR THE CORRECTION OF THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5021

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the Special Order of Mr. MCGOVERN). Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5021) an Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: At the end, add the following and conform the table of contents accordingly:

"TITLE III—TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES

"SEC. 3001. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

''(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by 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 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

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

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING LOUIS THEODORE GETTERMAN, JR.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, our Nation lost Louis Theodore Getterman, Jr., a veteran, a successful businessman, a dedicated philanthropist, and a legend at Baylor University.

Lovingly known by all as Ted Getterman, he was born on October 1, 1924, in Baltimore, Maryland, and later moved to Waco, Texas, to attend Baylor University and to eventually become an active community leader.

Ted Getterman lived his entire life with excellence. At the age of 18, he volunteered for the Army, and served our Nation for 3½ years during World War II. He was on the beach with his fellow soldiers, preparing to invade Japan, when the atomic bomb was dropped, thus ending the war. Upon his return, he attended Baylor University, where he received both his BBA and J.D. degrees.

Ted Getterman was very dedicated to his alma mater, Baylor University. He upheld the university's mission well—to educate men and women for worldwide leadership and service by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment within a caring community. He was active in various Baylor organizations, and was an honorary member of the Baylor ''B'' Association. Ted was also awarded with the Baylor Athletic Director's Hall of Honor Achievement Award, the Victory with Integrity Award, and the Baylor Founder's Medal. He was also a fellow in the Golden Bear Circle. He was even recognized as a Distinguished Alumnus by the Baylor Hankamer School of Business. The Baylor softball field was even named in his family's honor—Getterman Stadium.

In addition to his love for his university, Ted Getterman was also successful and active as a businessman. He was a partner of the Seven-Up Bottling Company, which owned franchises in 29 Texas counties and bottling plants in the Texas cities of Waco, Bryan, and Austin. Ted also served in the leadership of various business organizations, including having been the chairman of his chapter of the Texas Manufacturers Association and the president of the State Bottlers Association.

As an active community leader, Ted Getterman served on the Waco City Council, and was the mayor of Waco for two terms. He also served tirelessly on various boards and organizations, including the Waco Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club of Waco, the Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center, the Salvation Army, the Family Counseling and Children's Services, the Baylor Stadium Corporation, the Bear Club, the Baylor Development Council, the Ridgewood Country Club, and the McDonald Observatory of Texas. In fact, Ted was named the Philanthropist of the Year by the Central Texas Chapter of Fund-Raising Executives.

Ted Getterman was a hardworking man who also enjoyed his leisure time with family, friends, and his rescue dog, Noodle. He enjoyed traveling, golfing, and working out at the Ted and Sue Getterman Wellness Center. He was a faithful husband to his loving wife, Sue; a mentoring father to his sons, ''T'' and Holt; and an inspiration to his numerous grandchildren and great grandchildren.

When I was growing up, my dad used to always tell me the same thing each day. Those words were: ''Go make a hand.'' In other words, he was telling me to add value, to make the world a better place. I think all of us in the 17th Congressional District of Texas can unanimously say without reservation that Ted Getterman made a hand.

Before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women, and for our first responders, who serve selflessly to keep us safe and free.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Ted Getterman's. He will be forever remembered as selfless, hardworking, and devoted man of God. He left a legacy of love, dignity, grace, and philanthropy. God bless his family and our community as we mourn his passing.

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

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a festival of charts with me, not because they are pretty, not because they are attractive, but because I have something very important I want to talk about today, and I just can't do it without the direct quotes. I want to talk about the separation of powers.

If you will remember the conversation that the gentleman from Massachusetts had—he was down here on the floor with the gentleman from North Carolina—they were talking about constitutional powers. They were talking about what we need to do in this body to fulfill our constitutional powers. It is hard. I don't envy them at all, Mr. Speaker. I come down here, and folks at home always ask about this time at the end of the day.

They say, What goes on in that time?

I say, Well, they yield time for long periods, about an hour at a time. They will yield Members time to come down here and debate the issues of their choice, but your job of sitting there as the impartial observer while anybody says ''goodness knows what'' down here on the House floor is a hard, hard job—a hard job.

I didn't want to come down here today and try to come up with something that was divisive, that would try to get you out of your chair, that would try to bring your gavel down on me. I wanted to come up with something today that would be something that we could agree on as a people.

Now think about that.

I don't know what your understanding is, Mr. Speaker, of who we are

as a people. I was just visiting with some young constituents out in the hallway—ages 6, ages 8, ages 10. What does it mean to be an American? It is a set of ideas. It is a set of values. It is a set of principles. Now, most of those principles, I would argue, are contained in our United States Constitution. It is a pretty simple document. It lays out a vision, a vision that has governed this country well for over 200 years.

Sadly—and I mean, sincerely, I do think it is sad—we have crafted a resolution up in the Rules Committee—and we just had a hearing on it this week—where we are suing the President of the United States over his adherence to the Constitution. Now, I take absolutely no pleasure in that. To be fair, as folks back in their offices know, Mr. Speaker, I am a hardcore Republican from the State of Georgia, but I take no pleasure in suing the President of the United States.

I take no pleasure in it because I represent the article I United States Congress. It is not my power that is in my voting card. It is the power of 650,000 constituents back home in Georgia. It is the people's power that is represented in my voting card. I will tell you that, not just during the time you have been here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and not just during the 3 years that I have been here in Congress, but for a long period of time, the people's power that is represented here in this institution has been slipping and sliding right down Pennsylvania Avenue, behind me, and accumulating in the United States White House. Administrations, both Republicans and Democrats, have been taking one fiber of freedom—one fiber of power at a time—from the people, taking it from the Congress and amassing it down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The reason I say I take no pleasure in the lawsuit, Mr. Speaker, is that I don't want to have to go across the street to the Supreme Court and ask a coequal branch of government—those article III courts—to return to me the people's power that I lost. I should have never lost it to begin with. Now, I wasn't here in Congress when so much of that was going on, Mr. Speaker. You know it has only been 3 years that I have had a voting card, but I feel responsible. Here is what the resolution says:

> Resolve: that the Speaker—the Speaker of the House—may initiate or intervene in one or more civil actions on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives in Federal court.

It is saying that we have experienced institutional harm in article I. In article I in the House, we have experienced institutional harm. It authorizes the Speaker to file suit not on his behalf but on our behalf. He is not the Speaker of the Republicans. He is not the Speaker of the Democrats. He is the Speaker of the whole House. It is to file suit on our behalf, and it is a suit on the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. If you have not had a chance to see this resolution, you are thinking, Oh, boy. Here go those Republicans again. They are just filing one more lawsuit to try to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Not true. Not true. This is a lawsuit to require the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

I want you to think about that. That is why we are in this constitutional crisis.

I didn't want the Affordable Care Act. I wasn't here at the time. I didn't have a chance to vote for it. I knew I wasn't going to be able to keep my doctor. I knew I wasn't going to be able to keep my insurance policy. I knew that, if we wanted to take care of the needs of the uninsured, there were better ways, but I didn't get a chance to vote. I wasn't here. The Senate passed it. It got jammed through the House. The President signed it. It turns out it didn't quite work the way the President wanted it to.

So what does he do? He started to implement some of it, and decided not to implement other parts of it.

You don't get to do that.

We have an article I Congress. We pass the law. The President gets to sign it or veto it. The courts decide whether or not it is constitutional. Presidents don't get to decide which laws they like, which laws they don't like, which lines they want to implement, which lines they don't. So this is a lawsuit to require the President to follow the law that he signed.

I wish we would repeal the law. It turns out—and it has been said many times by leaders in this country—that the best way to do away with a bad law is to require its aggressive enforcement. I want you to think about that. The best way to end a bad law is to require its strict enforcement because then the people will make that decision.

I don't mean to pick on the President. Again, the President has a hard job. I was with my mom on Mother's Day at church, Mr. Speaker.

Someone came up, and said, Oh, Ms. Woodall, we just love your son. We hope he will think about running for the White House one day.

My mom looked him in the eye, and said, That is a terrible thing to say about my son.

And it is. It is just awful. It is an awful job, and I am glad we have men and women who are willing to pursue it, but it must be pursued, not as an all powerful executive, but as a caretaker of the constitutional responsibilities invested in that position by article II of our Constitution. Not more than 30 days ago the Supreme Court ruled on that.

This is what I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker. I know you followed the Noel Canning decision, but what the Supreme Court said in a case called Noel Canning v. NLRB not more than 30 days ago—and just to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, you have looked at that Court, haven't you? I mean, there are some hardcore, rock-ribbed conservatives on that Court, and there are some fringe liberals on that Court, too. I suppose, if I were in the other category, I would say there were fringe conservatives and some rock-ribbed liberals. Yet what I am saying is that they don't agree on much in that Chamber. You see it over and over and over again the decisions that come out of there. It is that five of them believe this and that four of them believe that. It is a divided Court, a divided opinion, but not so when it comes to the United States Constitution in this Noel Canning case.

In the Noel Canning case, the Court ruled 9–0—the Court ruled unanimously, Mr. Speaker—that the President of the United States exceeded his constitutional authority in making appointments to positions without consulting the United States Senate. The President made appointments to positions that the Constitution requires that the Senate approve, that the Democratic Senate approve. He made those appointments without Senate approval. He said he thought he could do it. He said it was the right thing to do. He said the ends justified the means. The Supreme Court said, 9–0, no, he can't do it. The Constitution doesn't allow it.

But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker.

The point is that that happened 2 years ago. The President made these appointments 2 years ago, and you have not heard one peep out of that United States Senate. This wasn't a lawsuit that the Senate brought to say, Wait a minute, Mr. President. You are stealing the power of the people out from under article I on Capitol Hill. This wasn't a Senate lawsuit. This was a private sector lawsuit. This was just some company out there across America that said, I have been disadvantaged because the Constitution has been breached, and I am seeking relief from the United States Supreme Court. The Senate did not stand up when the President stole their power.

□ 1445

The only way our system of government works, Mr. Speaker, is when we stand up for the people to preserve their power here in this institution.

This is what the Court said, and I just so identify with this. They said the Recess Appointments Clause—that is what we are talking about.

That was where the President said: I am going to make these appointments because the Senate is not in session. The Senate said: yes, I am in session. The President said: no, you are not, you are mistaken, I am going to make these appointments.

Anyway, the Supreme Court said the Recess Appointments Clause 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 is the money line, Mr. Speaker: ''Here, as in other contexts, friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.''

I happen to have a copy of the Constitution right here, Mr. Speaker. Friction, the Supreme Court says, is ''an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.'' If you don't like friction, you need to rewrite your Constitution because the Constitution creates this friction to create that balance between the article I Congress, the article II executive, the article III courts.

This is not news to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is not news to the country at all.

This is George Washington's farewell address. It was 1796, Mr. Speaker, 1796. This is our unwilling President. President Washington didn't want to be our first President. He was drafted to do the job.

Turns out, some of the best Presidents are the ones who don't want the job, but who have it thrust upon them by the circumstances of history.

President Washington says this—farewell address, 1796, he said:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another.

President George Washington, having fought that Revolutionary War, having given us the benefit that no other nation on the planet had, of self-governance, having been drafted into service after the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to serve as the first President of the United States—in his parting words, in the final wisdom that he tries to pass on to preserve this fledgling Nation that he pledged his life and his fortune to create, he said, it is important, in the habits of thinking in a free country, that those habits should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker, where we are today, where the Supreme Court is ruling unanimously that this President of the United States has overstepped his constitutional bounds, where the House of Representatives is considering a lawsuit against the President of the United States for even more overreaching of his constitutional authority.

From the very beginning of this Nation, our leaders knew that the Nation's success depended on confining each branch of government to its respective constitutional sphere.

Now, I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. You are thinking that was 1797, things change.

Well, let's take a look and see. Here is a quote from Senator Barack Obama, 2007. Senator Barack Obama, 2007, says this—he says: I was a constitutional law professor, which means, unlike the current President, I actually respect the Constitution.

That is pretty powerful. Now, in fairness, there were Presidential campaigns beginning then. People sometimes say inflammatory things during campaigns that they later regret saying, but then-Senator Barack Obama said: This current President, George Bush, he doesn't respect the Constitution. Maybe he doesn't understand it; but I, President Obama, said—then-Senator Obama said: I am a constitutional professor. I understand it. I get it, and I respect it.

Not so, says the Supreme Court this summer, 9–0, that the President overstepped his constitutional bounds. I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. You are saying you have been around this town for a short period of time, and you know how people game these quotes. They go out and they pull the most awful quote out, and they pretend that that represents someone's entire body of thought.

Well, I have gone much further. Here, again, Senator Barack Obama, 2007: These last few years, we have seen an unacceptable abuse of power here at home in America.

He said: We have paid a heavy price for having a President whose priority is expanding his own power. The constitution is treated like a nuisance.

I want to think about that, Mr. Speaker, because I want to come back to that.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, observing what happened in the Bush administration, says: We have paid a heavy price for having a President whose priority is expanding his own power. The Constitution is treated like a nuisance.

Now, what I hope the take-home message is, Mr. Speaker, that you will share with your constituents back home, that I certainly share with mine, is we have just had a debate over constitutional responsibility on the floor of the House, where both our Democratic friend from Massachusetts and our Republican friend from North Carolina both agreed that we need to stand up more for our article I powers.

I want to associate myself with the comments of Senator Barack Obama in 2007. Had Republicans done a better job—and, again, I wasn't in Congress at the time. You weren't in Congress at the time, Mr. Speaker—had Republicans done a better job reining in the overreach of then-President Bush, we wouldn't be having so many of these conversations today.

Something very destructive is happening in this country, very destructive, where Republicans prioritize protecting Republicans in the White House more than they prioritize protecting the Constitution, where Democrats prioritize protecting the Democrats in the White House more than they prioritize protecting the Constitution.

I don't know how that happened. We had giants in this institution, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the aisle—both sides of the aisle.

Robert Byrd from West Virginia always comes to mind. I couldn't agree with him on many policy issues, but, boy, did I love his affection for the United States of America. Man alive, did I admire his commitment to the Constitution.

The thing of it is, Mr. Speaker, if we don't stand up for it, no one else will. President Obama said he was going to stand up for it. He said we had paid a heavy price under President Bush for treating the Constitution as a nuisance.

Let me go a little more current. President Obama, at a press conference, August 13 of 2013, he is talking about the Affordable Care Act. He is talking about that bill on which the House is getting ready to file a lawsuit.

This is exactly what he said: In a normal political environment—President Obama said—it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker and say, you know what? This is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law.

He is talking about delaying the employer mandate. He is talking about taking that part of the law that says this must happen by this date and deciding it is not going to happen by that date. In fact, it might not happen at all, but it is certainly not going to happen this year.

He says, ordinarily, he would have just called up the Speaker and said, We need to tweak this. He says, Let's make a technical change to the law, would be what he would ordinarily tell the Speaker. He said that would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we are not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare.

We had the executive authority to do what we did, and so we did so.

Our President who, as a Senator, recognized the erosion of power from article I, our President who, as a Senator, wanted to rein in what George Bush was doing—in fact, accused George Bush of considering the Constitution a nuisance, our President, when then a Senator, said he was a constitutional law professor, he understood the nuances of the Constitution.

When he became President, Mr. Speaker, he said: you know what? I understand that what is supposed to happen is that I am supposed to go to Capitol Hill, I am supposed to talk to the Speaker, and I am supposed to get the law changed—but these aren't ordinary times. These aren't times like last year or 2 years ago or 10 years ago or 200 years ago. These are special times, and in these special times, I am just going to do it myself from the White House.

Incredibly dangerous, incredibly dangerous—he could be right, he could be 100 percent right about what he wants to do, but the way he wants to do it is 100 percent wrong.

Don't believe me, listen to the Supreme Court, which said, 9–0, unanimously, the President has overstepped his bounds.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, Mr. Speaker: I taught constitutional law for 10 years, I take the Constitution very seriously.

This is 2008. There is a war ongoing. The economy is collapsing, America is in crisis, and this is what then-Senator Barack Obama says: The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with George Bush trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker. 2008, in the midst of crisis in this country, a Presidential election year, where candidates are telling the American people who they are, what they believe, and what the American people can count on them to do if elected to office.

Looking at that landscape of crisis in this country, President Obama—then-Senator Obama says: The biggest problem that we are facing right now has to do with George Bush trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all.

Here is the money line, Mr. Speaker: That is what I intend to reverse when I am President of the United States of America.

This body is getting ready to file a lawsuit, unprecedented, against the President of the United States for failure to stay within his constitutional lane.

The lawsuits filed by the private sector are coming back from the Supreme Court, 9–0, that the President has exceeded his constitutional lane. He ran on a platform of Presidents are exceeding their constitutional lanes and it is destroying the country. It is among the biggest problems the Nation faces. He pledges to reform it.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, in the 40 years that I have been watching the governance of this Nation, I have never seen it any worse, but to be clear, I have seen it bad. I have seen it bad, and I have seen the failure of this House to stop it. I have seen the failure of the Senate to stop it.

There is plenty of blame to go around. I am not interested in who to blame for it, I am interested in how to solve it, because here is the question that I think all the board of directors of America has to answer.

Now, I gesture to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, as if the board of directors live here. They do not. The board of directors of the United States of America lives at home in Peachtree Corners, Georgia; in Lawrenceville, Georgia; they live in Poughkeepsie; they live in L.A.; they live in New York; they live in Sioux City; they live in New Orleans; they live all across this land.

The board of directors are those people with voter registration cards in their pocket. They are the ones who run this country. They are the ones to whom we are accountable.

The President knows—he knew it when he was in the Senate, he knew when he began his campaign for office, he knew what George Washington told us in his farewell address, which was only a reverence for the division of powers crafted by the Constitution will allow our country to be strong.

He knew it, he campaigned on it, and the pressures of the job—the pressures of this horrible, horrible job, I will tell you, that is President of the United States, have caused him to lose sight of that constitutional mooring; and we, the board of directors, must bring him back.

Now, we are going to try to do it through a lawsuit here in the U.S. House. The private sector has already done it through multiple lawsuits, through the Supreme Court.

The American people need to do it—not at the ballot box because this President will never seek election again. They need to do it through the court of public opinion.

□ 1500

Getting our goals accomplished is important. How we get those goals accomplished may be even more.

Senator Barack Obama in 2008: One of the most important jobs of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch on the power of the other branches. And I think the Chief Justice has been a little bit too willing and eager to give the administration—then the Bush administration—whether it's mine or George Bush's, more power than I think the Constitution originally intended.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is an election year. This is 2008. The President is running to be the President of the United States. He is being asked about what that separation of powers means. He is being asked whether or not the Constitution matters. He is being asked, how do we continue this great experiment in self-governance that is the United States of America? And he says: One of the most important jobs of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch on the power of the other branches.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen to what is coming out of this White House when we talk about this lawsuit the House is considering filing. Is this what you hear? Is what you hear from President Barack Obama in 2014 the same thing you heard from him as candidate-for-President Barack Obama in 2008?

The most important job of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch?

That is all this House is asking the Court to decide.

And we didn't choose a controversial issue, one that we might disagree with the President on, on whether or not it should be implemented. We chose his own health care bill to say: Mr. President, I know you are proud of this health care bill, and so let's do it. Let's implement it. Let's not pick and choose. Let's do the whole thing exactly the way you signed it, exactly the way the House and Senate passed it. Let's do it that way. You don't get to make those decisions on your own.

The President knew that as a Senator. In fact, he criticizes the Supreme Court. In the same way that today, what I hear coming out of the White House is a criticism of the U.S. House for even going to the Court to try to chasten the President, when he was a Senator, he goes the other direction. He says: I think the Chief Justice has been a little bit too willing and eager to give the administration, whether it's mine or George Bush's, more power than I think the Constitution originally intended.

There is a lot of pressure to get your agenda accomplished. It is not just a Capitol Hill thing. It is not a White House thing. It is a life thing. We have been talking about that since we were kids, Mr. Speaker.

Do the ends justify the means? Does the process matter? I will tell you, if you have a broken process, you are going to end up with a broken product.

We have an opportunity in this Chamber to do exactly what then-Senator Obama asked us to do, which is to stand up for this division of power.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 2008, he says this about the division of power. He does understand it. At least in 2008, he got it. This is what he said. He said: Everybody's got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation, and the President can veto it or sign it. But what George Bush has been doing, as a part of his effort to accumulate more power in the Presidency, is he has been saying, Well, I can basically change what Congress passed by attaching a letter that says I don't agree with this part or that part. He says: What President Bush is doing is saying, I am going to choose to interpret it this way or that way.

But then-Senator Barack Obama goes on to say that is not part of the President's power. He says: This is part of the whole theory of George Bush, that he can make up the law as he goes along. Then-Senator Barack Obama says: I disagree with that.

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter whether you are the most liberal Democrat in this country or the most conservative Republican or anybody in between. There is no question that there is picking and choosing going on in the implementation of laws in this country: I am going to enforce this law because I like it; I am going to ignore this law because I don't like it; I am going to change this law because I would like it better if only it had this instead of that.

The lawsuit this institution is proposing is not to settle any kind of policy dispute; it is to settle a process dispute. It is to say, whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it passed the Senate; whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it passed the House; whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it was

signed into law by the President of the United States and upheld by the Supreme Court; so let's enforce it. Let's enforce it. Let's do what it says. If it says these policies should be outlawed, let's outlaw them. You don't get to choose which ones you think should and shouldn't be outlawed. The law, itself, says outlaw them. No policy shall be sold after this date.

If you believe that the protections of the Affordable Care Act—I don't call them protections. They have done more to destroy health insurance in my district than to protect the uninsured in my district. But if you believe those protections are important for America, implement those. Implement those.

You saw the chaos that was caused in the individual market when that one set was implemented. No more deadlines have been implemented since that time.

The President said: You know what? That wasn't quite what I had intended. It wasn't supposed to work out that way. He says: In ordinary times, I would have gone to the U.S. House of Representatives. I would have called the Speaker. I would have said let's work together to change the law. But these are not ordinary times, so I am going to change it myself, as the Executive of the United States.

You won't find those powers in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker. You won't find them here. You will find a long history of Senators and House Members saying: Mr. President, you can't do that; you will find a long history of the Supreme Court saying: You can't do that; and you will find, in the case of this President in particular, because he had decades as a constitutional scholar, you will find speech after speech, you will find quote after quote, you will find article after article that say to the then-President of the United States, George Bush: Stay in your constitutional lane. Obey that simple document that is our United States Constitution. If you want something done, go to the Congress to get it done. Do not do it by yourself in the White House. Don't pick up your pen. Don't pick up your phone. Get in your car and drive down to the United States Congress.

And every single time then-Senator Barack Obama said that, he was right. And there were far too few Republicans in this Chamber, far too few Republicans in the Senate who stood up and agreed with him.

As Republicans, we had a war on our hands. The Nation was in crisis, a national security crisis. Terrorism was on our shores like we had never seen before. And we thought, you know what—and again, I wasn't here then. I can only imagine what was going on in this body. I can only imagine what those with voting cards were thinking. But I imagine they were thinking: I would hate to criticize my own President in these tough times for America. Maybe it would be better if I looked the other way. Maybe it would be better if I just turned my head just this once, irrespective of what the constitutional guidance requires.

If that was the thought of any man or woman in this Chamber, if that was the thought of any man or woman in the United States Senate, they were 100 percent wrong. I get it. I get how they could feel that way, but they were 100 percent wrong. And if any man or woman in this Chamber or in the United States Senate is thinking today, I must protect my President from the strictures of the Constitution, they are wrong.

The Constitution does not exist to protect the President. The Constitution exists to protect the people. The Constitution is not a document to make sure that government power is preserved. The Constitution is a document to make sure the people's power isn't abrogated. It is not easy.

I hope folks liked to see the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from North Carolina, gentlemen who disagree on so much about policy in this Chamber, gentlemen from different parts of the country, gentlemen from different parties down here agreeing on the constitutional role of this House when it comes to sending our young men and women into harm's way. They were exactly right.

We have to come together to do this, Mr. Speaker. And if we could come together to do this, a lawsuit wouldn't even be necessary.

Again, we used to have giants. We used to have giants in this institution who put the country first and the party a distant, distant second or third or fourth. We have got to bring those traditions back.

President Barack Obama, August 2013, an incredibly popular President sat for reelection, reelected to a second term by the American people. A constitutional scholar, having forewarned the American people for over a decade about the dangers of too much power involved in the executive branch, having warned the American people about the importance of including Congress, having told the Bush White House how absolute power cannot reside there, must have ideas originating from the U.S. House, says: In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to call the Speaker and say, You know what, let's tweak this legislation. That would be the normal thing, and that is what I would prefer to do, but I am not going to do it. We are not in a normal atmosphere around here, he says. I have executive authority, and I used it.

The funny thing about the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, folks always talk about their constitutional rights. They always talk about their constitutional rights. Sometimes the rights they are talking about really are constitutional; sometimes they are not. But the funny thing about this Constitution is it allows the President to do anything he or she wants to do until somebody stands up and says no.

The powers are in the Congress. The powers are in the courts. The Executive's role is to implement those rules, to implement those laws. But if no one stands up and says no, the largest branch in the country is the executive branch, and they continue to operate unfettered.

We don't have an opportunity to say no. We have an obligation to say no. Not to say no to this President, but to say no to the Office of the President. When these powers slip away, these powers that don't belong to this Chamber but belong to the American people, when they slip away, they are hard to get back.

We didn't have a revolution in this country because the executive wasn't powerful enough. We had a revolution in this country because the executive was all powerful, and we thought there was a better way.

The President, speech after speech, article after article, thought there was a better way. But the power of that office, perhaps the burdens of that office, the responsibility of that office, have brought a 180-degree change in the President's view of the Constitution. We are back to where he identified George Bush as being 8 years ago, where the Constitution is treated as a nuisance.

The Constitution is not a nuisance. The Constitution is the only thing standing between the American people and a complete seizure of their freedoms. This is that document.

I am going to end where I began, Mr. Speaker, with the Noel Canning decision, 9–0. The Supreme Court says President Barack Obama had no constitutional authority to do what he did—no constitutional authority. And what the Court observes is friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional form of government.

□ 1515

We can absolutely do away with the friction. We can absolutely get things done. We can absolutely move all the obstacles out of the way. But that would not be America. That would not be our constitutional form of government.

You cannot eliminate the friction without eliminating the Constitution. There is not a constituent in my district back home that would make that choice. We have to embrace the friction. We have to embrace the battles of ideas that is America, and we have to commit ourselves—even when it is inconvenient—to playing by the rules of the United States Constitution. It has protected our freedoms as a self-governing people for 200 years, and it can do it for another 200 years if we don't lose track of our obligation to protect it today.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for being down here with me today, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2244. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of Ohio Army National Guard duty in Columbus, Ohio.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 17, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 697. To provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 18, 2014, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9913-18] (RIN: 2070-AJ53) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6477. 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; Connecticut; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0919; A-1-FRL-9810-2] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6478. 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; Illinois; Latham Pool Adjusted Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0119; FRL-9912-19-Region 5] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6479. 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; Maryland; Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0310; FRL-9913-30-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6480. 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; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0649; FRL-9913-41-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Control of Commercial Fuel Oil Sulfur Limits for Combustion Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0241; FRL-9913-26-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6482. 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; West Virginia; Minor New Source Review [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0789; FRL-9913-42-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6483. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0715; FRL-9913-28-Region 10] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6484. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Flexible Permit Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0542; FRL-9913-48-Region 6] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6485. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Delaware, District of Columbia, and West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0475; FRL-9913-32-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0323; FRL-9913-12-Region 9] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6487. 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-2014-0166; FRL-9910-01] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6488. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Hawaiian Island Commercial Harbors, HI [USCG-2013-0021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6489. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Hudson River Swim for Life; Hudson River, Sleepy Hollow, New York [USCG-2014-0363] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6490. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lady Liberty Sharkfest Swim; Upper New York Bay, Liberty Island, NY [USCG-2014-0117] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6491. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Texas City Channel, Texas City, TX [USCG-2014-0034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6492. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV [USCG-2014-0402] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6493. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Arts Project Cherry Grove Pride Week Fireworks Display; Great South Bay; Cherry Grove, Fire Island, NY [USCG-2014-0180] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; July 4th Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Zone, Miami, FL [USCG-2014-0165] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6495. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0368; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-17851; AD 2014-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6496. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airplanes Originally Manufactured by Lockheed for the Military as Model P-3A and P3A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1073; Directorate Identifier

2012-NM-039-AD; Amendment 39-17856; AD 2014-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 645. Resolution requesting that the President of the United States transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Executive Office of the President that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, adversely; (Rept. 113–524). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 647. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, adversely; (Rept. 113–525). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit; with an amendment (Rept. 113–527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3202. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–528). Referred to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3136. A bill to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education; with an amendment (Rept. 113–529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4983. A bill to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4984. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3716. A bill to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4508. A bill to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services (Rept. 113–534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4527. A bill to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4562. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (Rept. 113–536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4315. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4316. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the disclosure of certain expenditures under that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–540, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4318 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5129. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed for custody and care in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5131. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical providers for the provision of certain hospital care and medical services to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to dispense with the requirement of providing assurance of payment for utility services under certain circumstances,; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5133. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 11 of the United States Code to improve protections for employees and retirees in municipal bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5134. A bill to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COOK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. REED, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 5135. A bill to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, 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 Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5136. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project under the Medicaid

program under title XIX of the Social Security Act under which payment may be made to States for expenditures for medical assistance with respect to substance use disorder treatment services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5137. A bill to modify the treatment of unaccompanied alien children who are in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Homeland Security, 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. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require consultation with State and local elected officials and a public hearing before awarding grants or contracts for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5139. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5140. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to enable a State to be reimbursed for child welfare training expenditures made by a nonprofit educational institution in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5141. A bill to reduce the amount of foreign assistance to Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador based on the number of unaccompanied alien children who are nationals or citizens of such countries and who in the preceding fiscal year are placed in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 5142. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Jackson Street in Rich Square, North Carolina, as the ''Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, 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. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 5144. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States which require individuals to present a photo identification as a condition of voting in elections for Federal office to accept a photo identification presented by a student which is issued by the school the student attends; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 5145. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5146. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 5147. A bill to provide certain uninsured individuals a special enrollment period after tax filing in 2015 for enrollment in qualified health plans offered through an Exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5148. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to exempt certain higher-risk mortgages from property appraisal requirements and to exempt individuals from penalties for failure to report certain appraisers, and to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to exempt certain higher-risk mortgages from property appraisal requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5149. A bill to provide for a smart water management pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5150. A bill to establish a WaterSense program within the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain information be included in loan disclosure statements prior to disbursement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5152. A bill to save the Federal Government money by reducing duplication and increasing efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Veterans' 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Act of September 16, 1922, to clarify the responsibility of Federal agencies to remove snow and ice for areas around Federal buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5154. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Administrator of General Services to make rules to streamline and simplify the registration system used by small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5155. A bill to prohibit the National Endowment for the Humanities to provide funds to carry out the Popular Romance Project or any similar project relating to love or romance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5156. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to identify and declare wildlife disease emergencies and to coordinate rapid response to these emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5157. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive certain requirements relating to the approval of programs of educations for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 5021; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. HIMES):

H. Res. 673. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 674. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that sedentary lifestyles are a public health issue and supporting the designation of a National Get Vertical Day to recognize the importance of preventing physical inactivity and

encouraging adults to live physically active lifestyles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 675. A resolution supporting the Constitutional authority of the Governors of the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to take action to secure the international border of the United States within their States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power ''To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.''

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 5134.

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. NOEM:

H.R. 5135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 5136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 5137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the US Constitution

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 5138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power to...provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States;

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 5140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. BURGESS:

H.R. 5141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law. and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: To Establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization;

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 5143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 5146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 5147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, ''The Congress shall have the Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof'

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5155.

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 Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 5156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. COBLE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 148: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 208: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 217: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 318: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 333: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 519: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 594: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 647: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 789: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 920: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 942: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 956: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1020: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1070: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1179: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1180: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1252: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1362: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1449: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1500: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1527: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1563: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1620: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1627: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1761: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1788: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1801: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1920: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2149: Mr. COOPER and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2283: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2366: Mr. HURT, Mr. BARR, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. REED, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2453: Mr. PERRY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr JOLLY, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 2500: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2510: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2523: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2529: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2536: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2591: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2673: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 2767: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2835: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2852: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2918: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3116: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3136: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3150: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3374: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3383: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3398: Ms. CHU, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3461: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3486: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3505: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3544: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3556: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3680: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3698: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3740: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3742: Mr. BARTON and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3930: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3999: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4041: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4060: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4086: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4119: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4148: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4156: Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4158: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4190: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4205: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4216: Mr. LOWENTHAL
H.R. 4238: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4271: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4294: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4301: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4336: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4361: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4426: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4432: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4437: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4450: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4521: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4525: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4531: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4576: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4613: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4680: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 4703: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4706: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4727: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4732: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4778: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4792: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 4805: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4857: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4885: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4888: Mr. HOLT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 4900: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4920: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4930: Mr. ROONEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4960: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4980: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4983: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 4984: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 4986: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4989: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 5018: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 5024: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5026: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 5033: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5041: Mr. COOK and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5052: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5054: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5078: Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5079: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 5081: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5083: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 5084: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5095: Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5111: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5113: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5114: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 5119: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COOK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 109: Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 208: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 231: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 281: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 456: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 522: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 612: Mr. YOHO.
H. Res. 644: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H. Res. 649: Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 665: Mr. LAMALFA.