United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 25, 2014 No. 118

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 28, 2014, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 2014

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 25, 2014.

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

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

PRAYER

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

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

Please hear our prayers for the Members of this assembly, upon whom the authority of government is given. Help them to understand the tremendous responsibility they have to represent both their constituencies and the people of this great Nation of ours.

This is a great but complex task. Grant them as well the gift of wisdom to sort through what competing interests might exist to work a solution that can serve all of the American people.

Finally, give each Member peace and equanimity, and give all Americans generosity of heart to understand that governance is not simple but difficult work, at times requiring sacrifice and forbearance.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

THE AMNESTY PRESIDENT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the border crisis continues with the influx of migrants, mostly Honduran teenagers. Rather than quickly reuniting recent migrants with their homeland, the President is considering giving them refugee status.

The amnesty President again is going to go his own way. Obviously, he doesn't understand the consequences of his newly proposed executive mandate made from behind the White House fences.

The migrants are coming to the United States illegally because the President has sent the word out far and wide that he will not enforce the border security laws.

The President of Honduras, whom I met with in January, said as much again yesterday. He said the minors are coming because the drug cartels, who smuggle the minors for a hefty fee, tell them that this President will let them stay in the United States.

So now Americans who are struggling to take care of their own families will be expected to permanently pay for the housing, education, and health care of these individuals.

The rule of law seems to be a mere suggestion to the amnesty President. This crisis—that is the President's doing—will just continue.

And that is just the way it is.

POVERTY SIMULATION

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Representatives BARBARA LEE, CHRIS GIBSON, RICHARD HUDSON, and I hosted a Poverty Simulation for Members of Congress and their staffs here on Capitol Hill. Run by Entergy and Catholic Charities USA, this poverty simulation provided a way for policymakers and their staffs to experience poverty in a new and different way.

This simulation allowed participants to experience firsthand what it is like to be poor in America. Far too often, we talk about poverty, but we don't understand it. Being poor is hard work. It is hard to figure out how to stretch your food dollar and get from home to school to work with limited transportation, for example, when you are poor and are living on a limited income.

This simulation is one step in understanding how we end hunger and poverty. We can't begin this fight if we can't come together as Republicans and Democrats, and simulations like this could prove to be the way we all start working together on this common goal.

THE ERADICATION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, Pope Francis has spoken about the conditions in Iraq for Christians.

Now His Grace Bishop Angaelos, General Bishop of the Coptic Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom, said the following today:

> As the widespread violence and aggression facing Christians and minority groups in Mosul, Iraq, intensifies, it is increasingly evident that the fundamental right and freedom to practice one's faith and belief is—and continues to be—grossly violated.
>
> We are currently witnessing an unacceptable widespread implementation of extremist religious ideology that threatens the lives of all Iraqis who do not fit within its ever-narrowing perspective. While this situation stands to eradicate centuries of coexistence and culture in the region, it also threatens to significantly and negatively impact these communities for generations to come. If left unchallenged, it is not Iraq alone that is at risk, but the potential is intensified for the replication of this ideology as a viable and legitimate model for others across the Middle East.

He then thanked the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies and its chairman, His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan bin Talal of Jordan, for expressing his concern about the current situation in Mosul.

Everyone—the President, the Congress, religious leaders—should speak out on the eradication of Christianity in the Middle East.

VETERANS' CARE AND CONGRESS' AUGUST RECESS

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge congressional leaders to keep the Senate and House in session and to forgo the August recess until both Chambers come together and pass compromise legislation to help our veterans get access to the timely and quality health care they have earned and deserve.

In light of the serious allegations of wrongdoing within the Department of Veterans Affairs, in addition to unacceptably long wait times at the VA medical facilities, it is urgent that a fix be put in place now.

Last month, both the Senate and House passed legislation that would expand veterans' ability to seek care at non-VA facilities under certain conditions, strengthen Congress' oversight of the VA, and eliminate performance-related bonuses for VA employees. Since then, the Conference Committee, tasked to work out a compromise between the two bills, has yet to do so.

I know I speak for many when I say the health of the veterans who have served us so bravely should not be placed on hold while Congress is away in August. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in calling on Congress to stay in session until we do right by our veterans.

PASSAGE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION 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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the National Defense Authorization Act and to call on Congress to come together and pass this important bill so that our troops have the support they need to succeed in the field and so that our military commanders and policymakers have the certainty they need to conduct our Nation's national security affairs.

This year's NDAA has already been voted on by the House, passing with bipartisan support.

In addition to keeping troops adequately equipped and trained, this year's legislation also includes a piece of legislation called the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members Act, or MEPS Act, which is a bill I introduced that will help our military move toward a more comprehensive and effective approach to suicide prevention and detection.

While our military has made great strides to address issues of mental illness, it is tragic events such as those at Fort Hood that remind us we must do better.

Madam Speaker, I am calling on the Senate to move forward on this legislation so that we can fulfill our commitment to those who serve in uniform. They deserve as much.

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, as a former State supreme court justice and now as the ranking Democrat on a subcommittee whose responsibilities include child well-being, I ask my colleagues to avoid the easy political path advanced by those who claim they would help vulnerable children by deporting them. We must say ''no'' to those who would hold up needed Homeland Security funding unless we agree to blame the victims—stripping these desperate children of their vital right to be heard.

Let's heed the good counsel of ABA President James R. Silkenat. He says:

> The U.S. finds itself at a critical crossroads. The American Bar Association has long recognized the special vulnerabilities of children. We oppose any diminution in the rights available to Central American children under the law. It is imperative that children's immigration cases be conducted in the presence of an adjudicator. In addition, added resources are needed to reform and bolster our system for immigration adjudication, a system that has been severely short-funded for many years.

Shortcutting justice for children cuts short justice for abuse.

WORLDWIDE DAY OF PRAYER FOR CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, moments ago, the House opened in prayer. Today, I am rising in solidarity with those who are calling for a worldwide day of prayer for Christians suffering in Iraq, Syria, Egypt, and across the Middle East.

Radical Islamists have a phrase: ''first the Saturday people, then the Sunday people.''

Those who call for Israel's destruction are the same radicals who are persecuting Christians throughout the Middle East. Reported cases of Christians killed for their faith doubled worldwide from the previous year. Others have been kidnapped, forcibly converted, or exiled, while churches and holy sites have been destroyed.

Iraq's Christian community has dropped from 1.5 million people in 2003 to only 200,000 today, and in Mosul—home of one of the world's oldest Christian communities—ISIS militants have overrun the city. They are using this Arabic symbol and are painting it on homes to identify Nazarenes, or Christians, who are told to convert to Islam, pay a religious tax, or be executed. Now almost no Christians remain in Mosul, a city with a 2,000-year relationship with the Christian faith. The situation is also dire in Syria and elsewhere.

Middle East Christians need our prayers, our support, and our voices,

and I am proud to stand with those who follow the Nazarene.

AMERICA STANDS WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, the war in Gaza continues. Every human life that is killed is a tragedy, particularly those of civilians, but I think it is important to put it in perspective. The fight is not between Israelis and Palestinians. The fight is between Israelis and Hamas, which is a terrorist organization.

Week after week, month after month, year after year, Hamas has lobbed missiles into the Israeli civilian population—killing Israelis, maiming Israelis. Israel is fighting back in order to try to stop the onslaught of Hamas.

What would we do, Madam Speaker, if missiles came over the border from Canada or from Mexico, attacking population areas of the United States? Of course, we would go over the border and attempt to stop the terrorists who were doing that to our civilians.

That is precisely what Israel is doing, and quite frankly, the media coverage of the war in Gaza has been absolutely one-sided against Israel and absolutely disgraceful.

Hamas uses its people as human shields. They build bomb factories and missile factories in heavily populated civilian areas. So, when civilians are killed, it is the fault of Hamas, not the fault of Israel, which has tried to defend its way of life and defend its citizens.

I am proud that America stands with Israel, and we will continue to do so.

□ 1015

LET'S GET THE CHILDREN OUT OF HARM'S WAY IN GAZA

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, last night, on the national news I saw the terrible agony and tears of a man whose children had been, according to the report, blown to pieces when a school was hit in Gaza.

Hamas started this war. Israel certainly has a right to defend its people.

In today's Washington Post, Michael Oren, the former Israeli Ambassador to the U.S., said it is ''indeed agonizing'' to watch the images of the dead and wounded and, I might add, especially the children.

Israel agreed to an Egyptian-sponsored cease-fire. Hamas did not. I rise today to plead for both sides in this war to at least let the little children get out of the war zone.

The United Nations has never been very effective, but it should at least attempt to lead in an effort to get children out of harm's way.

If this fighting, unfortunately, has to continue, our President and State Department should at least do everything possible to get little children out of Gaza and to some safe place away from the bombs and the rockets.

REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of July 23, 2014, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the amendment numbered 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is adopted, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION REGARDING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Nothing in this concurrent resolution supersedes the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and to submit any extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I very much appreciate the way in which Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, the bipartisan leadership of the House, and the staff of the committee have worked through this issue to bring us here this morning. I thank all of the Members. I also think all of the Members of this body can support this motion.

Earlier this week, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard testimony from senior officials from the Departments of State and Defense on the situation in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the situation in this critical Middle Eastern country is precarious. The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, an al Qaeda offshoot, has taken over most of western Iraq, it has turned its sights on Baghdad, and it may be preparing to launch attacks against the United States.

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled such a large, resource-rich safe haven as ISIS does today. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry, the cash, the personnel that ISIS does today, which includes thousands of Western passport holders.

What started as a crisis in Syria has become a regional disaster with serious global implications, including credible threats of international terrorism, humanitarian disaster, and upward pressure on energy prices in a fragile global economy.

The top State Department official told our committee that ISIS represents a growing threat to U.S. interests in the region, local populations, and the homeland, calling it a vital national security challenge. This is a common assessment outside of government as well.

As part of the response to this threat, the Obama administration has deployed additional military assets and up to 475 troops to secure our Embassy, our personnel. A few hundred U.S. military advisers are evaluating how we might best train, advise, and support the Iraqis to take on ISIS.

As the Department of Defense testified this week, these small teams are ''armed for self-defense, but do not have an offensive mission.'' It was noted, these teams are not unlike the missions being carried out by U.S. forces around the world. U.S. forces currently maintain these types of troops in more than 70 countries, in Africa, the Americas, and Asia.

Now, if the President did decide to take more aggressive action in Iraq, Members on both sides of the aisle would be deeply split. Some don't see any role for the U.S. military. Others believe we should be more active in this region, believing that our absence has contributed to a vacuum that is churning the entire region.

But where I think all Members can agree is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body.

That is the text before us today:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

At the same time, this text preserves the flexibility the President may need to respond to the rapidly evolving national security in order to protect our

Embassy, to conduct search and rescue, or target an al Qaeda-type terrorist who poses an imminent threat to the United States, among other things.

Nothing in this text impacts the War Powers Resolution which, of course, requires the President to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities within 60 to 90 days after introduction, absent an authorization from Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts brings a critical issue to the House floor: the use of force by U.S. Armed Forces, and the appropriate role for the Congress in that decision.

Any military officer will tell you that the support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously, and it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 105. It reaffirms our belief that U.S. troops should not be deployed in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific congressional authorization.

Since last December, the terrorist group ISIS has marched across Iraq with lethal efficiency. Fallujah, Ramadi, and Mosul have fallen to their control. Thousands of Iraqi soldiers have been killed or have laid down their weapons. The military equipment they left behind, some supplied by the United States, is now in the hands of these fanatics.

After erasing the border between Iraq and Syria, ISIS has advanced toward our ally, Jordan. And the leaders of ISIS have declared an Islamic caliphate, promising to rule with a brand of barbarism, such as mandatory female genital mutilation, more suited to the Dark Ages than the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is real. Iraq is teetering on the brink, and we cannot allow that country to become a safe haven for terrorists that could be used to launch another 9/11.

While the Hamas terrorists are pushing forth in Gaza, the ISIS terrorists are pushing forth in Iraq.

At the same time, however, we need to make clear to the American people and to the Iraqi government that the U.S. combat mission in Iraq is over. After losing more than 4,000 American lives and spending more than $1 trillion, we cannot allow ourselves to be sucked into another sectarian quagmire.

The crisis in Iraq cannot be solved through military means alone. The solution will be rooted in real political changes in Iraq, more inclusive policies, and a greater effort to avoid sectarian conflict.

President Obama removed the last American combat troops from Iraq on December 18, 2011, under an agreement reached by the Bush administration, and he has no intention of sending them back, a position with which I firmly agree.

As the President said last month: ''American forces will not be returning to combat in Iraq, but we will help Iraqis as they take the fight to terrorists who threaten the Iraqi people, the region, and American interests as well.''

In the last several weeks, the President has expanded intelligence and surveillance efforts. He has sent a contingent of troops to protect our diplomatic personnel at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, and he has deployed small military assessment teams to get information about the threat that ISIS poses to Iraq, to the region, and to American interests.

I support these measures. They represent the sort of security cooperation with the Iraqi government that we should be offering to support our own national security interests. But they don't require a sustained presence of American combat troops in Iraq.

At the end of the day, we all know it is past time for the Iraqi government to confront some serious challenges. These will require an Iraqi solution, one based on respect for each other and the rule of law.

I would like to thank Representative MCGOVERN, Representative JONES, and Representative LEE for their tenacity and leadership in sparking this important debate. They have worked with us in the Foreign Affairs Committee, constructively with me and Chairman ROYCE both, along with the House leadership on both sides of the aisle, to ensure that the amendment we are considering today would enjoy broad bipartisan support.

So I hope that the process which brought about today's bill will serve as an example of bipartisan cooperation for the House to follow in the days to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the House is debating H. Con. Res. 105. I want to thank the Republican leadership for working with Mr. JIM MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and myself and our staffs to get this language so that we could debate it today.

As James Madison said: ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.''

Unfortunately, we in Congress have for too long abdicated our constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of military force.

This began, for me personally, with my vote for the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq, which is one of the biggest regrets during my tenure of Congress in voting for that.

With that vote, we gave up our constitutional authority on one of the most important decisions a Member of Congress can make: the decision to send American men and women into war to possibly die.

□ 1030

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that one day, we in Congress will repeal the 2001 and the 2002 AUMF. Until that time comes, I believe that today represents a strong step toward reclaiming the constitutional power that we each have and are entrusted with, to make decisions about going to war or declaring war.

I cannot emphasize enough that no decision is more important for a Member of Congress than a vote to send young men and women to fight and to die for our country.

The main text of this resolution is simple. The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.

Madam Speaker, this is what Madison meant when he said, ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.''

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

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

Mr. JONES. The legislature is us, the Congress. This is a monumental step toward reclaiming our constitutional authority.

In closing, I want to thank Representatives MCGOVERN and LEE and all my friends in both parties who have fought with me for the right of Congress to declare war. For years, we have been calling for a debate on the floor of the House with regard to the use of our military.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and their staffs for this opportunity today.

May God continue to bless our troops, their families, and may God continue to bless America.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 105, as amended. This important bipartisan bill asserts the important constitutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace, and it is my sincere hope that every single Member of this institution will vote in favor.

It is important for our colleagues to know that this resolution is the result of open discussion and dialogue between both sides of the aisle, and it is an example of what can happen when Members come together and decide they want to accomplish something meaningful.

I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leadership, Leader PELOSI and Minority Whip HOYER, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman

ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, and I want to thank my good friends who have helped lead this effort, my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for working together on the language of this resolution.

I want to send a special thanks to all the staff who spent many hours listening to the views and concerns that spanned the political spectrum of this House about America's engagement in Iraq.

In particular, I want to thank Jen Stewart, Rob Karem, Emily Murry, Wyndee Parker, Dan Silverberg, Doug Anderson, Tom Sheehy, Ed Burrier, Jason Steinbaum, Janice Kaguyutan, Doug Campbell, Mira Resnick, Ed Rice, Jirair Ratevosian, Dan Zisa, Ray Celeste, Cindy Buhl, and Keith Stern on my own staff. I am very grateful for how hard each of them worked to achieve a consensus.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is quite straightforward. It requires an authorization from Congress, should the President determine that the United States should escalate its military presence in Iraq.

It does not change the President's existing authorities to protect and ensure the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, and it does not alter the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

This resolution makes one clear statement: if the President decides we should further involve our military in Iraq, he needs to work with Congress to authorize it. I don't know how Congress would respond and vote on such a request. For the record, I want to state in the strongest possible way that I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to reengage militarily in Iraq.

I want to make clear that the intent of this resolution is not to criticize President Obama. I believe him when he says that he has no intention of significantly expanding our military presence in Iraq, and so far, in each of the three recent deployments to Iraq that he has announced, the President rightfully and formally informed Congress ''consistent with the War Powers Resolution.''

Nor is this the intent to criticize the Republican leadership—rather, the intent of this resolution is to begin to reestablish Congress' rightful role, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, when it comes to matters of war and peace.

I believe there is broad bipartisan and growing concern that over the past several decades, Congress has ceded far too much of its power to the executive branch. It has happened under Democratic and Republican Presidents. It has happened under Democratic and Republican control of the House and Senate. It is not really a partisan issue. It is an institutional one. We simply haven't done our job.

My concern all along is that Congress has not lived up to its constitutional responsibilities to debate and authorize the introduction of U.S. forces where they are engaged in roles related to combat.

So while this resolution clearly puts the President on notice, it also reinforces the institutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace.

Madam Speaker, the time to debate our reengagement in Iraq—should it come to that—is before we are caught in the heat of the moment, not when the first body bags come home, not when the first bombs start to fall, not when the worst-case scenario is playing out on our TV screens.

The time to debate Iraq is when we can weigh the pros and cons of action, the pros and cons of supporting the violent and sectarian policies of the Maliki government or whatever government is cobbled together should Maliki be forced to step down.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that further deployment of U.S. troops in Iraq receives the careful debate and authorization it deserves. We owe as least that much to our men and women in uniform and their families, and we owe at least that much to our democracy and democratic institutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS MASSIE.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105. Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution gives the sole power to declare war to Congress, not the President.

The situation in Iraq is deteriorating as we speak. ISIS, a group of violent fundamentalist Islamic thugs, is terrorizing the people of Iraq and destroying the ancient culture of Mosul.

Some have called for the U.S. to interfere once again, but if we are to do so and to send our brave men and women into harm's way overseas, we must honor the Constitution. Congress must authorize any such military action. It would be illegal for the President to do so alone.

Any future military action in Iraq would constitute a new war, with new enemies—ISIS—and would require a new congressional authorization. The President cannot use the 2002 authorization for the use of force in Iraq to justify any new action.

It is important for those who are quick to rush into another war to remember that wars often have unintended consequences. Iraq is a prime example.

In a recent article in The Telegraph, historian Dr. Tim Stanley pointed out that prior to the 2003 Iraq war, there were 1.5 million Christians in Iraq. Today, there are only 400,000.

As Dr. Stanley writes, ''The lesson is: 'either leave other countries alone or, if you must intervene, do so with consistency and resilience.' The consequences of going in, messing things up, and then quitting with a weary shrug are terrible for those left behind.''

If we are going to go to war, we must follow the Constitution, have Congress declare it, and fight to win. Anything else is illegal, unconstitutional, and likely to lead to unintended, horrific consequences. That is why I support H. Con. Res. 105, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of the leaders on this resolution.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding, but also for his tireless leadership on this very important issue.

I am proud to join Congressman WALTER JONES and Congressman MCGOVERN in introducing this bipartisan resolution, and I thank them for their consistent support and work, as great Americans, to address these serious issues of war and peace.

This resolution simply prohibits the President to deploy armed services or to engage in combat operations in Iraq without specific debate and authorization from Congress, but this resolution also seeks to reclaim a fundamental congressional responsibility, the constitutionally protected right for Congress to debate and to determine when this country enters into war.

I also am personally concerned about mission creep. 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.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support, supported by attack helicopters and drones. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

Now, I, too, believe President Obama does not intend to send ground troops to Iraq, but we need to make sure that Congress reasserts its constitutional responsibility on this grave issue.

After more than a decade at war in Iraq and Afghanistan, with thousands of United States lives and billions of dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

Let me remind you, it was this absence of full debate that led to Congress passing the overly broad 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in the wake of 9/11. This law has been used to justify everything from the war in Afghanistan, warrantless domestic and international surveillance, holding prisoners indefinitely in Guantanamo, and conducting drone strikes in countries that we are not at war with.

I couldn't vote for that resolution because I have always believed that such

consequences are grave for the United States' national security interests unless we fully debate these issues and, of course, to our standing in the world. We did not debate that resolution any more than 1 hour, and I have continued to attempt to repeal and address the problematic actions justified under this law ever since.

On July 16, Congressmen MCGOVERN, JONES, RIGELL, myself, and others—over 100 Members of Congress from both parties wrote a letter—and we signed that letter—to President Obama to come to Congress for an authorization before any military escalation in Iraq, exactly what this resolution would do.

I will insert the letter into the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 02, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join you and with those in the international community who are expressing grave concern over the rise in sectarian violence in Iraq over the last days and weeks. The consequences of this development are particularly troubling given the extraordinary loss of American lives and expenditure of funds over ten years that was claimed to be necessary to bring democracy, stability and a respect for human rights to Iraq.

We support your restraint to date in resisting the calls for a ''quick'' and ''easy'' military intervention, and for your commitment not to send combat troops back to Iraq. We also appreciate your acknowledgement that this conflict requires a political solution, and that military action alone cannot successfully lead to a resolution.

We do not believe intervention could be either quick or easy. And, we doubt it would be effective in meeting either humanitarian or strategic goals, and that it could very well be counter-productive. This is a moment for urgent consultations and engagement with all parties in the region who could bring about a cease fire and launch a dialogue that could lead to a reconciliation of the conflict.

Any solution to this complex crisis can only be achieved through a political settlement, and only if the process and outcome is inclusive of all segments of the Iraqi population—anything short of that cannot successfully bring stability to Iraq or the region.

As you consider options for U.S. intervention, we write to urge respect for the constitutional requirements for using force abroad. The Constitution vests in Congress the power and responsibility to authorize offensive military action abroad. The use of military force in Iraq is something the Congress should fully debate and authorize. Members of Congress must consider all the facts and alternatives before we can determine whether military action would contribute to ending this most recent violence, create a climate for political stability, and protect civilians from greater harm.

We stand ready to work with you to this end.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lee; Sam Farr; James P. Moran; Janice Hahn; Peter A. DeFazio; Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.; Michael M. Honda; Scott E. Rigell; Chellie Pingree; Betty McCollum; John Garamendi; James P. McGovern; Richard M. Nolan; Beto O'Rourke, Members of Congress.

Katherine Clark; Zoe Lofgren; Earl Blumenauer; George Miller; Anna G. Eshoo; Julia Brownley; Hakeem S. Jeffries; Chris Gibson; Jackie Speier; John J. Duncan, Jr.; Judy Chu; Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott; Alan Grayson; James A. Himes, Members of Congress.

Michael H. Michaud; John B. Larson; Mark Pocan; Reid J. Ribble; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Karen Bass; Maxine Waters; John Conyers, Jr.; Walter B. Jones; Peter Welch; Jared Huffman; John P. Sarbanes; Ed Pastor; Grace F. Napolitano, Members of Congress.

Alcee L. Hastings; John Lewis; José; E. Serrano; Nydia M. Valázquez; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Andre Carson; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Jim McDermott; Keith Ellison; Lloyd Doggett; Rush Holt; Bobby L. Rush; Emanuel Cleaver; Bennie G. Thompson, Members of Congress.

Lois Capps; Kurt Schrader; Jerrold Nadler; Mark Takano; Collin C. Peterson; Ann McLane Kuster; Justin Amash; Charles B. Rangel; Raul M. Grijalva; Niki Tsongas; Kathy Castor; Michael E. Capuano; Yvette D. Clarke; Matt Salmon; Kyrsten Sinema; Donald M. Payne, Jr.; Lois Frankel; Rosa L. DeLauro; Richard E. Neal; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Alan S. Lowenthal; Stephen F. Lynch, Members of Congress.

Paul Broun; Cheri Bustos; Marcy Kaptur; Sheila Jackson Lee; John Tierney; Henry Waxman; James R. Langevin; Thomas Massie; Carolyn B. Maloney; Tony Cárdenas; Steve Cohen; Howard Coble; Donna F. Edwards; David Cicilline, Members of Congress.

Ann Kirkpatrick; Donna Christensen; William Pascrell; Luis V. Gutiérrez; Robin L. Kelly; Marcia L. Fudge; Dave Loebsack; Paul D. Tonko; Mike Doyle; Jan Schakowsky, Chaka Fattah; Suzanne Bonamici; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; William R. Keating, Members of Congress.

Ms. LEE of California. Also, let me remind you that last month, we debated the Defense Appropriations bill. Over 150 bipartisan Members supported my amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

This resolution, which is bipartisan, merely requires the President to come to Congress, should he decide to engage in an escalated combat role in Iraq.

The reality is, though, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were enflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides.

The change Iraq needs must come from Iraqis rejecting violence in favor of a peaceful democracy and respect for the rights of all citizens.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the American people agree. After more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives lost, and billions of dollars spent, the American people are rightfully weary.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibility and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq.

Of course, after we pass this resolution, I urge the Republican leadership to bring up our bill, H.R. 3852, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I want to, once again, thank Congressman MCGOVERN for staying the course. He was one of the first Members calling for an end to the war in Iraq and to bring our brave troops home. He has provided tremendous leadership through a variety of legislative efforts. This is just another one of those efforts. So I want to thank you again, Congressman MCGOVERN and Congressman JONES.

I thank all of the Members who are supporting this, including our leadership. Congress should never allow war authorizations to remain on the books in perpetuity. We don't do this for the farm bill. We don't do this for the transportation bill. Sooner or later, we need to repeal the initial authorization.

□ 1045

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ADAM KINZINGER, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to say thank you to the chairman for yielding me this time. Thank you to both sides for your hard work. It is rare that we get compromises in Washington, and I appreciate the work you have put in, but I cannot, in good conscious, support this.

I am a veteran of Iraq. I saw many people that fought hard to bring the Iraqi people freedom, and I saw a war that was won in 2011. What we are watching happen in Iraq right now is the worst-case scenario in the Middle East. There is a march of jihadism and extremism that makes al Qaeda look like puppy dogs that is happening in Iraq, a President that is indecisive on what to do. We have genital mutilations ordered in Mosul just the other day by ISIS, and we are here in Washington, D.C., debating what we need to do to hamstring the President who is already indecisive enough about this.

When American military—American Marines and Army—get themselves into sustained combat, they often call on strong air support to help them win the fight. And that is why—as well as the strong Marines and Army we have, that is why we are so good at what we do. We are asking the Iraqi military to take back their country and take land but yet not providing them substantial air power that is needed to destroy this very evil cancer that is growing in the Middle East.

That is what we ought to be here discussing today is how to stop this cancer of jihadism and ISIS that is growing in the Middle East, how to stop that from growing, and ultimately prevent it from coming here to the United

States of America and potentially to our allies.

So while I, again, strongly respect and fully understand what my chairman is doing here and appreciate his hard work, I think instead of giving the President an ability to blame Congress for his indecisiveness, I think it is time that we stand up and say we have to defend our interest and defend people that want to defend themselves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments and for his service to our country. But the gentleman should draft an authorization for war and ask for his leadership to bring it up. That is what the Constitution tells us to do.

What this resolution is about today is not a vote on getting out of Iraq or staying in Iraq or expanding our role in Iraq. This is a vote on whether or not we are going to live up to our constitutional responsibility. This should not be controversial no matter what one's views are on military reengagement in Iraq.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), who has been a leader on this issue.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105 having already taken action on this issue that has every American gravely concerned. I opposed our involvement in Iraq in 2002. I opposed it last month, and I oppose it today.

While I intend to support the resolution at hand, I believe we should have required the President to recall any troops that are not in Iraq strictly for diplomatic security. This was the original version of this resolution. Notwithstanding, it is very significant that this House of Representatives will probably pass overwhelmingly this resolution that takes a very firm stand that Congress should be authorizing any further military action in Iraq. We owe it to the people of this Nation.

Let's be clear. The President invoked the War Powers Act under the guise of protecting our embassy. There are now nearly 1,000 U.S. troops in harm's way—Apache helicopters and drones, just to name a few—and we are taking sides in a sectarian civil war. Let's not forget that that is what we are doing.

Congress must reject a new war in Iraq. I urge my colleagues to demand further action and to take further action to withdraw our troops now before our men and women in uniform are again asked to pay too high a price for our inaction.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Joseph Cirincione wrote an article in Defense One, and I want to quote a part of it. He says:

> 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 cannot 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. 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 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.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I commend the authors of this resolution, Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE, for their leadership on this issue of war and peace.

The topic of limiting our future military involvement in Iraq deserves more than 1 hour. It deserves an entire legislative day to discuss this resolution and the larger question: the issue of the war-making powers of Congress. The history of our involvement in Iraq and exactly how we came to this point is of paramount importance in understanding why it is vital that the House pass this resolution. But since time is limited, let me come to the point: no more American soldiers should kill or be killed in Iraq to redeem our past mistakes.

The United States has spent years and billions of dollars trying to rebuild Iraq's armed forces, to no end. Sending 300 or 3,000 or 30,000 advisers to Iraq would be a pointless exercise when the Iraqi Army continues to melt away in the face of rebels.

Unless the Iraqi Government can inspire confidence in Kurds, Sunni, and Shi'a that it is a fair, legitimate government concerned with the welfare of all Iraqis, no amount of money or American advisers will save it. We have already lost more than 4,000 Americans in one war in Iraq. Let's not invoke the insidious and fallacious argument that our previous heavy investment justifies further heavy investment.

Had America not waged an unnecessary war in Iraq starting in 2003, there would be no need for us to debate this resolution now. Like so many misguided military interventions in our history, America's misguided war with Iraq unleashed forces that we cannot now control. We should not compound that error by squandering more lives and money in Iraq.

I hope we can have, beyond this moment now, a fuller debate of the war-making powers of Congress. I hope, as Representative LEE said a few moments ago, that we can have a debate on the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force that was the excuse for much military, paramilitary, and domestic intrusive activities in this country.

But for now we should, I think, recognize the good acts of Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE in bringing this resolution to the floor. I think it will help further the debate greatly. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I am going to reserve the right to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from 33 national organizations in support of this resolution.

JULY 23, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: Representatives Jim McGovern, Walter Jones and Barbara Lee have introduced H. Con. Res. 105, a privileged resolution to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year. We urge you to co-sponsor and support this important resolution.

This resolution, which provides an exception for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, is likely to be voted on in the full House before the end of July. The sponsors are using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution that requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance support, augmented by Apache attack helicopters and drones, after military aggression by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

As the United States knows from past, bitter experience in Vietnam, a small military engagement can escalate into a major military war that is disastrous for the United States. There is little a few hundred or a few thousand troops can do in Iraq that 140,000 could not do at the height of American involvement in Iraq.

President George W. Bush signed an agreement before leaving office to withdraw all American forces from Iraq by 2011. That decision should not be reversed.

Congress has the constitutional responsibility to debate the merits of American military involvement in Iraq before the first American casualties. Whatever your position on Iraq or this resolution, the measure provides an opportunity for sorely needed debate on a very critical issue.

We urge you to co-sponsor and support the resolution, and to oppose what is likely to be a tabling motion before the end of July.

Sincerely,

Fred Azcarate, USAction; Medea Benjamin and Jodie Evans, CODEPINK; Becky Bond, CREDO; Simone Campbell, SSS, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Angela Canterbury, Council for a Livable World; Jeanne Dauray, Progressive Democrats of America; Carolyn Rusti Eisenberg, United for Peace and Justice; Michael Eisenscher, U.S. Labor Against the War; Jenefer Ellingston, DC Statehood Green Party; Hannah Frisch, Civilian Soldier Alliance; Anna Galland, MoveOn.org; William Hartung, Center for International Policy; Susan Henry-Crowe, M.Div., DD, The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; Matt Howard, Iraq Veterans Against the War; Rev. Linda Jaramillo, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Kevin Kamps, Beyond Nuclear; Aura Kanegis, American Friends Service Committee; David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Rabbi Michael Lerner, Tikkun Magazine's Network of Spiritual Progressives; Paul Kawika Martin, Peace Action.

Stephen Miles, Win Without War; Andrea Miller, Progressive Democrats of America; Robert Naiman, Just Foreign Policy; Jim O'Brien, Historians Against the War; Jon Rainwater, Peace Action West; Diane Randall, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Susan Shaer, Women's Action for New Directions; Alice Slater, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, NY; Guy Stevens, PeacePAC; Paul Walker, Green Cross International; Jim Wallis, Sojourners; Rabbi Arthur Waskow, The Shalom Center; Jim Winkler, National Council of Churches, USA.

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

Regarding the term ''sustained combat role,'' this resolution specifically states that nothing in this language supersedes the War Powers Resolution. The War Powers Resolution lays out very clear timeframes, beyond which we should consider troops to be deployed for a sustained period. ''Combat role'' implies the many roles that our troops might be engaged in or supporting combat operations in Iraq. I think, however, that this resolution is based on the President and the Congress acting in good faith and working together to authorize any deeper involvement in the ongoing conflict in Iraq.

I want to again acknowledge that this is an important resolution, and this is an important moment for this institution. We have bipartisan collaboration on this language. We have bipartisan agreement that we ought not to give up our constitutional responsibilities when it comes to declaring war or getting into wars.

Again, I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER. I want to thank Leader PELOSI, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and everybody who is involved in working together and understanding that no matter what your view is on what we should be doing in Iraq, that we all agree that we have a responsibility here and that we matter in this debate.

I think it is also important to realize that we are coming together to acknowledge that it is important to debate this issue before we get into the heat of battle, and I hope that it never comes to that. For too long, I think this institution has not done what it is supposed to do when it comes to war, both under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents.

As I said in the beginning, this is not a critique of President Obama. I believe the President when he says he does not want to see any more combat troops deployed in Iraq. I believe him when he says he does not want to reengage militarily in yet another war. But I also know from history that there is such a thing called the slippery slope and there are events that happened that sometimes overtake people's original positions, and then we find ourselves in a situation that we did not expect to be in.

What we are saying here is that, if, in fact, the President, for whatever reason, decides to escalate our military involvement, Congress needs to debate it and Congress needs to authorize it. It is that simple.

This resolution is not as strong as some of us would want it to be, and it is not as weak as some would want it to be. This represents a compromise. I also think it is important to point out that every once in a while this place works; and I think this is one of the moments where we can point to that the Congress is working, and we are working on an issue that I think is of incredible importance.

Madam Speaker, I will just close by saying, like so many of my colleagues here, I have been to countless funerals of soldiers who have been killed not only in Iraq but in Afghanistan. I have talked to parents, I have talked to brothers and sisters, and I have talked to grandparents during very difficult times when they have lost a loved one.

It is important that we recognize that going to war, deploying our troops in hostilities, is a big deal. We ought to be very clear that this is important and that we ought not to go down that road lightly. I am grateful that this resolution makes it clear that we are going to debate these issues, that we are going to authorize these issues, and that we are going to respect the Constitution.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ROYCE. I want to thank everybody who has been involved in this. This is an important statement, and I am very hopeful that we will get strong, bipartisan support.

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

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

Well, Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' spirit of cooperation. Mr. MCGOVERN and I have worked on a number of issues from victims' rights to trying to stop the exploitation of child soldiers in Africa, and so I appreciate that spirit on his part.

As I noted in my opening testimony, my opening statement here, the threat of ISIS is real, and I do think we should reflect on that as we debate this issue.

□ 1100

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled so much territory, especially such a large, resource-rich safe haven, as ISIS has in this caliphate, as they perceive it, now. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry and cash and personnel as ISIS does today, and this includes thousands of Western passports and thousands of individuals who are passport holders from the West.

One militant engaged in this battle recently returned to Europe and attacked a museum in Brussels, so more of that is coming as a result of ISIS. And let's not take this debate to mean that we should not be doing anything to offset that organization.

I think the President has failed U.S. national security interests by not, for example, authorizing or accepting the request made by the government in Iraq and by our personnel in our Embassy for drone strikes on these terrorist ISIS camps. Remember, this is a situation where the drone can actually see the ISIS combatants with the black flag of al Qaeda waving as they move across the desert or as they are encamped. This was an opportunity to hit them when they were vulnerable, before they began that city march across the desert, as they began to take those cities with their armed columns.

I do think, as the U.N. reported yesterday, that there are going to be consequences to these fatwas that come down from ISIS. The one yesterday specifically—according to the U.N., ISIS is requiring female mutilation in the new caliphate it is establishing, at least in the Mosul area and around that area. That is about 4 million females that would be subject to this, if they are as doctrinaire as they have been on other issues. So we will be wrestling with what to do about ISIS, what we can do.

What this resolution says, and I think the overwhelming majority of us in Congress agrees with this, is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body, and that is the text before us today.

It says, again:

> The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of adoption of this concurrent resolution.

That is the position of the Members of Congress, as the representative body, frankly, and as any military officer will tell you, support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously. And, again, it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 105, a resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in sustained combat roles in Iraq unless specifically authorized by Congress by statute enacted after the date of adoption of the resolution.

The war in Iraq caused a lot of unearned suffering in Iraq and here at home. This is the same war, Madam Speaker, whose proponents misrepresented to the nation would last no more than six months and likely less than six weeks.

This same war in Iraq, we were led to believe by the Bush Administration, would cost less than $50 billion and would be paid out of

the ample revenues from Iraq's oil fields. The war in Iraq, the American people were promised, should have ended years ago with Americans troops greeted as liberators by jubilant Iraqis throwing rose petals at their feet.

As I and my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus and the Out of Iraq Caucus forecast at the time, the starry-eyed, rosy scenarios laid out by President Bush, Vice-President Cheney, and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld would come to pass in fantasy land, but not in the cold, hard world of reality which they refused to live in.

The war in Iraq lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history. But there was a difference. The Second World War ended in complete and total victory for the United States and its allies.

But then again, in that conflict America was led by FDR, a great Commander-in-Chief, who had a plan to win the war and secure the peace, listened to his generals, and sent troops in sufficient numbers and sufficiently trained and equipped to do the job.

As a result of the colossal miscalculation in deciding to invade Iraq, the Armed Forces and the people of the United States suffered incalculable damage.

The war in Iraq claimed the lives of 4,484 brave servicemen and women. More than 24,600 Americans were wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries. American taxpayers paid more than $800 billion to sustain this misadventure.

The depth, breadth, and scope of the misguided, mismanaged, and misrepresented war in Iraq is utterly without precedent in American history. It was a tragedy in a league all its own.

And it must never be repeated. That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 105 and urge all my colleagues to join me.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 680, I call up the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 680, 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 113–54 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4935

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 ''Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN CHILD TAX CREDIT; INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS IN CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY.—Section 24(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''means—'' and all that follows and inserting ''means $75,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS.—Section 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the $1,000 amount in subsection (a) and the $75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—Any increase determined under paragraph (1) shall be rounded—

''(A) in the case of the $1,000 amount in subsection (a), to the nearest multiple of $50, and

''(B) in the case of the $75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2), to the nearest multiple of $1,000.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's social security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the social security number of either spouse is included on such return.''.

(b) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct social security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN required under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of such Code is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

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

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from 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 include extraneous material on H.R. 4935.

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.

Mr. Speaker, if one thing has been consistent about the Obama administration, it is the failure of its economic policies. The President's economic policies make it harder for American families to get by every day. A record number of Americans are unable to work, and those who can find work are unable to secure full-time employment and instead are forced to accept only part-time jobs. This last quarter, the economy actually shrunk, and real wages—what Americans use to pay their mortgages and put their kids through school—are continuing to fall.

Worse yet, the cost of raising a family is only getting more expensive. The cost of clothing, food, child care, and schooling all continue to climb. According to the Department of Agriculture, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by about 4.4 percent per year. But more recently, since 2004, the cost of children's clothing has gone up 89 percent; the cost of food since then 21 percent; and the cost of child care since 2004 107 percent. And since then, the child tax credit has remained unchanged.

Currently, our Tax Code helps ease some of this burden by providing a child tax credit. The credit, which has been around since the 1990s, now provides a $1,000 tax credit for each child. Unfortunately, that credit is not, and has not, been indexed for inflation. So while the cost of raising children continues to rise, the value of the child tax credit actually decreases.

Today's legislation, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, will fix this problem by indexing the child tax credit to inflation. Making a commonsense change like this will ensure that families can make every dollar count. The current child tax credit also disadvantages those who file jointly compared to those who file as single individuals, creating what is known as a marriage penalty. This

bill would eliminate the marriage penalty embedded in the child tax credit, helping millions of families across the country.

The Family Research Council, which supports this bill, notes the importance of the child tax credit. They say:

> This tax credit recognizes the important contribution of the family and children to our country and starts to address a problem with our Tax Code today, the marriage penalty. A fair system of taxation does not penalize marriage and family.

In addition, this bill contains strong antifraud provisions to ensure that the child tax credit goes to those who are truly deserving. The bill would require one parent to submit a Social Security number to qualify for the refundable portion of the child tax credit. According to a report by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, the number of filers for the additional child tax credit without a Social Security number grew from 62,000 filers—claiming $62 million in benefits—in 2000 to 2.3 million filers—claiming $4.2 billion in benefits—in 2010.

This is a commonsense provision that will help safeguard taxpayer dollars from fraud and put it in line with other refundable tax credits, like the earned income tax credit, which requires a Social Security number.

I hear too many stories about families struggling to afford basic necessities to care for their children. It is time we make some simple improvements to the child tax credit so it keeps up with the cost of raising children.

Improving the child tax credit would give moms and dads nationwide needed relief at a time when their budgets are tight and they are forced to make difficult choices about how to spend their money. This provision has earned bipartisan support for years, so let's vote ''yes'' on this opportunity to help American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Yesterday on the topic of poverty, Congressman RYAN spoke. Today, he and his House Republican colleagues, will vote. Actions speak louder than words. And at every turn over the last 3 years, the actions House Republicans have taken have cut programs for low- and middle-income families.

Funding for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program—slashed in the Ryan Republican budget.

Social services block grants—eliminated.

Food assistance, Pell higher education grants, job training, and housing assistance—dramatically scaled back.

And extension of unemployment insurance and a raise in the minimum wage—both blocked by House Republicans.

The new Republican rhetoric on poverty is no match for the deeply troubling actions they have repeatedly taken, and continue to take with this legislation today.

This bill leads to harm for millions of low- and middle-income families and their kids. It completely ignores the need to extend the 2017 expiration of the expanded refundable portion of the child tax credit, which, if allowed to occur, would push 12 million people, including 6 million children, into poverty or deeper into poverty, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Republicans may say that such an extension could be done later, as they claimed in our discussion at the Rules Committee, but that talk about future action is made incredulous when Republicans this week add another $187 billion to the deficit, bringing the total they have passed in unpaid-for tax cuts to more than $700 billion. This comes after Republicans have slashed nondefense domestic discretionary spending to its lowest level on record as a percentage of GDP.

In contrast, this bill expands and makes permanent the availability of the child tax credit to many new, upper middle-income families whose incomes are too high to qualify under current law. Under this legislation, a married couple making $160,000 with two kids would get an additional $2,200 in their 2018 tax refund, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, while a single mother of two making $14,500 would see her refund cut by $1,750.

But it gets still worse.

Republicans this week inserted a provision into this legislation requiring recipients of the child tax credit to provide their Social Security number, a change that could lead to the loss of this credit for families of 5 million children, 4 million of whom are U.S. citizens. In all, 400,000 veterans and Armed Forces families will lose all or part of their credit. That is the reason that the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes this requirement, because it is deeply flawed and would leave millions of families with children behind.

Ben Franklin once said:

> Well done is better than well said.

Today it is even truer that well said cannot obscure what is harmfully done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

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

I feel compelled to correct the record here. The opponents make a false claim that somehow this bill eliminates benefits for millions of low-income families, and that is just wrong because the provision he is talking about is, frankly, the failure of the Obama administration to make that provision permanent. The provision he refers to does not expire until 2017. So what they are saying is, in a word, ''nonsense.''

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that Ms. JENKINS control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this particular issue.

We are a Nation that is struggling to make ends meet. The rising cost of everyday essentials, such as gas, groceries, and electricity, all continue to rise, while household incomes remain stagnant.

There is no need to compound these problems with a Tax Code that punishes working parents by making it hard for them to keep up with the rising costs of raising a family.

The child tax credit was originally enacted in 1997 to ease the financial burden on families. Over time, the original credit amount was eventually increased and made partially refundable to help more families. However, since being expanded to $1,000 back in 2004, the child tax credit has failed to keep pace with costs.

Kids are expensive: diapers and car seats, haircuts, toothbrushes, books, clothes, and even sporting equipment. A recent study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that for a middle-income couple, it will cost over $240,000 to raise a child until 18 years of age.

I did the calculation for a middle-income two-parent household with three kids. According to the USDA calculator, the average household will spend $3,500 on food, $4,000 on transportation, $1,600 on clothing, and nearly $7,000 on child care and education for a total of over $30,000 annually.

Contributing the most to these rising costs are items such as spending on education and child care. In fact, since 2000, the cost of child care has increased twice as fast as the median income of families with children.

The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act, which is before us today, indexes the credit and the limitations to inflation to help parents keep more of their hard-earned money to use for the mounting expenses of parenting.

In addition to indexing the credit and limits to inflation, the bill also eliminates the marriage penalty by increasing the joint filing phaseout threshold to exactly double that of single filers. Removing marriage penalties and indexing for inflation have become a recognized part of our tax system.

The lack of indexing of a particular provision to inflation means that a provision is worth less to taxpayers every year. In the case of the child tax credit, this means working low and middle class families.

This legislation essentially removes the annual hidden tax placed on these families and recognizes that $1 of income in 1998 and in 2004 is not the same as $1 of income in 2014.

Similar tax credits that Congress has smartly indexed to inflation include the adoption tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and education tax credit. All of these tax credits make it easier on working families to put money aside and save for the future.

Increasing the phaseout level is a family-friendly change that greatly simplifies the code for middle class parents currently forced to perform a complicated computation and increases the fairness across the Code.

It also includes an antifraud provision championed by Congressman SAM JOHNSON, seeking to curtail tax fraud by requiring a Social Security number to be eligible for this tax credit. It is a simple principle also supported by Democrat United States Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL. Simply put, if you are breaking the law by working illegally in our country, you should not be getting a tax benefit for it.

This is sensible legislation that will help hardworking families keep more of their paychecks and help pay for the rising costs of raising a family. A vote for this bill will give Americans more freedom to save their own money and help struggling families who are just trying to get by.

I urge everyone to support H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, because when working families succeed, the Nation's economy succeeds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear the debate. I wonder if the gentlewoman believes the analogy she made in terms of the cost of living applies to the minimum wage as well, and if she does, I would ask her to urge her leadership to bring the minimum wage bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which takes from those who have little in order to give to those who have more.

For many working families, the child tax credit helps parents keep their children and themselves out of poverty. It is a program that Ronald Reagan liked, it is a program that works, and it is a program that we ought to reform and expand.

Sadly, this Republican bill would allow provisions that most directly support low-income working parents to expire, while expanding the credit to families making up to three times what an average household brings home—how perverse, how predictable.

It will do so by adding $115 billion to our deficit. In a time of economic recovery, Mr. Speaker, we should be doing the opposite, providing a leg up for struggling families while paying for what we buy.

Members on both sides of the aisle agree that the right way to do this is comprehensive tax reform. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP—again, I commend him for putting on the floor—or putting on the table at least—a comprehensive tax reform bill.

He showed courage and good sense. That was done just a few months ago. It showed the difficult choices that are necessary. This bill makes no choices. It just borrows more and puts us more in debt while hurting families.

I don't agree with all of what was in Mr. CAMP's bill, but it was a starting point that, through a bipartisan process of amendment, could provide a path to where we all know we need to go. This bill shirks that responsibility.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. This bill, this bill shirks that responsibility, adds $115 billion to the deficit, and will make the children of low-income working parents less economically secure—how sad.

Reject this bill. Vote ''no.''

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would also like to thank Chairman CAMP for including in this bill my commonsense measure to require tax filers to provide their Social Security number in order to claim the $1,000 refundable child tax credit, formerly known as the additional child tax credit.

My measure would save $24.5 billion. Now, that is real money. Sadly, there has been a lot of misinformation about this commonsense measure. I would like to clear that up.

First, this is basically a benefit check handed out by the IRS. Second, this measure is based on the good work of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

Right now, the IRS is providing this refundable child tax credit to those who are here illegally, but don't take my word for it. This is what the IG said about the refundable tax credit:

> Although the law prohibits aliens residing without authorization in the United States from receiving most Federal public benefits, an increasing number of these individuals are filing tax returns claiming the additional child tax credit, ACTC.

Notice the IG refers to this as a public benefit. The IG also points to an increase in the number of illegal immigrants claiming this benefit. I would add that some are claiming children who don't even live here.

Third, and even more troubling in light of the border crisis, is that the IG says this credit can encourage individuals to come illegally to the United States.

The last thing we need is to continue to encourage folks from Central America to make the dangerous and life-threatening trek to Texas.

Accordingly, the IG has recommended the IRS require Social Security numbers. Why is that? Because Social Security numbers are provided to those who can legally be in the United States.

Additionally, this credit is based on earned income, income that should be earned by those who have Social Security numbers, period.

Fourth, it is not just Republicans who have expressed concern and the need to take action, but also Democrats—yes, Democrats—about the IG's work. For instance, following the 2011 IG report, Democrat Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL from Missouri demanded answers from the IRS and, more importantly, vowed to end payments to individuals without Social Security numbers.

Also, then-Finance chairman and Democrat Senator Max Baucus from Montana, along with other Finance Committee members, fired off a letter expressing serious concern to Treasury and the IRS.

Fifth, requiring tax filers to include their Social Security numbers for the $1,000 refundable child tax credit is a longstanding commonsense idea. For instance, the IRS requires Social Security numbers for the earned income tax credit, a similar refundable credit for low-income families.

Congress included this antifraud measure in the 1996 welfare reform law signed by Democrat President Bill Clinton. Democrats, such as then-Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator HARRY REID, and Congressman STENY HOYER, voted for that law.

Now, let me ask: Do Democrats now oppose requiring Social Security numbers for the earned income tax credit?

In 2008, 215 House Democrats voted for the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, which provided tax rebates to individuals and children. Guess what? That bill also required Social Security numbers. Do Democrats now regret supporting that policy back in 2008?

What is going on here is that President Obama and his Democrat allies in Congress are now playing politics with taxpayer dollars. It is wrong and irresponsible. There is no policy reason for this opposition.

Bottom line, my measure is about protecting the hard-earned taxpayer dollars of Americans, especially those who are struggling to make ends meet in this economy.

It is time to stop playing politics with this. It is time to stand up for the American taxpayer.

I thank the chairman again for working with me on this important taxpayer measure.

□ 1130

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

I say to my friend from Texas, this isn't politics. This is 5 million children, and the estimate is that 4 million are citizens of the United States.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, Republicans are offering a bill that claims to help families but actually does great harm to low-income families with children.

It is really quite a surprising piece of legislation, actually, because it is a backdoor pay increase for Congressmen and Congresswomen who have children. We don't give ourselves any kind of cost-of-living increase, but this is a backdoor pay increase put forward by the Republicans.

Under this bill, couples making between $150,000 and $205,000 would be newly eligible for the child tax credit. So that is all of us, folks. Thank the Republicans for this.

This bill does not, however, make permanent a key provision made to the law in 2009 that is set to expire in 2017. This improvement expanded the refundable portion of the tax credit for millions of hardworking, low-income Americans. Under H.R. 4935, families making minimum wage would lose a portion of their tax credit in 2018. This means that a single mother in South Lake Union, Seattle, working full-time, making $14,500 a year, struggling to support two children, will lose $1,725 in 2018.

In addition, this bill requires one of the taxpayers claiming the child tax credit to have a Social Security number. This provision will harm millions of American kids who are United States citizens living in immigrant families. These children and their families will be cut off from crucial tax relief if this becomes law. That is why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes this bill's Social Security number requirement. They recognize what you are doing. You are going after people at the bottom to give a pay increase to Congressmen. Vote ''no.''

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

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for recognizing that this does put more money back in the pockets of hardworking Americans, but I just want to correct the record that this is in no way, shape, or form a tax increase.

There certainly have been a lot of inaccuracies and highly misleading statements from the other side of the aisle about this bill this morning. This bill does not end the credit for low-income working families. It is not a tax increase on them. It certainly does not cast millions of children deeper into poverty.

The tax provision in this bill originated from the stimulus bill. It was extended back in 2013 for 5 additional years. So it is not currently expiring, and it will not expire until 2018.

All H.R. 4935 does is it keeps that in place and does not even address that particular provision. It does not call for ending that provision. It does not call for reducing or altering that provision. Rather, this bill deals with the immediate concern, and that is the erosion of the value of the child tax credit for every family struggling today.

So following this absurd logic from the other side, every single bill and amendment that comes to the House floor that fails to address or does not extend their provision is a tax increase.

This bill before us today will have and deserves bipartisan support. It is unfortunate that some have resorted to recycled talking points and outright falsehoods to conjure up some reason to oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What you say is totally wrong. You make permanent under your provision a child tax credit for a couple making $160,000, while you do not make permanent the refundable tax credit for families making much, much, much less. That is a fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. To the Chair, I ask that perhaps we can ask someone from the majority as to whether or not the accusation made by the ranking member of the Ways and Means is correct.

To the Chair, I ask that the attention of the majority be given to the speaker at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. LEVIN has said that this change in the law and to remove the marriage penalty allows people making between $150,000 and $205,000 to become eligible for the tax credit. It also says that a family making $160,000 a year would receive a new tax cut of $2,200.

It just seems to me that the majority in this House is not going to allow this to stand unchallenged, and I would hope that either those that are controlling the time or the staff have enough interest to protect the integrity of the Ways and Means Committee to say that these child tax credits are for the working people that need the assistance that they can't get except through the Tax Code.

If we are going to go near a trillion dollars in extending tax credits and extending our national debt, we certainly shouldn't do this for the benefit of the higher-income middle class people. So please don't let this debate close without hearing an answer as to why in the world would we extend the deficit for the benefit of people that are making up to $200,000 a year to receive benefits for child credits.

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

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us actually evens the playing field. If two people are single and have children at the income levels the previous speaker just mentioned, they get the credit. Under current law, if they are married, they don't get the credit.

So what this bill does is actually extends the benefit that goes to singles to married people. We do away with what is called the marriage penalty.

I don't know why the other side is opposed to people getting married, but what is really important about this credit is that it helps middle class families who have seen the credit erode over the years as the cost of food, clothing, housing, and schooling have gone up.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, across America, there are many young couples devoting time to determining the name of their newborn—a happy experience—but I can tell you there is no couple in America that devotes more time to selecting names than our Republican colleagues.

Much of this session, that name-making has been about naming post offices, because if they weren't naming post offices and beginning to rename post offices, they would run out of excuses for doing nothing on the great challenges that our country faces. But the essence of Republican name-making creativity is directed toward bills like this. They are so good at applying names to their bills and so sorry at what goes in the bills.

Today's Child Tax Credit Improvement Act only lacks the fact that it represents no improvement for the working poor. It neither improves the child tax credit nor improves the lives of millions of children living at or near poverty.

Under this bill, a single mom with two children who works full-time at the minimum wage loses almost $2,000 a year. This bill does deserve a name. I think the best one would be the ''Pushing More People Into Poverty Act,'' since its net effect is to push 12 million people, including 6 million children, right into poverty or deeper into it. That includes 400,000 veteran and Armed Forces families who would lose all or part of their child tax credit.

The Republicans may curse Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty on this big anniversary for it, but they continue to wage a war on those in poverty, especially America's most needy children.

A leading advocacy group, First Focus Campaign for Children, reports that our Federal investment in our children has fallen 60 percent faster than overall Federal spending. This analysis shows that small children are

the big losers in the Federal budget battle because their voices aren't heard the loudest.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. We know that every single dollar that these Republicans add to the national debt—and they propose to add about a trillion dollars to the national debt with these unpaid tax breaks—every one of those dollars is another trillion dollars of excuses when it is time to renew the Child Health Insurance Program next year, or CHIP; when it is time to invest in early education and Head Start; and when it is time to invest in preventing child abuse, strengthening our adoption system, and having a family-nurse partnership to work with these young families. Those are the excuses, while one House Republican group calls all of these welfare.

Let's vote for children and against this act.

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

I am just puzzled by this logic that the minority is concerned about a provision that expires in 4 years. They are worried about that today, but yet they are not worried about the loss of buying power for hardworking American families starting next year. They are willing to give up helping families next year, and they want to debate an issue that we aren't going to even address for another 4 years.

As it relates to their charge that this in some way helps the wealthy, I would like to point out that a foundational principle of the Tax Code is that it should be, at worst, neutral toward the decision to get married. It should not be a deterrent. Certainly, it should not make taxpayers worse off merely by making the decision to marry and start a family. Marriage is beneficial to society and something that we have and should continue to encourage.

Removing the marriage penalty is about one thing, and that is fairness. This is especially true for today's two-earner households where both spouses have to work just in order to make ends meet.

Congress has had the wisdom to remove the marriage penalties from many other parts of the Tax Code, including the standard deduction. A deduction for married couples is twice the amount for single filers, and in tax brackets the income range of 10 to 15 percent brackets for couples is twice that of individuals, as it should be.

□ 1145

We are asking for that same parity to be afforded in the child tax credit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), another distinguished member of our committee.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been described by the Republican majority as an extension—an improvement—of the child tax credit, important to many American families, but the fact is this bill is deeply flawed. At a cost of nearly $100 billion, it increases the child tax credit for those with higher incomes while failing to extend needed relief for lower-income families.

Consider the consequences.

A single mother, with two children, working full time at minimum wage, earns just $14,500 annually. She will see a tax increase of $1,725. A lance corporal in the Marine Corps, with 2 years of service, married, with two children, earns about $23,000 a year in base pay. This family will see its taxes go up by $750. Yet those with higher incomes, including Members of Congress, who earn $174,000, and who have two children, will receive a tax cut of $1,600. Then in a hastily added provision, a child who is a legal resident or is a U.S. citizen and whose parent uses an individual tax ID number rather than a Social Security number will be denied the child tax credit no matter what the level of income.

As a result of this legislation, 6 million children will fall into—or deeper into—poverty. In my own home State of Pennsylvania, families making less than $40,000 a year will see their taxes increase by an average of $456, while families making more than $100,000 will see their taxes cut by $685.

This bill ignores these harmful consequences. It will hurt too many hardworking families and children in our Nation. It is wrong. It is a bill that is fiscally irresponsible, and it is morally reprehensible. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with dozens of religious, child, tax, and poverty organizations to strongly oppose H.R. 4935 because it would push an estimated 12 million people, including 6 million children, into deeper poverty.

The child tax credit is one of the most effective tax benefits for families with children and is a shining example of smart Federal investment. The credit encourages work, raises millions of children from poverty, and helps grow economies and support businesses.

Rather than strengthening this antipoverty program, the bill will take away—eviscerate, wipe out—benefits for the most vulnerable Americans, denying financial assistance for basic necessities, like rent and food, and eliminating an average of $1,800 from low-wage families per year.

The child tax credit was designed to help hardworking, low-income families meet the needs of their children, but this child tax credit bill harms these families and threatens the well-being of millions of American children. In reality, the bill does exactly the opposite of what the child tax credit was designed to do. In essence, you could really call it the ''Reverse Robin Hood Child Tax Credit'' bill—take from the poor, benefit the more affluent.

I urge that we vote ''no.''

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the child tax credit, and I support expanding and strengthening the child tax credit.

The problem is this bill does just the opposite for the most needy families with kids in the United States. They don't get a tax cut under this bill. In fact, they get deliberately left behind because this bill fails to extend a critical improvement to the tax credit that is only currently temporary in law, and they don't extend that.

I heard the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee earlier blaming that on the President, once again, as if the President made our Republican colleagues not include that provision in their bill. Extending the child tax credit is in the President's budget. Extending the child tax credit is in the House Democratic budget. Extending that child tax credit enhancement is not in the House Republican budget, and that is why it is not here today.

What is the impact of this?

The impact is to hurt our low-income families with kids. As Mr. LEVIN pointed out earlier, it is really ironic that, just yesterday, the chairman of the Budget Committee gave a big talk in Washington about how he wanted to ''start a conversation about poverty'' and ''help families get ahead.'' That was yesterday. Those were words. Here we are on the floor of the House today with an actual deed, an actual act—a vote that will put 12 million more Americans into poverty or deeper into poverty, 6 million of them children.

The President in his budget extends those benefits—those tax strengthening, tax-cut provisions—and pays for them by getting rid of some of the big tax breaks for corporations. The Republican approach has been just the opposite. In the last 6 weeks, they have permanently extended tax breaks for big corporations, but today, when it comes to the kids, they leave them behind. They don't extend those enhancements.

Who are these individuals? Let me point out to our colleagues the folks who are being left behind:

A single mother of two, working full-time at minimum wage, will lose a tax credit of $1,725. This is an individual who is making about $15,000 a year. These are the people we are trying to help with the child tax credit. Yes, we would love to expand it, but not at the expense of this single mom. Who else

gets left behind? It would be an Army private E–1—married, one child. They are going to lose $229 in their child tax credit because this Republican bill refuses to extend those enhancements.

Mr. Speaker, yes, let's strengthen it, but not at the expense of those most vulnerable families. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am just amazed by the other side's doing time travel 4 years into the future when a lot of hardworking families are struggling every day—right now—to deal with this economy, and that needs to be the focus of this debate.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman BRADY, a fine member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the leadership of Congresswoman JENKINS' on such an important issue for families.

We have two young boys. It is expensive raising kids—it just is—all across America. I don't care what you make or where you live. This is about making it a little easier to raise your children.

You have heard today that everyone is for the child tax credit except, of course, when they have to vote for the tax credit. Then you hear every excuse in the world.

Let's look at what this bill does:

First, it makes permanent this child tax credit so people can count on it. It is indexed for inflation, so that means, when your dollar buys less and less, you shouldn't be punished by Uncle Sam because inflation is going up. It is so families can more closely keep up with the real costs of raising their kids. It eliminates the marriage penalty so Uncle Sam doesn't punish you—so the Federal Government doesn't punish you—simply because you are married and are raising your children. We think it is important that married couples who are struggling to raise families aren't punished by Uncle Sam, and it makes sure more Americans can take advantage of this.

Here is what it doesn't do:

It doesn't include the same failed stimulus programs the White House brought down upon America. As you know, we were promised the economy would be roaring. America normally bounces back from tough economic times, but not this time. This is the worst economic recovery in more than half a century.

To President Obama's unfortunate example, the worst economic recovery in this President's lifetime is his economic recovery. We are missing almost $1.5 trillion out of our economy. We are missing jobs for 5.8 million people. To put that in perspective, if the President had, like an average President, just led a C-grade type of recovery, everyone looking for work in 44 States could have a job today.

Also, as a result of this very weak recovery, do you know what a family of four in America is missing each month from its wages? $1,120. That is $1,120 that should be in a family's pocketbook to pay the rent or utilities or food or all of that. It is missing today because of this poor recovery. Some people say let's stay the course and do more of it. This bill says, no, let's change course and get people back to work, and let's help them raise their children.

The final point I would make is of this provision, including the key antifraud provision by Congressman SAM JOHNSON of Texas. What we know is that billions of dollars each year are being sent to people whose children don't exist. Their children don't exist. Some of the children live outside the country. Others aren't eligible for this at all. Yet Washington sends them a check—your hard-earned tax dollars. They are people who don't deserve this. Congressman JOHNSON's provision says you will actually give us the Social Security number—an accurate one—of that child you are seeking the help for so that we make sure the money goes to those who are eligible for it.

I don't understand sort of the profraud lawmakers who say we don't need to do this, and we don't need to save those dollars. The truth is, for as hard as you work for your money—for the dollars that are out of your paycheck each week or each month—and for what you pay on April 15, your money should go to help people who deserve the help, not to children who don't exist, not to families who don't exist. This is a critical part. It saves billions of dollars.

Let's help families raise their children. Let's help our tax dollars go to the people who actually need them, and let's save some money for Uncle Sam. This bill deserves our support.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when I go home, I often hear people who are disillusioned with politics in America. Some even say that they don't really see a difference between Democrats and Republicans.

Today, my Republican colleagues are demonstrating just how significant the differences really are between Republicans and Democrats, especially when it comes to who is looking out for corporate America and who is looking out for hardworking, middle class America.

This bill claims to do a lot of things, but what it really does is shifts the tax burden away from large multinational corporations and puts it on the backs of working families with children.

Now, they are going to tell you that they are fighting fraud, but that is not what this bill is about today.

If my Republican colleagues wanted to crack down on fraud, they would have joined with Democrats in closing loopholes that provide tax breaks to large companies that shift American jobs overseas, but they haven't done that. They would also join Democrats in cracking down on multinational corporations that avoid paying their fair share of taxes by simply changing the address of a headquarters to a post office box on the Cayman Islands.

I will tell you, if middle class Americans could change their post office boxes to the Cayman Islands, my Republican colleagues would have a bill on the floor to stop that, but they don't have that luxury.

□ 1200

Hardworking Americans can't change their address to a Cayman Island address, so they are just flat out of luck.

Where is the outrage from our Republican colleagues, from my friends, on these abuses?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, there simply isn't any outrage. In fact, the House has taken more than a dozen votes to end these abusive practices, and the majority of my Republican colleagues have opposed each and every one of them.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. The contrast between Republicans and Democrats could never be more clearer than it is right now. Republicans continue to want to protect corporate America, and Democrats want to protect, average, hardworking middle class Americans. That is the clear distinction, once again being demonstrated by this bill on the floor.

Vote ''no'' on this bill. It is time to tell our Republican colleagues to put the interests of the middle class before corporate American interests.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition against this cruel half-measure by the House Republican majority.

The bill is a boon for upper middle class families, but failing to extend the child tax credit expansion for lower-income families means 12 million Americans will be plunged deeper in poverty. That includes six million children, infants, and toddlers. It also includes 400,000 veterans and members of the armed services, men and women who are giving their lives and sacrificing their families for this Nation.

Yesterday, in an article, Bob Woodson, the president of the Center For Neighborhood Enterprise and, I might add, a mentor for Chairman PAUL RYAN, my Republican colleague, he told The Wall Street Journal that we cannot and should not—and this is a quote—''should not generalize about poor people. There are the deserving poor, and there are the undeserving poor.''

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in this Republican majority, you tell me which are the infants

and the toddlers who are the deserving poor and those infants and toddlers who are the undeserving poor?

This is not right. I have always been a strong supporter of the child tax credit. Research has shown that this sort of income support for parents, it boosts employment, increases earnings and income, reduces poverty, and improves kids' school performance.

I have worked hard to pass the expansion of the child tax credit in the recovery act.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. I have long called for the lowering of the eligibility threshold to zero, so that more families in need could benefit. But, like so much else from this majority, this bill unnecessarily leaves working families who are struggling behind. I cannot, in good conscience support it, nor should any of my colleagues support it.

Oppose this cruel, cruel elimination of a child tax credit for deserving families.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and will be prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member for yielding and for your tremendous support on so many issues that affect working men and women, the middle class, the working poor, and the poor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4935, which is the so-called Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an improvement at all. This bill fails to make permanent a key child tax credit improvement for working families earning as little as $3,000 a year. Instead, this bill permanently extends it to higher income families.

A permanent child tax credit must address the needs of all families, but especially the ones who earn the least. Extending a permanent child tax credit that helps wealthy families while failing to make permanent the credit for those living in poverty is just not fair. It is un-American.

This failure would have a devastating impact on more than 5 million families that are already struggling to make ends meet and who need the credits the most.

The President clearly understands this.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. In the Statement of Administration Policy, it is clear that the President understands this. Actually, he understands that this also not only affects the 5 million families, it cuts it for an additional 6 million families. And so I am very pleased that the White House has advised that they do not support this and, hopefully, a veto threat would come if it ever got that far.

Now, yesterday, I might say, Chairman RYAN—and I have to remind us that he rolled out his plan to reduce poverty. Yet, today we see this bill, which would increase poverty.

I am not sure what is going on, Mr. Speaker. We are here to protect all families, particularly those living in poverty. Why in the world would we try, or the Republicans, at least, try to put a compassionate voice and face on such draconian policies?

The rhetoric of yesterday, as it relates to the Ryan rollout of the anti-poverty program, is totally inconsistent with the reality of what we are dealing with and seeing today.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

So under the Republican approach here, they make permanent a child tax credit for families making $150- to $205,000, while refusing to do the same, a refundable tax credit for 12 million people, including 6 million kids, and 400,000 veterans and their families, and they make permanent cutting off another 5 million kids. The estimate is 4 million of them are American citizens.

This is why the Statement of Administration Policy says this: ''If the President were presented with H.R. 4935, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.''

What the Republicans are doing, making permanent a tax cut for families making $150- to $205,000 while refusing to do that for families making much less, this takes the mask off of their rhetoric about poverty. It takes off that mask.

Vote ''no.''

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. One goal of tax policy is to strengthen the economy so that there are more jobs and bigger paychecks for American families. Today, we have an opportunity to put more money in the pockets of hardworking families.

This commonsense bill reforms the child tax credit so that it can keep up with the rising cost of living, and eliminates the current marriage tax penalty.

I have a letter of support that says it best, and I quote:

> Representative Jenkins' bill indexes the credit and income limits for inflation. Inflation erodes the value and purchasing power of the U.S. dollar and, as a result, a dollar is worth less today than it was years ago. This important piece of legislation adjusts the credit for inflation to ensure that the value of the credit continues to maintain its value.
>
> We know that family and marriage is beneficial to society, and the Federal Government ought to promote economic policies that allow families to thrive. This tax credit recognizes the important contribution of the family and children to our country and starts to address a problem with our Tax Code today, the marriage penalty. A fair system of taxation does not penalize marriage and family.

With that, I would ask the body to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, to honor families with children.

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this Republican-led House has recently been in the habit of passing extraordinarily expensive corporate and business tax provisions, making each permanent.

However, we are here today to follow a completely different track. Today, we will leave countless single mothers and fathers, struggling to support a family, without the certainty we rushed to provide corporations.

Honestly, I'm dumbfounded by this. I'm dumbfounded and frustrated by a Majority that can find it in their hearts to make corporate provisions like R&D—which I support—permanent, but can't find that same heart for hardworking Americans.

It is truly disgraceful.

While there are a few good provisions in the bill before us, we are leaving the most vulnerable taxpayers out in the cold. Literally. Parents will have to choose between heating their home in the dead of winter and putting food on the table for their kids when we take roughly $1,700 out of their pockets.

Kids are not cheap and this bill doesn't come close to addressing the price of raising healthy, successful children. As a working mom, I understand the struggle to raise a family. And I'm one of the lucky ones.

Many of my constituents—and constituents of each one of us here today—aren't so lucky. These aren't lazy people, expecting a government handout, but hardworking parents.

I cannot support a bill to increase poverty across the country.

On top of all this, at the eleventh hour, the Majority tossed in a devastating amendment to this bill. An amendment that denies millions of children a tax benefit their parents deserve and have paid for. Parents who have worked long hours and paid their fair share of federal taxes will no longer be able to claim the refundable child tax credit. Seriously? You are going to pull the rug out from under struggling families? You have got to be kidding me.

If we can pass permanent tax law for corporations, we can certainly tackle permanent policy for people straining to make ends meet.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 4935, The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act indexes the credit and the limitations to inflation to help parents keep more of their hard earned money to use for the mounting expenses of parenting. Under the bill, the amount of the child tax credit would be indexed for inflation and the marriage penalty would be eliminated by increasing the joint filing phase-out threshold to exactly double that of single filers.

A product of the 1997 Tax Act, the Child Tax Credit complements the Earned Income Tax Credit and helps to further buttress the case that the road to prosperity winds through the tax code by reducing poverty, encouraging work, and strengthening families with children.

The changes proposed earlier this year by both President Obama and Chairman CAMP highlight some of the challenges that these programs face including the complexity surrounding combining work and child tax incentives, definitions of qualifying children, and some of the deficiencies these tax benefits have with respect to childless workers.

But the version of the bill reported by the Ways & Means increases the deficit by $114.9 billion. In addition, a provision was added in the Rules Committee requiring taxpayers to have a Social Security Number to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit, reducing the value of the underlying bill by $24.5 billion.

As a result, the final version of the bill increases the deficit by $90.4 billion.

I want to continue to work on tax legislation which benefits the 18th District and enhances the Child Tax Credit, so that the working families across this great nation you have advocated for may lift themselves out of poverty, and seek the American Dream but this version is not an improvement but instead is a step back.

In fact Mr. Speaker, while I proudly serve on the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, in April, I hosted a briefing on the Child Tax Credit and the Earned Income Tax Credit, which demonstrates the importance of this provision in helping to fight poverty and allowing many Americans in Texas and elsewhere to have a better shot at the American Dream.

This briefing was led by two experts, Elaine Maag from the Urban Institute and Margot Crandall-Hollick of the Congressional Research Service which was organized, along with two other briefings on International Taxation and Retirement Tax provisions, by my Economic Policy Counsel, Darrell Rico Doss. And in spite of the fact that it took place during recess and we did not serve food—my staff assures me that we had an excellent turnout and an even better briefing because of Elaine and Margot who addressed a spellbound audience of Hill staff and others on the intricacies of the two tax credits.

Why? Because the Child Tax Credit was significantly expanded by the Bush tax cuts, and further expanded, especially for low-income taxpayers, by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Many, though not all of these expansions were subsequently made permanent by the American Taxpayer Relief Act. That expansion of the credit occurred under two presidents—illustrating its bipartisan nature.

But only in this Congress—led by an intransigent GOP Majority would this critical poverty-busting tax provision be politicized to the point that I suspect the vote will largely be along party lines.

Today, as the House considers this GOP child tax credit bill which does the opposite of what is needed: it would provide permanent tax cuts to many affluent families, while letting the Child Tax Credit disappear for many low-income working families after 2017.

After 2017, H.R. 4935 would effectively eliminate the Child Tax Credit for 5 million families, while cutting it for 6 million more. A single parent with two children working full-time at minimum wage would lose her entire tax credit of $1,725.

Meanwhile, a couple with two children with income of $150,000 would receive a Child Tax Credit $2,200 larger than today. In addition, H.R. 4935 would immediately eliminate the Child Tax Credit for millions of American children whose parents immigrated to this country, including U.S. citizen children and ''Dreamers,'' and would push many of these children into or deeper into poverty.

Here are the three key features of this GOP child tax credit bill (more information about each of these features is below):

It fails to make permanent a key improvement in the Child Tax Credit enacted in 2009 that makes more low-income working families eligible for the credit and that will expire in 2017 unless Congress acts.

It indexes the current maximum credit of $1,000 per child to inflation, which benefits only those with incomes high enough to receive the maximum benefit.

It extends the Child Tax Credit up the income scale—on a permanent basis—so more families with six-figure incomes will benefit.

So, today after Rep. PAUL RYAN unveiled his so-called ''antipoverty'' plan, my Republican colleagues bring up this bill that is estimated to result in pushing 12 million people—including 6 million children—into or deeper into poverty, by failing to extend the key 2009 Child Tax Credit improvement which will expire in 2017.

First, this bill hurts low-income working families by failing to make permanent the key provision enacted in 2009 that made more low- and moderate-income working families eligible for the CTC and enlarged the CTC for others who had been receiving only a partial credit. This provision expires in 2017. If this provision expires on schedule, as this GOP bill allows:

A single mother with two children in Houston who works full time throughout the year at the minimum wage and earns $14,500 would lose $1,725 in 2018, as her Child Tax Credit would be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, about 12 million people including 6 million children in 2018 will be pushed into, or deeper into, poverty.

Again, it is hypocritical of House Republicans—who have let emergency unemployment insurance expire for more than 3 million Americans, refused to provide a permanent fix to the sustainable growth rate (SGR) for Medicare payments to doctors, and failed to replace the irrational, across-the-board spending cuts imposed by the sequester all on arguments over offsets—to bring this bill to the Floor without paying for it.

As I cast my vote this morning the fact is not lost on me—and I am sure many other Members in this body—that four months ago the Republican Leadership let emergency unemployment insurance expire for more than 1.3 million Americans—many at the end of their proverbial economic rope.

Many of these unemployed live in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, comprising Houston and outlying areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than irresponsible but recklessness in the guise of looking out for families.

I have to ask a burning question—what happened to deficit reduction?

However, the choice made by House Republicans to address these provisions one by one, while adding their cost to the deficit, represents an irresponsible approach that will only make fixing our broken tax system harder and put further fiscal strain on federal, state, and local programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for children and families—but this bill must be paid for—because if they are not—future generations will suffer because of the unsustainable debt.

Let us get back to being fiscally responsible and helping America's families by enacting smart, pragmatic tax policy.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4935 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Con. Res. 105, adoption of the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5081.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 173, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—237

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
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
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)

Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—173

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

NOT VOTING—22

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Fleischmann
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Heck (WA)
Honda
Kingston
Marchant
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

□ 1237

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PEARCE and GIBSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 40, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—370

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

NAYS—40

Aderholt
Brooks (IN)
Cantor
Cartwright
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Cotton
Crawford
Duffy
Flores
Gosar
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Hunter
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Messer
Palazzo
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rooney
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Schock
Sessions
Shimkus
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Fleischmann
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Heck (WA)
Honda
Kingston
Marchant
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1243

Mrs. WALORSKI changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''A concurrent resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific, subsequent statutory authorization.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452, I inadvertently voted "nay." My intent was to vote "yea."

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) 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 213, nays 193, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—213

Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
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
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—26

Bishop (UT)
Buchanan
Campbell
Capito
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Fleischmann
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Heck (WA)
Honda
Kingston
Marchant
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1251

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. JONES, ROYCE, and CASSIDY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5081) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—399

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta

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

NOT VOTING—33

Amodei
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Fattah
Fleischmann
Gardner
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Marchant
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NE)
Stewart
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1258

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 680, H.R. 4935 is laid on the table.

□ 1300

UNLOCKING CONSUMER CHOICE AND WIRELESS COMPETITION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 517) to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 517

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 ''Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF EXISTING RULE AND ADDITIONAL RULEMAKING BY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

(a) REPEAL AND REPLACE.—As of the date of the enactment of this Act, paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended and revised by the Librarian of Congress on October 28, 2012, pursuant to the Librarian's authority under section 1201(a) of title 17, United States Code, shall have no force and effect, and such paragraph shall read, and shall be in effect, as such paragraph was in effect on July 27, 2010.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights, who shall consult with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and report and comment on his or her views in making such recommendation, shall determine, consistent with the requirements set forth under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code, whether to extend the exemption for the class of works described in section 201.40(b)(3) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended by subsection (a), to include any other category of wireless devices in addition to wireless telephone handsets. The determination shall be made in the first rulemaking under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code, that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) UNLOCKING AT DIRECTION OF OWNER.—Circumvention of a technological measure that restricts wireless telephone handsets or other wireless devices from connecting to a wireless telecommunications network—

(1)(A) as authorized by paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as made effective by subsection (a); and

(B) as may be extended to other wireless devices pursuant to a determination in the rulemaking conducted under subsection (b); or

(2) as authorized by an exemption adopted by the Librarian of Congress pursuant to a determination made on or after the date of enactment of this Act under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code,

may be initiated by the owner of any such handset or other device, by another person at the direction of the owner, or by a provider of a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service at the direction of such owner or other person, solely in order to enable such owner or a family member of such owner to connect to a wireless telecommunications network, when such connection is authorized by the operator of such network.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as expressly provided herein, nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter the scope of any party's rights under existing law.

(2) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—Nothing in this Act alters, or shall be construed to alter, the authority of the Librarian of Congress under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COMMERCIAL MOBILE DATA SERVICE; COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICE.—The terms

''commercial mobile data service'' and ''commercial mobile radio service'' have the respective meanings given those terms in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.—The term ''wireless telecommunications network'' means a network used to provide a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service.

(3) WIRELESS TELEPHONE HANDSETS; WIRELESS DEVICES.—The terms ''wireless telephone handset'' and ''wireless device'' mean a handset or other device that operates on a wireless telecommunications network.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MOLDOVA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 562) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for Moldova's territorial integrity, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 562

Whereas the United States has enjoyed good relations with the Republic of Moldova since the Republic of Moldova's independence in 1991;

Whereas since the Republic of Moldova's independence, the United States has provided financial assistance to support the people of Moldova's efforts to build a prosperous European democracy;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Moldova further strengthened their partnership through the launching of a Strategic Dialogue on March 3, 2014;

Whereas the Republic of Moldova is due to sign an Association Agreement containing comprehensive free trade provisions with the European Union on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States Government supports the democratic aspirations of the people of the Republic of Moldova and their expressed desire to deepen their association with the European Union;

Whereas in a judgment in 2004, the European Court of Human Rights found that Transnistria was set up with the support of the Russian Federation and considered it ''under the effective authority or at least decisive influence of Russia'';

Whereas the United States supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and on that basis participates as an observer in the ''5+2'' negotiations to find a comprehensive settlement that will provide a special status for the separatist region of Transnistria within Moldova;

Whereas the leaders of the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova requested to postpone the ''5+2'' round of talks scheduled to take place in April 2014;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation banned the import of Moldovan wine in 2013 and has threatened to ban Moldovan agricultural products, curtail the supply of energy resources to Moldova, and impose stricter labor migration policies on the people of Moldova;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation maintains a contingent of Russian troops and a stockpile of Russian military equipment and ammunition within the Moldovan region of Transnistria;

Whereas the Government of Russia has been actively issuing Russian passports to the residents of the Transnistria region;

Whereas the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Government of Moldova have called upon the Government of the Russian Federation to remove its troops from the territory of the Republic of Moldova;

Whereas authorities in the Republic of Moldova's Transnistria region have restricted access to the region by OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors, preventing the Mission from providing impartial reporting on the security situation in the region;

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate both passed by an overwhelming majority, and the President signed into law, S. 2183, providing for a United States international broadcasting programming surge to counter misinformation from Russian-supported news outlets and ensuring that Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine and Moldova have access to independent news and information; and

Whereas Moldova has been a valued and reliable partner in promoting global security by participating in U.N. peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and the inviolability of its borders by other nation-states;

(2) supports the Strategic Dialogue as a means to strengthen relations between the Republic of Moldova and the United States and enhance the democratic, economic, rule of law, and security reforms already being implemented by the Republic of Moldova;

(3) encourages the President and the Department of State to enhance United States cooperation with the Government of Moldova and civil society organizations and focus assistance on justice sector reform, anti-corruption efforts, strengthening democratic institutions, domestic energy development, diversification of energy supplies and energy efficiency, as well as promoting trade and investment opportunities;

(4) encourages the President to expedite the implementation of Public Law 113-96, especially for populations in Ukraine and Moldova;

(5) affirms the Republic of Moldova's sovereign right to determine its own partnerships free of external coercion and pressure, and affirms Moldova's right to associate with the European Union or any regional organization;

(6) calls upon the Government of Russia to fulfill its commitments made at the OSCE's Istanbul summit in 1999 and to withdraw its military forces and munitions from within the internationally recognized territory of the Republic of Moldova;

(7) calls upon the Government of Russia to refrain from economic threats and pressure against Moldova and to cease any and all actions that support separatist movements on the territory of Moldova;

(8) supports constructive engagement and confidence-building measures between the Government of Moldova and the authorities in the Transnistria region in order to secure a peaceful resolution to the conflict;

(9) supports efforts to resolve the Transnistria issue through a comprehensive settlement that affirms Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while providing a special status for the Transnistrian region within Moldova;

(10) urges officials in the Transnistrian region to allow OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors unrestricted access to the region;

(11) urges all parties to refrain from unilateral actions that may undermine efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution, as well as the agreements already reached, and encourages leaders of the Transnistrian region to resume negotiations toward a political settlement; and

(12) affirms that lasting stability and security in Europe is a key priority for the United States and that these can only be achieved if the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European countries is respected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and the inviolability of its borders by other nation-states;

(2) supports the Strategic Dialogue as a means to strengthen relations between the Republic of Moldova and the United States and enhance the democratic, economic, rule of law, and security reforms already being implemented by the Republic of Moldova;

(3) encourages the President and the Department of State to enhance United States cooperation with the Government of Moldova and civil society organizations and focus assistance on justice sector reform, anti-corruption efforts, strengthening democratic institutions, domestic energy development, diversification of energy supplies and energy efficiency, as well as promoting trade and investment opportunities;

(4) encourages the President to expedite the implementation of Public Law 113–96, especially for populations in Ukraine and Moldova;

(5) affirms the Republic of Moldova's sovereign right to determine its own partnerships free of external coercion and pressure, and affirms Moldova's right to associate with the European Union or any regional organization;

(6) calls upon the Government of Russia to fulfill its commitments made at the OSCE's Istanbul summit in 1999 and to withdraw its military forces and munitions from within the internationally recognized territory of the Republic of Moldova;

(7) calls upon the Government of Russia to refrain from economic threats and pressure against Moldova and to cease any and all actions that support separatist movements on the territory of Moldova;

(8) supports constructive engagement and confidence-building measures between the Government of Moldova and the authorities in the Transnistria region in order to secure a peaceful resolution to the conflict;

(9) supports efforts to resolve the Transnistria issue through a comprehensive

settlement that affirms Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while providing a special status for the Transnistrian region within Moldova;

(10) urges officials in the Transnistrian region to allow OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors unrestricted access to the region;

(11) urges all parties to refrain from unilateral actions that may undermine efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution, as well as the agreements already reached, and encourages leaders of the Transnistrian region to resume negotiations toward a political settlement; and

(12) affirms that lasting stability and security in Europe is a key priority for the United States and that these can only be achieved if the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European countries is respected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the text be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the United States has enjoyed good relations with the Republic of Moldova since the Republic of Moldova's independence in 1991;

Whereas since the Republic of Moldova's independence, the United States has provided financial assistance to support the people of Moldova's efforts to build a prosperous European democracy;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Moldova further strengthened their partnership through the launching of a Strategic Dialogue on March 3, 2014;

Whereas the Republic of Moldova is due to sign an Association Agreement containing comprehensive free trade provisions with the European Union on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States Government supports the democratic aspirations of the people of the Republic of Moldova and their expressed desire to deepen their association with the European Union;

Whereas in a judgment in 2004, the European Court of Human Rights found that Transnistria was set up with the support of the Russian Federation and considered it ''under the effective authority or at least decisive influence of Russia'';

Whereas the United States supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and on that basis participates as an observer in the ''5+2'' negotiations to find a comprehensive settlement that will provide a special status for the separatist region of Transnistria within Moldova;

Whereas the leaders of the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova requested to postpone the ''5+2'' round of talks scheduled to take place in April 2014;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation banned the import of Moldovan wine in 2013 and has threatened to ban Moldovan agricultural products, curtail the supply of energy resources to Moldova, and impose stricter labor migration policies on the people of Moldova;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation maintains a contingent of Russian troops and a stockpile of Russian military equipment and ammunition within the Moldovan region of Transnistria;

Whereas the Government of Russia has been actively issuing Russian passports to the residents of the Transnistria region;

Whereas the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Government of Moldova have called upon the Government of the Russian Federation to remove its troops from the territory of the Republic of Moldova;

Whereas authorities in the Republic of Moldova's Transnistria region have restricted access to the region by OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors, preventing the Mission from providing impartial reporting on the security situation in the region;

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate both passed by an overwhelming majority, and the President signed into law, S. 2183, providing for a United States international broadcasting programming surge to counter misinformation from Russian-supported news outlets and ensuring that Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine and Moldova have access to independent news and information; and

Whereas Moldova has been a valued and reliable partner in promoting global security by participating in U.N. peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the preamble text be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 653) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 653

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 ''Near East and South Central Asia Religious Freedom Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ENVOY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President may appoint a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (in this Act referred to as the ''Special Envoy'') within the Department of State. The Special Envoy shall have the rank of ambassador and shall hold the office at the pleasure of the President.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Special Envoy should be a person of recognized distinction in the field of human rights and religious freedom and with expertise in the Near East and South Central Asia.

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Special Envoy shall carry out the following duties:

(1) Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.

(2) Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(3) Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities.

(4) Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

(5) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(6) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Special Envoy shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees and Migration, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and other relevant Federal agencies and officials.

SEC. 4. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.

Subject to the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, the Special Envoy is authorized to represent the United States in matters and cases relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia in—

(1) contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, and specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(2) multilateral conferences and meetings relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATIONS.

The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations

and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on October 1, 2019.

SEC. 7. FUNDING.

Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary of State for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, the Secretary of State is authorized to provide to the Special Envoy $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year for the hiring of staff, the conduct of investigations, and necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSESSING PROGRESS IN HAITI ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1104) to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1104

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 ''Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On January 12, 2010, a massive earthquake struck near the Haitian capital city of Port-au-Prince, leaving an estimated 220,000 people dead, including 103 United States citizens, 101 United Nations personnel, and nearly 18 percent of the nation's civil service, as well as 300,000 injured, 115,000 homes destroyed, and 1,500,000 people displaced.

(2) According to the Post Disaster Needs Assessment conducted by the Government of Haiti, with technical assistance from the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and the European Commission, an estimated 15 percent of the population was directly affected by the disaster and related damages and economic losses totaled $7,804,000,000.

(3) Even before the earthquake, Haiti had some of the lowest socioeconomic indicators and the second highest rate of income disparity in the world, conditions that have further complicated post-earthquake recovery efforts and, according to the World Bank, have significantly reduced the prospects of addressing poverty reduction through economic growth.

(4) According to the World Food Programme, more than 6,700,000 people in Haiti (out of a population of about 10,000,000) are considered food insecure.

(5) In October 2010, an unprecedented outbreak of cholera in Haiti resulted in over 500,000 reported cases and over 8,000 deaths to date, further straining the capacity of Haiti's public health sector and increasing the urgency of resettlement and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) efforts.

(6) The international community, led by the United States and the United Nations, mounted an unprecedented humanitarian response in Haiti, with donors pledging approximately $10,400,000,000 for humanitarian relief and recovery efforts, including debt relief, supplemented by $3,100,000,000 in private charitable contributions, of which approximately $6,400,000,000 has been disbursed and an additional $3,800,000,000 has been committed as of September 30, 2013.

(7) The emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the United States Southern Command, as well as of cities, towns, individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States, was particularly swift and resolute.

(8) Since 2010, a total of $1,300,000,000 in United States assistance has been allocated for humanitarian relief and $2,300,000,000 has been allocated for recovery, reconstruction, and development assistance in Haiti, including $1,140,000,000 in emergency appropriations and $95,000,000 that has been obligated specifically to respond to the cholera epidemic.

(9) Of the $3,600,000,000 in United States assistance allocated for Haiti, $651,000,000 was apportioned to USAID to support an ambitious recovery plan, including the construction of a power plant to provide electricity for the new Caracol Industrial Park (CIP) in northern Haiti, a new port near the CIP, and permanent housing in new settlements in the Port-au-Prince, St-Marc, and Cap-Haïtien areas.

(10) According to a recent report of the Government Accountability Office, as of June 30, 2013, USAID had disbursed 31 percent of its reconstruction funds in Haiti, the port project was 2 years behind schedule and USAID funding will be insufficient to cover a majority of the projected costs, the housing project has been reduced by 80 percent, and the sustainability of the power plant, the port, and the housing projects were all at risk.

(11) GAO further found that Congress has not been provided with sufficient information to ensure that it is able to conduct effective oversight at a time when most funding remains to be disbursed, and specifically recommends that a periodic reporting mechanism be instituted to fill this information gap.

(12) Donors have encountered significant challenges in implementing recovery programs, and nearly 4 years after the earthquake, an estimated 171,974 people remain displaced in camps, unemployment remains high, corruption is rampant, land rights remain elusive, allegations of wage violations are widespread, the business climate is unfavorable, and government capacity remains weak.

(13) For Haiti to achieve stability and long term economic growth, donor assistance will have to be carefully coordinated with a commitment by the Government of Haiti to transparency, a market economy, rule of law, and democracy.

(14) The legal environment in Haiti remains a challenge to achieving the goals supported by the international community.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support the sustainable rebuilding and development of Haiti in a manner that—

(1) promotes efforts that are led by and support the people and Government of Haiti at all levels so that Haitians lead the course of reconstruction and development of Haiti;

(2) builds the long term capacity of the Government of Haiti and civil society in Haiti;

(3) reflects the priorities and particular needs of both women and men so they may participate equally and to their maximum capacity;

(4) respects and helps restore Haiti's natural resources, as well as builds community-level resilience to environmental and weather-related impacts;

(5) provides timely and comprehensive reporting on goals and progress, as well as transparent post program evaluations and contracting data;

(6) prioritizes the local procurement of goods and services in Haiti where appropriate; and

(7) promotes the holding of free, fair, and timely elections in accordance with democratic principles and the Haitian Constitution.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that transparency, accountability, democracy, and good governance are integral factors in any congressional decision regarding United States assistance, including assistance to Haiti.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and annually thereafter through December 31, 2017, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake recovery and development efforts in Haiti.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of ''Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity'', including any significant changes to the strategy over the reporting period and an explanation thereof;

(2) a breakdown of the work that the United States Government agencies other than USAID and the Department of State are conducting in the Haiti recovery effort, and the cost of that assistance;

(3) an assessment of the progress of United States efforts to advance the objectives of the ''Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity'' produced by the Department of State, compared to what remains to be achieved to meet specific goals, including—

(A) a description of any significant changes to the Strategy over the reporting period and an explanation thereof;

(B) an assessment of progress, or lack thereof, over the reporting period toward meeting the goals and objectives, benchmarks, and timeframes specified in the Strategy, including—

(i) a description of progress toward designing and implementing a coordinated and sustainable housing reconstruction strategy that addresses land ownership, secure land tenure, water and sanitation, and the unique concerns of vulnerable populations such as women and children, as well as neighborhood and community revitalization, housing finance, and capacity building for the Government of Haiti to implement an effective housing policy;

(ii) a description of United States Government efforts to construct and sustain the proposed port, as well as an assessment of the current projected timeline and cost for completion; and

(iii) a description of United States Government efforts to attract and leverage the investments of private sector partners to the CIP, including by addressing any policy impediments;

(C) a description of the quantitative and qualitative indicators used to evaluate the

progress toward meeting the goals and objectives, benchmarks, and timeframes specified in the Strategy at the program level;

(D) the amounts committed, obligated, and expended on programs and activities to implement the Strategy, by sector and by implementing partner at the prime and subprime levels (in amounts of not less than $25,000); and

(E) a description of the risk mitigation measures put in place to limit the exposure of United States assistance provided under the Strategy to waste, fraud, and abuse;

(4) a description of measures taken to strengthen, and United States Government efforts to improve, Haitian governmental and nongovernmental organizational capacity to undertake and sustain United States-supported recovery programs;

(5) as appropriate, a description of United States efforts to consult and engage with Government of Haiti ministries and local authorities on the establishment of goals and timeframes, and on the design and implementation of new programs under the Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity;

(6) a description of efforts by Haiti's legislative and executive branches to consult and engage with Haitian civil society and grassroots organizations on the establishment of goals and timeframes, and on the design and implementation of new donor-financed programs, as well as efforts to coordinate with and engage the Haitian diaspora;

(7) consistent with the Government of Haiti's ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, a description of efforts of the Governments of the United States and Haiti to strengthen Government of Haiti institutions established to address corruption, as well as related efforts to promote public accountability, meet public outreach and disclosure obligations, and support civil society participation in anti-corruption efforts;

(8) a description of efforts to leverage public-private partnerships and increase the involvement of the private sector in Haiti in recovery and development activities and coordinate programs with the private sector and other donors;

(9) a description of efforts to address the particular needs of vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, women, children, orphans, and persons with disabilities, in the design and implementation of new programs and infrastructure;

(10) a description of the impact that agriculture and infrastructure programs are having on the food security, livelihoods, and land tenure security of smallholder farmers, particularly women;

(11) a description of mechanisms for communicating the progress of recovery and development efforts to the people of Haiti, including a description of efforts to provide documentation, reporting and procurement information in Haitian Creole;

(12) a description of the steps the Government of Haiti is taking to strengthen its capacity to receive individuals who are removed, excluded, or deported from the United States; and

(13) an assessment of actions necessary to be taken by the Government of Haiti to assist in fulfilling the objectives of the Strategy.

SEC. 6. STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, acting through the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, shall coordinate and transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a three-year Haiti strategy based on rigorous assessments that—

(1) identifies and addresses constraints to sustainable, broad-based economic growth and to the consolidation of responsive, democratic government institutions;

(2) includes an action plan that outlines policy tools, technical assistance, and anticipated resources for addressing the highest-priority constraints to economic growth and the consolidation of democracy, as well as a specific description of mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating progress; and

(3) identifies specific steps and verifiable benchmarks appropriate to provide direct bilateral assistance to the Government of Haiti.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) should address the following elements:

(1) A plan to engage the Government of Haiti on shared priorities to build long-term capacity, including the development of a professional civil service, to assume increasing responsibility for governance and budgetary sustainment of governmental institutions.

(2) A plan to assist the Government of Haiti in holding free, fair and timely elections in accordance with democratic principles.

(3) Specific goals for future United States support for efforts to build the capacity of the Government of Haiti, including to–

(A) reduce corruption;

(B) consolidate the rule of law and an independent judiciary;

(C) strengthen the civilian police force;

(D) develop sustainable housing, including ensuring appropriate titling and land ownership rights;

(E) expand port capacity to support economic growth;

(F) attract and leverage the investments of private sector partners, including to the Caracol Industrial Park;

(G) promote large and small scale agricultural development in a manner that reduces food insecurity and contributes to economic growth;

(H) improve access to potable water, expand public sanitation services, reduce the spread of infectious diseases, and address public health crises;

(I) restore the natural resources of Haiti, including enhancing reforestation efforts throughout the country; and

(J) gain access to safe, secure, and affordable supplies of energy in order to strengthen economic growth and energy security.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In devising the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary should—

(1) coordinate with all United States Government departments and agencies carrying out work in Haiti;

(2) consult with the Government of Haiti, including the National Assembly of Haiti, and representatives of private and nongovernmental sectors in Haiti; and

(3) consult with relevant multilateral organizations, multilateral development banks, private sector institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and foreign governments present in Haiti.

(d) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, shall provide a quarterly briefing that reviews progress of the implementation of the strategy required under subsection (a).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3212) 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, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings; sense of Congress; purposes.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

Sec. 101. Annual report.
Sec. 102. Standards and assistance.
Sec. 103. Bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding.
Sec. 104. Report to congressional representatives.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Sec. 201. Response to international child abductions.
Sec. 202. Actions by the Secretary of State in response to patterns of noncompliance in cases of international child abductions.
Sec. 203. Consultations with foreign governments.
Sec. 204. Waiver by the Secretary of State.
Sec. 205. Termination of actions by the Secretary of State.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Sec. 301. Preventing children from leaving the United States in violation of a court order.
Sec. 302. Authorization for judicial training on international parental child abduction.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sean Goldman, a United States citizen and resident of New Jersey, was abducted from the United States in 2004 and separated from his father, David Goldman, who spent nearly 6 years battling for the return of his son from Brazil before Sean was finally returned to Mr. Goldman's custody on December 24, 2009.

(2) The Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, which serves as the Central Authority of the United States for the purposes of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (referred to in this Act as the ''Hague Abduction Convention''), has received thousands of requests since

2007 for assistance in the return to the United States of children who have been wrongfully abducted by a parent or other legal guardian to another country.

(3) For a variety of reasons reflecting the significant obstacles to the recovery of abducted children, as well as the legal and factual complexity involving such cases, not all cases are reported to the Central Authority of the United States.

(4) More than 1,000 outgoing international child abductions are reported every year to the Central Authority of the United States, which depends solely on proactive reporting of abduction cases.

(5) Only about one-half of the children abducted from the United States to countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention are returned to the United States.

(6) The United States and other Convention countries have expressed their desire, through the Hague Abduction Convention, ''to protect children internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention and to establish procedures to ensure their prompt return to the State of their habitual residence, as well as to secure protection for rights of access.''

(7) Compliance by the United States and other Convention countries depends on the actions of their designated central authorities, the performance of their judicial systems as reflected in the legal process and decisions rendered to enforce or effectuate the Hague Abduction Convention, and the ability and willingness of their law enforcement authorities to ensure the swift enforcement of orders rendered pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(8) According to data from the Department of State, approximately 40 percent of abduction cases involve children taken from the United States to countries with which the United States does not have reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or other arrangements relating to the resolution of abduction cases.

(9) According to the Department of State's April 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, ''parental child abduction jeopardizes the child and has substantial long-term consequences for both the child and the left-behind parent.''

(10) Few left-behind parents have the extraordinary financial resources necessary—

(A) to pursue individual civil or criminal remedies in both the United States and a foreign country, even if such remedies are available; or

(B) to engage in repeated foreign travel to attempt to obtain the return of their children through diplomatic or other channels.

(11) Military parents often face additional complications in resolving abduction cases because of the challenges presented by their military obligations.

(12) In addition to using the Hague Abduction Convention to achieve the return of abducted children, the United States has an array of Federal, State, and local law enforcement, criminal justice, and judicial tools at its disposal to prevent international abductions.

(13) Federal agencies tasked with preventing international abductions have indicated that the most effective way to stop international child abductions is while they are in progress, rather than after the child has been removed to a foreign destination.

(14) Parental awareness of abductions in progress, rapid response by relevant law enforcement, and effective coordination among Federal, State, local, and international stakeholders are critical in preventing such abductions.

(15) A more robust application of domestic tools, in cooperation with international law enforcement entities and appropriate application of the Hague Abduction Convention could—

(A) discourage some parents from attempting abductions;

(B) block attempted abductions at ports of exit; and

(C) help achieve the return of more abducted children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should set a strong example for other Convention countries in the timely location and prompt resolution of cases involving children abducted abroad and brought to the United States.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect children whose habitual residence is the United States from wrongful abduction;

(2) to assist left-behind parents in quickly resolving cases and maintaining safe and predictable contact with their child while an abduction case is pending;

(3) to protect the custodial rights of parents, including military parents, by providing the parents, the judicial system, and law enforcement authorities with the information they need to prevent unlawful abduction before it occurs;

(4) to enhance the prompt resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) to detail an appropriate set of actions to be undertaken by the Secretary of State to address persistent problems in the resolution of abduction cases;

(6) to establish a program to prevent wrongful abductions; and

(7) to increase interagency coordination in preventing international child abduction by convening a working group composed of presidentially appointed and Senate confirmed officials from the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Justice.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABDUCTED CHILD.—The term ''abducted child'' means a child who is the victim of international child abduction.

(2) ABDUCTION.—The term ''abduction'' means the alleged wrongful removal of a child from the child's country of habitual residence, or the wrongful retention of a child outside such country, in violation of a left-behind parent's custodial rights, including the rights of a military parent.

(3) ABDUCTION CASE.—The term ''abduction case'' means a case that—

(A) has been reported to the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the resolution of an abduction; and

(B) meets the criteria for an international child abduction under the Hague Abduction Convention, regardless of whether the country at issue is a Convention country.

(4) ACCESS CASE.—The term ''access case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a parent seeking rights of access.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''Annual Report'' means the Annual Report on International Child Abduction required under section 101.

(6) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the application required pursuant to article 8 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the formal document required, pursuant to the provisions of the applicable arrangement, to request the return of an abducted child or to request rights of access, as applicable; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the formal request by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country requesting the return of an abducted child or for rights of contact with an abducted child.

(7) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(8) BILATERAL PROCEDURES.—The term ''bilateral procedures'' means any procedures established by, or pursuant to, a bilateral arrangement, including a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country, to resolve abduction and access cases, including procedures to address interim contact matters.

(9) BILATERAL PROCEDURES COUNTRY.—The term ''bilateral procedures country'' means a country with which the United States has entered into bilateral procedures, including Memoranda of Understanding, with respect to child abductions.

(10) CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Central Authority'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the meaning given such term in article 6 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the official entity designated by the government of the bilateral procedures country within the applicable memorandum of understanding pursuant to section 103(b)(1) to discharge the duties imposed on the entity; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the foreign ministry or other appropriate authority of such country.

(11) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who has not attained 16 years of age.

(12) CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''Convention country'' means a country for which the Hague Abduction Convention has entered into force with respect to the United States.

(13) HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION.—The term ''Hague Abduction Convention'' means the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague October 25, 1980.

(14) INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''interim contact'' means the ability of a left-behind parent to communicate with or visit an abducted child during the pendency of an abduction case.

(15) LEFT-BEHIND PARENT.—The term ''left-behind parent'' means an individual or legal custodian who alleges that an abduction has occurred that is in breach of rights of custody attributed to such individual.

(16) NON-CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''non-Convention country'' means a country in which the Hague Abduction Convention has not entered into force with respect to the United States.

(17) OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''overseas military dependent child'' means a child whose habitual residence is the United States according to United States law even though the child is residing outside the United States with a military parent.

(18) OVERSEAS MILITARY PARENT.—The term ''overseas military parent'' means an individual who—

(A) has custodial rights with respect to a child; and

(B) is serving outside the United States as a member of the United States Armed Forces.

(19) PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''pattern of noncompliance'' means the persistent failure—

(i) of a Convention country to implement and abide by provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(ii) of a non-Convention country to abide by bilateral procedures that have been established between the United States and such country; or

(iii) of a non-Convention country to work with the Central Authority of the United States to resolve abduction cases.

(B) PERSISTENT FAILURE.—Persistent failure under subparagraph (A) may be evidenced in a given country by the presence of 1 or more of the following criteria:

(i) Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases.

(ii) The Central Authority regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to—

(I) the Hague Abduction Convention; or

(II) any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country.

(iii) The judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention country or a bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable.

(iv) Law enforcement authorities regularly fail to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases.

(20) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—The term ''rights of access'' means the establishment of rights of contact between a child and a parent seeking access in Convention countries—

(A) by operation of law;

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(21) RIGHTS OF CUSTODY.—The term ''rights of custody'' means rights of care and custody of a child, including the right to determine the place of residence of a child, under the laws of the country in which the child is a habitual resident—

(A) attributed to an individual or legal custodian; and

(B) arising—

(i) by operation of law; or

(ii) through a judicial or administrative decision; or

(iii) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(22) RIGHTS OF INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''rights of interim contact'' means the rights of contact between a child and a left-behind parent, which has been provided as a provisional measure while an abduction case is pending, under the laws of the country in which the child is located—

(A) by operation of law; or

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(23) UNRESOLVED ABDUCTION CASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''unresolved abduction case'' means an abduction case that remains unresolved for a period that exceeds 12 months after the date on which the completed application for return of the child is submitted for determination to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, in the country in which the child is located.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CASE.—An abduction case shall be considered to be resolved if—

(i) the child is returned to the country of habitual residence, pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or other appropriate bilateral procedures, if applicable;

(ii) the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the government of the country in which the child is located has implemented, and is complying with, the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or other bilateral procedures, as applicable;

(iii) the left-behind parent reaches a voluntary arrangement with the other parent;

(iv) the left-behind parent submits a written withdrawal of the application or the request for assistance to the Department of State;

(v) the left-behind parent cannot be located for 1 year despite the documented efforts of the Department of State to locate the parent; or

(vi) the child or left-behind parent is deceased.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

SEC. 101. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an Annual Report on International Child Abduction. The Secretary shall post the Annual Report to the publicly accessible website of the Department of State.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each Annual Report shall include—

(1) a list of all countries in which there were 1 or more abduction cases, during the preceding calendar year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States, including a description of whether each such country—

(A) is a Convention country;

(B) is a bilateral procedures country;

(C) has other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) adheres to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(2) for each country with respect to which there were 5 or more pending abduction cases, during the preceding year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States—

(A) the number of such new abduction and access cases reported during the preceding year;

(B) for Convention and bilateral procedures countries—

(i) the number of abduction and access cases that the Central Authority of the United States transmitted to the Central Authority of such country; and

(ii) the number of abduction and access cases that were not submitted by the Central Authority to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of such country;

(C) the reason for the delay in submission of each case identified in subparagraph (B)(ii) by the Central Authority of such country to the judicial or administrative authority of that country;

(D) the number of unresolved abduction and access cases, and the length of time each case has been pending;

(E) the number and percentage of unresolved abduction cases in which law enforcement authorities have—

(i) not located the abducted child;

(ii) failed to undertake serious efforts to locate the abducted child; and

(iii) failed to enforce a return order rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of such country;

(F) the total number and the percentage of the total number of abduction and access cases, respectively, resolved during the preceding year;

(G) recommendations to improve the resolution of abduction and access cases; and

(H) the average time it takes to locate a child;

(3) the number of abducted children whose habitual residence is in the United States and who were returned to the United States from—

(A) Convention countries;

(B) bilateral procedures countries;

(C) countries having other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) countries adhering to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(4) a list of Convention countries and bilateral procedures countries that have failed to comply with any of their obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, with respect to the resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) a list of countries demonstrating a pattern of noncompliance and a description of the criteria on which the determination of a pattern of noncompliance for each country is based;

(6) information on efforts by the Secretary of State to encourage non-Convention countries—

(A) to ratify or accede to the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) to enter into or implement other bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, with the United States; and

(C) to address pending abduction and access cases;

(7) the number of cases resolved without abducted children being returned to the United States from Convention countries, bilateral procedures countries, or other non-Convention countries;

(8) a list of countries that became Convention countries with respect to the United States during the preceding year; and

(9) information about efforts to seek resolution of abduction cases of children whose habitual residence is in the United States and whose abduction occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Unless a left-behind parent provides written permission to the Central Authority of the United States to include personally identifiable information about the parent or the child in the Annual Report, the Annual Report may not include any personally identifiable information about any such parent, child, or party to an abduction or access case involving such parent or child.

(d) ADDITIONAL SECTIONS.—Each Annual Report shall also include—

(1) information on the number of unresolved abduction cases affecting military parents;

(2) a description of the assistance offered to such military parents;

(3) information on the use of airlines in abductions, voluntary airline practices to prevent abductions, and recommendations for best airline practices to prevent abductions;

(4) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train domestic judges in the application of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(5) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train United States Armed Forces legal assistance personnel, military chaplains, and military family support center personnel about—

(A) abductions;

(B) the risk of loss of contact with children; and

(C) the legal means available to resolve such cases.

(e) REPEAL OF THE HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 2803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 11611) is repealed.

(f) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON COUNTRIES IN NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall include, in a separate section of the Annual Report, the Secretary's determination, pursuant to the provisions under section 202(b), of whether each country listed in the report has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance in cases of child abduction during the preceding 12 months.

(2) CONTENTS.—The section described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall identify any action or actions described in section 202(d) (or commensurate action as provided in section 202(e)) that have been taken by the Secretary with respect to each country;

(B) shall describe the basis for the Secretary's determination of the pattern of noncompliance by each country;

(C) shall indicate whether noneconomic policy options designed to resolve the pattern of noncompliance have reasonably been exhausted, including the consultations required under section 203.

SEC. 102. STANDARDS AND ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of State shall—

(1) ensure that United States diplomatic and consular missions abroad—

(A) maintain a consistent reporting standard with respect to abduction and access cases;

(B) designate at least 1 senior official in each such mission, at the discretion of the Chief of Mission, to assist left-behind parents from the United States who are visiting such country or otherwise seeking to resolve abduction or access cases; and

(C) monitor developments in abduction and access cases; and

(2) develop and implement written strategic plans for engagement with any Convention or

non-Convention country in which there are 5 or more cases of international child abduction.

SEC. 103. BILATERAL PROCEDURES, INCLUDING MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall initiate a process to develop and enter into appropriate bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, as appropriate, with non-Convention countries that are unlikely to become Convention countries in the foreseeable future, or with Convention countries that have unresolved abduction cases that occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States or that country.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall give priority to countries with significant abduction cases and related issues.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The bilateral procedures described in subsection (a) should include provisions relating to—

(1) the identification of—

(A) the Central Authority;

(B) the judicial or administrative authority that will promptly adjudicate abduction and access cases;

(C) the law enforcement agencies; and

(D) the implementation of procedures to ensure the immediate enforcement of an order issued by the authority identified pursuant to subparagraph (B) to return an abducted child to a left-behind parent, including by—

(i) conducting an investigation to ascertain the location of the abducted child;

(ii) providing protection to the abducted child after such child is located; and

(iii) retrieving the abducted child and making the appropriate arrangements for such child to be returned to the child's country of habitual residence;

(2) the implementation of a protocol to effectuate the return of an abducted child identified in an abduction case not later than 6 weeks after the application with respect to the abduction case has been submitted to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of the country in which the abducted child is located;

(3) the implementation of a protocol for the establishment and protection of the rights of interim contact during pendency of abduction cases; and

(4) the implementation of a protocol to establish periodic visits between a United States embassy or consular official and an abducted child, in order to allow the official to ascertain the child's location and welfare.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall submit written notification to the Member of Congress and Senators, or Resident Commissioner or Delegate, as appropriate, representing the legal residence of a left-behind parent if such parent—

(1) reports an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States; and

(2) consents to such notification.

(b) TIMING.—At the request of any person who is a left-behind parent, including a left-behind parent who previously reported an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, the notification required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as is practicable.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 201. RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote the best interest of children wrongfully abducted from the United States by—

(A) establishing legal rights and procedures for their prompt return; and

(B) ensuring the enforcement of reciprocal international obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or arrangements under bilateral procedures;

(2) to promote the timely resolution of abduction cases through 1 or more of the actions described in section 202; and

(3) to ensure appropriate coordination within the Federal Government and between Federal, State, and local agencies involved in abduction prevention, investigation, and resolution.

(b) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO UNRESOLVED CASES.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—For each abduction or access case relating to a child whose habitual residence is in the United States that remains pending or is otherwise unresolved on the date that is 12 months after the date on which the Central Authority of the United States submits such case to a foreign country, the Secretary of State shall determine whether the government of such foreign country has failed to take appropriate steps to resolve the case. If the Secretary of State determines that such failure occurred, the Secretary should, as expeditiously as practicable—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202; and

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that foreign country to directly address the resolution of the case with senior officials in the foreign government.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State may delay any action described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an additional period of time, not to exceed 1 year, will substantially assist in resolving the case.

(3) REPORT.—If the Secretary of State delays any action pursuant to paragraph (2) or decides not to take an action described in subsection (d) or (e) of section 202 after making the determination described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, not later than 15 days after such delay or decision, shall provide a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details the reasons for delaying action or not taking action, as appropriate.

(4) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.—At the request of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed briefing, including a written report, if requested, on actions taken to resolve a case or the cause for delay.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary of State should—

(A) take 1 or more actions that most appropriately respond to the nature and severity of the governmental failure to resolve the unresolved abduction case; and

(B) seek, to the fullest extent possible—

(i) to initially respond by communicating with the Central Authority of the country; and

(ii) if clause (i) is unsuccessful, to target subsequent actions—

(I) as narrowly as practicable, with respect to the agencies or instrumentalities of the foreign government that are responsible for such failures; and

(II) in ways that respect the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary of the country, as applicable.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—In addition to the guidelines under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, in determining whether to take 1 or more actions under paragraphs (5) through (7) of section 202(d) or section 202(e), shall seek to minimize any adverse impact on—

(A) the population of the country whose government is targeted by the action or actions;

(B) the humanitarian activities of United States and nongovernmental organizations in the country; and

(C) the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) RESPONSE TO A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to oppose institutional or other systemic failures of foreign governments to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, to resolve abduction and access cases;

(2) to promote reciprocity pursuant to, and in compliance with, the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as appropriate; and

(3) to directly engage with senior foreign government officials to most effectively address patterns of noncompliance.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall—

(A) review the status of abduction and access cases in each foreign country in order to determine whether the government of such country has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance during the preceding 12 months; and

(B) report such determination pursuant to section 101(f).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—The Secretary of State shall seek to determine the agencies or instrumentalities of the government of each country determined to have engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under paragraph (1)(A) that are responsible for such pattern of noncompliance—

(A) to appropriately target actions in response to such noncompliance; and

(B) to engage with senior foreign government officials to effectively address such noncompliance.

(c) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO A COUNTRY WITH A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days (or 180 days in case of a delay under paragraph (2)) after a country is determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A), the Secretary of State shall—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsection (d);

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that country to directly address the systemic problems that led to such determination; and

(C) inform senior officials in the foreign government of the potential repercussions related to such designation.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary shall not be required to take action under paragraph (1) until the expiration of a single, additional period of up to 90 days if, on or before the date on which the Secretary of State is required to take such action, the Secretary determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such additional period is necessary—

(A) for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the government of a country described in paragraph (1) in order to bring about a cessation of the pattern of noncompliance by such country;

(B) for a review of corrective action taken by a country after the designation of such country as being engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A); or

(C) in anticipation that corrective action will be taken by such country during such 90-day period.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR ADDITIONAL ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall not be required to take additional action under paragraph (1) with respect to a country determined to have been engaged in a persistent pattern of noncompliance if the Secretary—

(A) has taken action pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (d) with respect to such country in the preceding year and such action continues to be in effect;

(B) exercises the waiver under section 204 and briefs the appropriate congressional committees; or

(C) submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(i) indicates that such country is subject to multiple, broad-based sanctions; and

(ii) describes how such sanctions satisfy the requirements under this subsection.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the Annual Report, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the specific actions taken against countries determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under this section.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COUNTRIES.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the actions by the Secretary of State referred to in this subsection are—

(1) a demarche;

(2) an official public statement detailing unresolved cases;

(3) a public condemnation;

(4) a delay or cancellation of 1 or more bilateral working, official, or state visits;

(5) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States development assistance in accordance with section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n);

(6) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States security assistance in accordance with section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304);

(7) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of assistance to the central government of a country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(8) a formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(e) COMMENSURATE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Secretary of State may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (d) if the Secretary determines that such action—

(A) is commensurate in effect to the action substituted; and

(B) would substantially further the purposes of this Act.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If commensurate action is taken pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) describes such action;

(B) explains the reasons for taking such action; and

(C) specifically describes the basis for the Secretary's determination under paragraph (1) that such action—

(i) is commensurate with the action substituted; and

(ii) substantially furthers the purposes of this Act.

(f) RESOLUTION.—The Secretary of State shall seek to take all appropriate actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncompliance, as applicable.

(g) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

As soon as practicable after the Secretary of State makes a determination under section 201 in response to a failure to resolve unresolved abduction cases or the Secretary takes an action under subsection (d) or (e) of section 202, based on a pattern of noncompliance, the Secretary shall request consultations with the government of such country regarding the situation giving rise to such determination.

SEC. 204. WAIVER BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State may waive the application of any of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202 with respect to a country if the Secretary determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country—

(A) has satisfactorily resolved the abduction cases giving rise to the application of any of such actions; or

(B) has ended such country's pattern of noncompliance; or

(2) the national security interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date on which the Secretary of State exercises the waiver authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

(2) provide such committees with a detailed justification for such waiver, including an explanation of the steps the noncompliant government has taken—

(A) to resolve abductions cases; or

(B) to end its pattern of noncompliance.

(c) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall ensure that each waiver determination under this section—

(1) is published in the Federal Register; or

(2) is posted on the Department of State website.

(d) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State may limit the publication of information under subsection (c) in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the Secretary determines that the publication of such information would be harmful to the national security of the United States and would not further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Any specific action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of State submits a written certification to Congress that the government of such country—

(1) has resolved any unresolved abduction case that gave rise to such specific action; or

(2) has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct such country's persistent pattern of noncompliance that gave rise to such specific action, as applicable.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

SEC. 301. PREVENTING CHILDREN FROM LEAVING THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF A COURT ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 433. PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

''(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—The Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as 'CBP'), in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a program that—

''(1) seeks to prevent a child (as defined in section 1204(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from departing from the territory of the United States if a parent or legal guardian of such child presents a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction prohibiting the removal of such child from the United States to a CBP Officer in sufficient time to prevent such departure for the duration of such court order; and

''(2) leverages other existing authorities and processes to address the wrongful removal and return of a child.

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction. The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

''(A) the Department of State;

''(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official within the Department of Defense—

''(A) to coordinate with the Department of State on international child abduction issues; and

''(B) to oversee activities designed to prevent or resolve international child abduction cases relating to active duty military service members.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 432 the following:

''Sec. 433. Prevention of international child abduction.''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall seek to provide training, directly or through another government agency or nongovernmental organizations, on the effective handling of parental abduction cases to the judicial and administrative authorities in countries—

(1) in which a significant number of unresolved abduction cases are pending; or

(2) that have been designated as having a pattern of noncompliance under section 202(b).

(b) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements under this section.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY IN HONOR OF FALLEN HEROES OF 9/11.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on September 10, 2014, for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. Con. Res. 103) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On October 3, 2014, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 29th annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') may be run through the Capitol Grounds to carry the Special Olympics torch to honor local Special Olympics athletes.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3486

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3486.

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

There was no objection.

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 purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

In addition, the House will consider a package of bills to ensure transparency and accountability within the Endangered Species Act. Included in this package are H.R. 4315, the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, authored by Chairman DOC HASTINGS; H.R. 4316, the Endangered Species Recovery Transparency Act, authored by Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS; H.R. 4317, the State, Tribal, and Local Species Transparency Act, authored by Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER; and H.R. 4318, the Endangered Species Litigation Reasonableness Act, authored by Representative BILL HUIZENGA.

The House will also consider House Resolution 676, which provides for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that the House may also consider legislation to deal with the ongoing crisis on the border.

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

As the gentleman knows full well, we have 3½ days next week. We have, I guess, 9 full days and 3 half days scheduled in September and the first couple of weeks in October, assuming that we meet in that last week of September.

There have been some rumors. My Members have been asking me about whether or not there is serious consideration being given to not using the last week scheduled in September. Does that have any credence?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my gentleman for yielding.

Currently, there have been no changes to the schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

In any event, as the gentleman knows, in the very short period of time that we have left before the election—and there is a lot of very substantive work that, in my view, still needs to be done and that we feel very strongly about on this side of the aisle—the gentleman posits that we have four endangered species bills on the floor. Frankly, they probably could all be done by suspension on Monday, but I understand it is going to be under a rule.

In addition to that, we have legislation which is designed to authorize a suit against the President of the United States for trying to do things when we can't get the Congress to act on them, so that there can be some movement forward on behalf of the American people.

Does the gentleman believe there is any possibility of bringing up comprehensive immigration reform—either a comprehensive immigration reform bill that the majority supports, individual bills which are passed out of committee, border security which is passed out on a bipartisan way out of your committee here on this side of the House—on this side of the Capitol, or legislation which we believe would have had a direct effect on the crisis to which the gentleman refers may be addressed next week?

It is not scheduled. I understand that the majority leader's party is divided on the issue of what ought to be done to meet this crisis, but there is no doubt, Mr. Leader, that there are going to be additional resources necessary to meet the challenge that we are confronting now.

The administration has requested, as the gentleman knows, some $3.7 billion. The Senate, as I understand it, is suggesting $2.7 billion. Part of that, of course, is to meet the needs of fighting wildfires. In the Senate bill, there is also money for Iron Dome—to beef up Iron Dome in Israel, but we don't have any language, if language is contemplated.

So I am hopeful that language will not be included in any effort that is made next week on meeting this. You referred to it as a crisis. Whether you refer to it as crisis, challenge, whatever, we know that resources are needed. Everybody seems to agree on that.

Unfortunately, we have not had that bill on the floor now, so we can get it over to the Senate and get it to the President before we leave. We are at risk, in my view, Mr. Leader, of leaving here without addressing this issue.

Furthermore, last week, as the gentleman knows, I suggested that if we included legislative language on that bill, it would be almost impossible to get to the administration the resources it needs to comply with the law and to meet the challenge that has been presented.

□ 1315

Does the gentleman have any expectation that we will consider a comprehensive immigration bill that has resources and will be Senate-passed? We have a bill here, as the gentleman knows, that we introduced many, many months ago, which is a bipartisan bill. All the provisions have been supported in a bipartisan fashion—some in the Senate, some here in the House committee—unanimously.

Does the gentleman have any belief that we will consider next week a clean funding bill at such level as is necessary, at least until the end of the fiscal year, and/or some comprehensive immigration bills which will meet the issue and establish a process, the lack of which clearly is causing people to take actions which we do not approve of and not agree with, but are manifesting the frustration of a broken system remaining broken?

I yield to my friend.

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

As I mentioned in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. 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 House.

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

Does the gentleman contemplate that that bill will include substantive changes in law or will it simply be restricted to additional resources necessary to meet the crisis that confronts this country?

I yield to my friend.

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

As I said earlier, you should be prepared for a possible consideration. Once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing to announce the process.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the process will come from the Rules Committee. There is no text, Mr. Leader. We have seen no text to apparently amend legislation which was adopted overwhelmingly by this House and signed by President Bush.

We need resources today—and we will certainly need them next week—and we are going to go on a 5-week recess work period, at which point in time we will come back here and meet for a very brief period of time, and we don't have any text in this very substantive, very consequential area of the law, which obviously was adopted overwhelmingly, and we have no text.

I understand the process in the Rules Committee. There have been no hearings, no debate in committee, no subcommittee, no full committee hearings on any legislation.

As I suggested to you last week, Mr. Majority Leader, if you put legislation out there, you and I both know that inevitably that legislation will not be able to pass within the timeframe necessary to meet the crisis.

So the responsible thing, I suggest to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, is to provide the resources necessary to meet the challenge right now. And then, if hearings show substantive changes in the law are needed or further show what substantive changes ought to be made and can be considered in a thoughtful, effective fashion, we can then move forward at some point in time, perhaps as soon as September, on that legislation. But to do otherwise will put at great risk the ability of the administration and this country to respond consistent with the law that we passed and that was signed by President Bush.

I yield to my friend if he wants to comment further.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his passion on the crisis, just as we have on this side.

Since we have taken the majority, we made a pledge to America that we post bills with a 3-day process. So, as I mentioned in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. 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 House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader for that information, and I am glad that he brought up the processes that are going to be followed.

I want to quote to him something Speaker BOEHNER said on January 5, 2011, when he took the gavel:

> But you will always have the right to robust debate in an open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives and be heard.

The gentleman has told me now three times that the Rules Committee hearing is going to be open and they will decide the process under which a bill is going to be considered. Apparently, I am presuming the gentleman does not know what the substance of that process will be. I don't know the substance. I don't know any language that is being proposed. No Member on our side of the aisle knows what language is being proposed. Maybe Members on your side of the aisle know.

So what you are apparently telling me is that we will have the Rules Committee solely for the purpose of learning what substantive changes are suggested in the law. And I suggest to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the case, we will not be able to thoughtfully debate it, we will not be able to have a process that is open, and we will not have a process which allows us to make our case, offer alternatives, or be heard.

I would predict, as has happened 67 times to date, this is going to be a closed rule. One of my staffers, by the way, suggested that perhaps open rules ought to be included in the endangered species bills that we are considering. We are doing so many closed rules, open rules seem to be an endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the leader to please report if we are going to consider, as I think we should, a supplemental next week that gives our country the resources to meet the crisis to which you referred?

It is our responsibility to consider it. It is our responsibility to give the resources. We passed the law, which is being implemented by the administration. We passed it overwhelmingly. It was sponsored by a gentleman who just spoke on this floor a short time ago to try to prevent and ameliorate human trafficking.

A number of bills we passed this week on human trafficking were passed unanimously. That bill that passed overwhelmingly was also about human trafficking. And I tell my friend, we need the resources. It is the responsibility of the majority party and the minority party to join together to give the administration the necessary resources to respond to carrying out the law that we passed.

If we want to change that law, that is also our responsibility. But I tell my friend it cannot be done in the timeframe that is available to us. We have delayed this so long, there is no time. And the gentleman keeps responding to me that the Rules Committee will decide the process.

The Rules Committee normally does not decide the substance of legislation. It decides the process under which we will consider the substance. Authorizing committees, as my friend so well knows, decide the substance of that legislation.

But we will have no opportunity to see that, apparently, until perhaps this

weekend, at the earliest, or next week. That does not give us time to debate it and it certainly, as everybody knows, does not give it time to go to the Senate and be debated. I think they will disagree, perhaps, on the language that is suggested. I don't know what it is, but there is a high probability of disagreement. Conference will have to occur, and then it will have to get to the President. And both the Senate and the House are leaving next week for their district work period.

I would urge the majority leader to make every effort with his party to bring what I think ought to be our obligation: a bill which provides the resources necessary—and we may differ on that number—to carry out our responsibilities to implement the law that we passed.

If the gentleman wants to respond further, I yield. If not, I will go on.

Mr. Speaker, we have five appropriations bills which have not been brought to the floor. The Ag bill was on the floor. It was pulled. It has not been brought back. The Labor, Health and Human Services bill, the Interior bill, the Homeland bill, and the Foreign Ops bill have not been brought to the floor, nor has the gentleman indicated any of those are going to be brought to the floor next week.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is any plan to bring those bills to the floor in the 3 weeks that we will be back in September?

I yield to the majority leader.

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

I know we originated this for the schedule for next week. As the gentleman knows, the House has passed seven of the 12 appropriations bills in an open process.

To the fact that even one of your Members, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, has had 50 percent more amendments offered on this floor than the entire Republican Conference in the Senate for the last year, we are very proud of the open process we have brought back to the floor.

While the House is not scheduled to consider a regular appropriations bill next week, as the gentleman knows and as I stated already, the House may consider a supplemental appropriation request next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, but that does not give me any clarity in terms of the five appropriations bills. The supplemental appropriation bill, of course, is not a part of those bills, although, obviously, Health and Human Services is being put under a great deal of pressure by carrying out the terms of the law that we passed in 2008 signed by President Bush. They need resources. The supplemental is to give them the resources.

This is a scheduling conference. It is not just now, in my view, limited to next week, because we are not going to be here for 5 weeks thereafter, and Members want to know what they should anticipate as substantively going to be on the agenda in the 3 short weeks that we will have left, essentially, before the election.

So I can't tell from the gentleman's answer, Mr. Speaker, whether or not any of those five appropriations bills—I know seven have passed—are intended to be brought to the floor.

I yield to the majority leader.

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

The gentleman initiated this with inquiring about the schedule for next week. As I stated earlier, in the schedule for next week we do not have anything considered in the regular appropriations process, but we could possibly have a supplemental appropriation next week.

Mr. HOYER. Maybe I can just print that out and I will just read it, Mr. Speaker.

We have an Export-Import Bank that is going to expire very shortly. It is of great concern to many people on both sides of the aisle. Forty-one Republican Members, Mr. Speaker, have signed a letter urging that this be brought to the floor. It is a very timely, critical issue for the competitiveness of our country. It has been twisting in the wind for this entire year. I worked, Mr. Speaker, with the leader's predecessor to see whether or not we could get this bill to the floor.

I know what the schedule is for next week, so he doesn't need to repeat that for me—and I thank him very much—but does the majority leader have any idea whether we are going to consider the Export-Import Bank before the election?

I yield to my friend.

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

As my friend, the gentleman knows, this is in regard to the schedule for next week. And it is not scheduled for next week. If there will be any consideration, we will notify you.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask the majority leader any more questions because I am not going to get any answers.

The American people have a right to those answers. The American people need to have transparency, which was going to be brought to this body, frankly, by the young guns, and they need a right to debate, right to anticipate, right to participate, but the answer I get is, It's not scheduled for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not scheduled for next week. Critical legislation was not scheduled last week, the week before that, the week before that, the week before that, the week before that, and every week before that—critical legislation supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

□ 1330

I am simply inquiring of the majority leader: Is there any contemplation of bringing that legislation to the floor before this Congress leaves for the election so the American people who are going to either reelect this Congress or seek new leadership have an opportunity on which to make an informed decision, which, of course, is what the Speaker said we would have?

Certainly, we ought to have equal consideration for the American people as well so they have the right to robust debate and an open process and so it allows them to understand what we are doing.

I regret that the majority leader in critical issues, like the Export-Import Bank, which relate to the competitiveness of this country, and like Make It In America legislation that we defeated last week on suspension, which we agreed upon—the majority leader voted for it and I voted for it. I presume—I will ask him anyway. I said I wasn't going to ask him: Is there any contemplation of bringing that bill, which got 260 votes on this floor, back to the floor, under a rule which provides again for America's determining whether or not we can find additional rare earth, which is so necessary to be competitive in international markets?

I know it is not on the schedule, so he doesn't have to repeat that litany to me, because I get it. I have heard it now four or five or six times. I get it that it is not on the schedule for next week.

So the question I ask is: Is there any contemplation of bringing that bill, which has 260 people who voted for it, back to the floor, under a rule, so we can provide for a better opportunity to make it in America and to be competitive internationally?

I yield to my friend.

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

As the gentleman knows, this colloquy is always based upon the schedule for next week, and I would very proudly like to lay out the schedule for next week.

As the gentleman raised the question, he very well knows we did agree on that bill just as we agreed on quite a few bills. As of today, there are 333 bills that have passed this House that have gotten stuck in the Senate. Of those 333 bills, 40 of them are jobs bills. We know we linger in a very tough economy, and the gentleman voted for a few of those 40 bills. So let me repeat: the 40 jobs bills are still stuck in the Senate. We want to encourage economic growth and innovation. We can ensure a robust American manufacturing sector and put Americans back to work.

As the gentleman knows, as we sat down to lunch, we want to work together on that, but as of right now, it is not scheduled for next week. It was on this week. Unfortunately, it did not pass, but I look forward to continuing working with the gentleman, and, hopefully, we could work together to make the Senate move on those 40 jobs bills and those 333 bills that the American public would like to see move forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have worked together, and we have sat down for lunch. We agree on the bill that I mentioned, Mr. SWALWELL's bill, to try to make America more competitive by producing more rare earth here in this country—so essential in the electronics industry and in other places.

I can't control the Senate, Mr. Speaker. The majority leader cannot control the Senate. What the majority leader and I can do is control what we do here in this House to which we were elected. We can control either urging or, in the majority leader's case—and as the former majority leader of this House, I can tell you I could put a bill on the floor if I thought it was important for the American people and in the best interests of our country. I think the Export-Import Bank falls in that category. I think minimum wage falls in that category. I think comprehensive immigration falls in that category. I think jobs bills fall in that category. I think make it in America—the Swalwell bill—fell in that category.

We cannot control what the Senate does, but we can control what we do. We can move in a responsible fashion, which the American people, Mr. Speaker, expect us to do and not blame some outside group, whether it is the administration or the United States Senate, for our lack of addressing important issues.

TRIA is an important bill, Mr. Speaker. It is not on the schedule. I presume, if I asked the majority leader about TRIA, he would tell me it is not on the schedule next week. That would not come as a news flash to me, Mr. Speaker, because he has told me that now seven times.

I believe, if the House is going to act in a collegial manner and in a constructive manner and in a manner that the American people want us to act, that we will exchange information not just on what is on next week—there is not much on next week, Mr. Speaker. I know that. There is, in my opinion, a political bill to sue the President of the United States. The American people don't think that is a very good idea. That is on the calendar. So we are using the few short minutes that we have available to do the people's business on four bills, to send a message, that we could pass in, frankly, a very short period of time on Monday night on endangered species. We are filling time. We are treading water, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude with this. You have put the possibility that we are going to have a bill on the floor next week dealing with the crisis—your word—at the border. When will we see text of that legislation that might possibly be on the floor?

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern on the crisis. It is not just my word. It is the American word.

If it were not a crisis, we would not have three Presidents from Central American countries here today to talk about the crisis. We would not have three Presidents who are asking to reunite their children with their families in their countries. If it were not a crisis, you would not have a task force that was introduced by this Speaker on this side to address it. If it were not a crisis, you wouldn't even have Members on your side of the aisle partnering with their Senators from another party, sitting in the Senate, to address the crisis.

Now, many Members of this House have gone there to see the crisis. Some in the administration have not. This House is committed to addressing it as soon as it is available.

We take great pride in changing this House. As the majority leader knows, he cares about the institution; but when the majority changed over here, one of the number one things we said we would do is a 3-day process, as you would know in importance, so people can read the bill, because too many times I have been to this floor when thousands of pages have come out at 2 a.m. and have been voted on that day. We made a commitment to the American people, and we have kept our commitment just as we will keep our commitment that we will end this crisis no matter what it takes. This House will act.

Mr. HOYER. When it is available. That was the answer to my question. We don't know when it is going to be available. We don't know what it will be. We don't know, really, whether it will be considered, because the majority leader tells me, Mr. Speaker, that it may be on the floor. We know that it hasn't gone to committee. We know that there is no subcommittee hearing that has been held. We know that there is no committee hearing that has been held.

The gentleman talks about thousands of pages. We can get into that debate at some other time. I know which he refers to, a bill that had literally more consideration than any other bill I have seen considered by the Congress of the United States—the Affordable Care Act, which is having, in my view, a very positive effect. We don't need to debate that today.

I would tell the majority leader, if the crisis were going to be addressed, the first step is having the resources necessary to carry out the law, then, if the law needs to be changed, deciding how it should be changed, having debate on that, bringing it to this floor out of committee, and considering that legislation. There are differences of opinion on that. I recognize that. The gentleman has pointed that out. That would be the way to do it. That is the regular order of which you spoke and you promised.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that that could be followed. There are many of us who believe it is not being followed, and that is to the denigration of not only this body but to the American people's ability to see what we are doing, how we are doing it, when we are doing it.

Unless the gentleman has something further to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 28, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 28, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall 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 203 of the Senate amendment (relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration); 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 West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

The House has just finished its roll-call votes for this week. With the conference committee at an impasse on H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act, hope is fading that any legislation will be enacted this summer to address the urgent needs at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This is truly shameful, and as an American, I think this is shameful. It is beyond me to understand why our legislative branch of government cannot get this done.

It is true that this body has taken some modest steps toward improvements, like allowing veterans to seek care at non-VA providers when they cannot get medical appointments. I

have supported that effort. That is fine where private sector health providers are available, but for elderly veterans in rural areas, where travel is difficult and costly, where physician shortages and medically underserved areas are abundant, like in southern West Virginia, that doesn't help much.

My State's VA facilities need funding to hire doctors—lots of them. We need primary and specialty care providers and mental health specialists. We need the resources to train and recruit health professionals and to pay them competitive salaries.

Our VA health providers, many of them veterans themselves, have a unique understanding of our veterans' needs. That expertise cannot be duplicated in the private sector.

The VA health system is designed to take care of elderly veterans with special needs. It is designed to treat combat wounds, physical and psychological—something not commonly seen in the private sector.

The VA health system is designed so that doctors can build long-term relationships with their patients and can build expertise in illnesses unique to veterans. Clearly, a Vietnam veteran who is suffering from exposure to a toxic substance like Agent Orange could expect to find a greater depth of knowledge and experience with the particular infirmities from the VA than from a private sector facility.

□ 1345

My State needs VA doctors. We need VA specialty care providers. We need VA facilities.

The veterans bill in conference can provide relief to our veterans in need of care, but it remains stuck in conference, frustratingly hung up in partisan politics.

When it comes to the shortage of health providers in general, that is not a local problem affecting only my State. The Association of American Medical Colleges estimates a nationwide doctor shortage of more than 91,500 physicians by the year 2020. The shortage will grow to more than 130,000 by 2025.

The impact is most severe in rural States, so any notion of private sector medical care serving as a backstop to the VA is completely wrongheaded.

This is not a new problem either. We all know it has been projected going back years, before this administration, before the Affordable Care Act, to the Bush administration and beyond.

Baby boomers are getting older. Doctors are retiring. More patients require specialized and extended care.

We, this Congress, must address this crisis, and it is a crisis. But the House stands immobilized, ''frozen in the ice of its own indifference,'' as a great American President, Franklin Roosevelt once said.

So today, I am calling upon this House, I am imploring this House to put politics aside, advance the work of the ongoing conference, and get this bill done.

This motion calls for the House to recede from disagreement with section 203 of the Senate amendment relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration; and recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all instances.

I urge the House to support this motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct would instruct the House conferees to recede from disagreement with the Senate with respect to section 203 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3230, which would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to use unobligated balances to hire additional health providers.

It would also instruct the House conferees to recede to the Senate position on all other matters.

This is the fifth such motion that has been introduced in the last 10 days. None of them have brought us any closer to reaching the compromise our veterans deserve in the fiscally responsible manner that respects the rights of our taxpayers.

In addition, none of them have brought us any closer to correcting the systemic bureaucratic deficiencies that have led to thousands of veterans waiting for weeks, months, or even years to get the care that they need.

Today, our attention is best spent devoted on working in tandem with our Senate counterparts to find a true compromise. Instead, here we are, yet again, debating an unnecessary, unhelpful, and unbinding motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday afternoon, Chairman MILLER offered a formal proposal to the conference committee that would do the following:

First, it would accept title I through title VII of the original Senate bill, along with additional amended language to include the Oklahoma lease authorization that was included in the House-passed bill, H.R. 3521, but that was left out of the Senate language.

Second, it would provide the VA with $102 million for fiscal year 2014 to address the Department's internal funding shortfalls.

Third, it would provide $10 billion of no-year, mandatory emergency funding to cover the cost of the Senate's choice provision, with the remaining Senate provisions subject to appropriations on an annual basis.

I am supportive of Chairman MILLER's proposal, and I, like him, continue to remain optimistic that the House and Senate conferees will be able to successfully accomplish our mission and come to an agreement in advance of the August district work period which is scheduled to begin next week.

There are many important aspects of the bill where the House and the Senate do agree. Recently, however, Senator SANDERS, who is the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and the cochair of the conference committee, has indicated his desire to expand the scope of the conference to include the VA's recent request for as much as an additional $17.6 billion.

The VA health care system has not yet proven itself able to make effective use of the resources that it has been provided. Increasing those resources significantly at this time would be irresponsible, particularly in light of the insufficient details that the VA has provided about how it arrived at this request and how, specifically, this money would be used to increase access for our Nation's veterans and increase accountability for VA bureaucrats.

This summer, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has received hours of testimony from VA leaders and key, outside stakeholders in an effort to thoroughly understand and evaluate the access and accountability failures of the VA and, by extension, our Nation's veterans, the problems that they have been experiencing.

Those hearings have confirmed that the problems the VA is facing today require long-term and large-scale reform that more money, more people, and more buildings will not bring, by themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are continually trying to work out a deal with the Senate, and I would argue that these motions to instruct have become not just tiresome but, in fact, they have become very counterproductive.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to instruct, and to allow the conference committee the time and the latitude to work and reach the best possible compromise for the benefit of America's veterans. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK), a true leader on veterans issues and a member of the VA conference committee.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Congressman RAHALL, thank you for your strong support of one of the most important provisions in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3230.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this motion to instruct the conferees. Both the Senate and the House amendments will expand access to non-VA care for veterans, but this program will only last for 2 years.

It will only address the current emergency by ensuring those veterans who are waiting too long for appointments receive timely care. If we do not address the VA's doctor, nurse, and medical support staff shortage now, we will face the same crisis again in 2 years.

Just yesterday, I learned that the one physician serving the community-

based outpatient clinic in Flagstaff, Arizona, where I live, is leaving, and there is no physician identified as his replacement.

In another VA clinic in my district, the one doctor there is planning to retire, without a replacement doctor identified.

Our rural veterans struggle to access care, and VA hospitals and clinics must be able to recruit and retain doctors and nurses to serve veterans in rural and underserved communities.

Currently, 10 percent of all health care provider positions in the VA remain unfilled. By ensuring that the VA has the ability to quickly hire doctors and nurses and fill these positions, we help the VA ensure it has the capacity to provide timely, world-class care to our veterans before this 2-year program ends.

As a member of the conference committee, I strongly believe that the negotiations between the House and the Senate must continue. We need to put political differences aside and maintain our focus on the veterans we are here to serve.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity.

I am constantly frustrated in this Chamber by our inability to come to an agreement. And today, we stand here arguing about whether a Senate position is better or whether a House position is better.

The truth is that the American people want action. One of the basic things that we can all agree on is that we do not have enough medical providers in our system. We see a lot of veterans, and we try to force a lot of veterans through a very small funnel with very few providers.

In fact, if you look at the data recently, as men and women come back from different places across the world, like Iraq and Afghanistan, we have a much higher pronounced need than ever before for physicians to treat PTSD. And yet, we have fewer physicians able to do that because, in that area of specialization, we do not have enough medical care providers in the VA.

It seems pretty basic that one of the things that we ought to be able to agree on is the fact that we need more health care providers in our system. You can leave aside the issue of construction or leave aside the issue of technology or any of those kinds of things.

The fact is that when a person, a patient, comes into the VA system, he needs a health care provider to be able to see him or her, and we do not have enough health care providers. That fact is inescapable.

Today's motion, essentially, seeks to take care of that one issue, and that one issue is that we need more health care providers.

It makes no difference to me, to the American people, to anyone that I know, whether we adopt the Senate position or the House position. The idea that we are arguing about that, about whether the Senate does this or the House does that is, frankly, ludicrous.

We should all come together on that one point. We should all understand that we need more health care providers. Our veterans deserve it. Our veterans need it. They are asking for that. The American people are demanding it. And Congress needs to be able to respond.

How should they respond?

They should respond through this motion to instruct the conferees so that we can agree on a very limited provision of the bill, a limited provision that says, regardless of all of the disagreements, regardless of all these side fights, we will agree on this one area, and that one area would be, we need more health care providers.

PTSD isn't the only thing where we are short of physicians. We are short of cardiologists, we are short of a lot of things. And if the VA has the opportunity and the permission to go forward and look for additional health care providers now, then we will be up and running much earlier than if we wait and wait and wait.

The challenge with Congress: manana seems to be the busiest day of the week here. We wait until tomorrow and tomorrow, and maybe next week there will be an agreement or maybe the week after that there will be an agreement. We need an agreement today, and this is our opportunity to do that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to know that politics have not been part of this discussion in the conference committee, and any assertions to that standpoint are not true.

In terms of the manana comment, I will say this. We have worked diligently on the conference committee, on both sides of the aisle, to try to get to a solution with the Senate. We will continue to do that.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a doctor.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman RAHALL for yielding, and for your leadership on this issue to make sure our veterans get the health care that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Rahall motion to instruct our conferees. I look at this issue, not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor who has worked in the VA system.

Now, these are men and women who stepped up to answer the call to duty, to protect our freedoms, American freedoms, and we need to give them that same duty when they return. That is why we need to have enough doctors, nurses, and health care professionals in the VA system.

It has been reported, many of these men and women, needing necessary care, often have to wait 30 days, 60 days. That is unconscionable.

This isn't a Democratic or Republican issue. This is an issue of getting our men and women, our veterans, the necessary health care that they need.

And as a doctor, you have to have a work force. You have to have necessary health care professionals that can address these needs in a timely manner.

This is a very simple section of the Senate bill that Congressman RAHALL is suggesting we move forward, section 203. It would directly address the workforce shortage and the doctor shortage in the VA by targeting funding to hire additional health care providers and prioritizing these additional providers for the facilities that need them most.

It is common sense. It is the right thing to do to serve our men and women, to serve our veterans. Accepting these provisions is just one of many steps that we must do to ensure that they get the care that is necessary.

There are other things that we can do, but this is something we can do immediately, and we shouldn't delay it another week, another year. Let's take care of our veterans.

□ 1400

There is other legislation out there. We have a bipartisan bill, the Doctors Helping Heroes Act. It is Democrat and Republican. It is common sense.

Once we get section 203 passed, let's do more to train those necessary doctors. We can do it, and we have got the will, and I really commend my colleague from West Virginia, Congressman RAHALL, for taking the lead here. Let's do what is necessary to serve our men and women, our veterans, and let's move section 203 forward.

Mr. FLORES. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Military Construction-VA Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding and for his leadership in offering this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has a sacred obligation to provide for those who served and sacrificed for this country. Just as the military leaves no soldier behind on the battlefield, we must leave no veteran behind when they return home, and yet, Mr. Speaker, as too many veterans and their families can attest, our collective efforts often fall short.

The recent revelations of deceptive and dishonest scheduling practices at the Phoenix VA and elsewhere throughout the country have underscored a much more ominous reality:

serious structural systemic problems at the VA that must be addressed immediately. We clearly have work to do.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for funding military construction projects and the Department of Veterans Affairs, my colleagues and I have fought for years to ensure that the Department has the resources it needs to provide for our Nation's veterans.

While money alone is not a guarantor of timely access to quality care, a Department tasked with as monumental an undertaking as providing for millions of veterans, generations of veterans—from World War II to the current conflict in Afghanistan—must be ably prepared and equipped from the inside out, from top to bottom, with the resources it needs to get the job done.

Financial resources must translate into human resources. As the head of any large organization can tell you, it is the people who comprise the organization that ultimately make the difference.

That is why I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker. My district in North Carolina is home to tens of thousands of veterans who rely on the VA medical centers in Durham and Fayetteville or one of the many smaller facilities throughout the region for care.

I know firsthand the importance of an organization like the Department of Veterans Affairs, tasked with providing comprehensive medical care for so many veterans and for having sufficient staff on hand to do that, and too many VA facilities around the country don't have sufficient staff. They face glaring shortfalls of key medical personnel, particularly primary care and mental health professionals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the bad actors within VA management? They have received much attention since the current scandal broke. For certain, there is no question that bad actors within the Department must face the consequences of their actions. Those who bent or broke the rules have to be reprimanded or, in egregious cases, terminated.

This body has passed a bill that would provide the Secretary more authority to do just that, but too often overlooked are the tens of thousands of men and women—many, themselves, veterans—at the Department of Veterans Affairs who work tirelessly every day, often long hours, to ensure that our veterans receive the care they have earned and that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers and on both sides of the aisle: lay off the shots at ''VA bureaucrats,'' set aside partisan differences, work together to solve this crisis. We must address these shortcomings by enacting comprehensive VA reform legislation that is worthy of the men and women who have sacrificed so much.

That is why it is critically important, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs has the authority and the resources required to hire and employ sufficient numbers of medical professionals. This motion would do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a profound comment, and that is that money alone is not a guarantee of quality care for veterans, and that is one of the issues at stake here in the negotiations.

The Senate has decided to use this crisis to grab more money for the VA, when we are not sure the VA can handle the money it has appropriated today, which is substantial.

We want to make sure that we fix the VA right and do it right the first time. That is the crux of the issue. That is the objective that really gives our veterans the quality care that they deserve, and that is what the conference committee is committed to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. LOIS CAPPS, and commend her for her leadership on this issue as well.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from West Virginia for yielding me the time and for offering this motion to encourage conferees to swiftly settle their differences on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman RAHALL's motion to instruct conferees, so that our veterans are assured the care that they have earned.

For far too long, we have heard stories of men and women facing unacceptable wait times at the VA, and we have heard even more disturbing accounts of misconduct in the very organization our veterans should be most able to trust. In response to this scandal, both Chambers of Congress have passed bipartisan bills to hold the VA and its leadership accountable.

I was encouraged to see this body act quickly to address a very real problem and was pleased to support bipartisan legislation to help solve this crisis, but we cannot allow this momentum to fade or allow disagreement to stand in the way of our veterans getting the care they have earned and so clearly deserve.

This motion to instruct simply urges the conferees to move past disagreements that are stalling this critical bill. It would ensure that the VA can use resources it already has to hire additional health professionals to meet the needs of our veterans. Doing this will enable the VA to cut down on excessive and unacceptable wait times.

As a nurse, I know the importance of having adequate staffing levels filled with our Nation's best health care providers. We need to encourage the VA to bring these experts into the VA to treat our vets in need, and most importantly, the motion supports actions to give VA the resources it needs to improve care and responsiveness at every level while finding appropriate areas to cut back.

We owe it to our veterans to work tirelessly to finish this bill before we leave Washington. Veterans have already waited long enough. Let's not allow this critical bill to stall any longer. It is time to finish the job.

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

Mr. RAHALL. May I have a time check, please, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Reserving my right to close, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge all Members to oppose the motion to instruct. The conference committee is working diligently on both sides of the aisle to try to reach agreement with the Senate, and we want to do it in a responsible manner that puts the interests of our Nation's veterans at the forefront of the negotiations, but also is respectful of the resources required from our taxpayers to meet that objective.

So, again, I urge Members to oppose the motion to instruct. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, America's veterans deserve the very best care our Nation can muster. The gentleman from North Carolina said it well. Many Americans have said it well. Every one of our soldiers knows it is their motto to leave no soldier behind. Therefore, we, as Americans, should have as our creed and our basic principle guiding us that we leave no veteran behind.

That prescription begins with the very best corps of physicians that we can assemble. Time alone will not heal the wounds of war that our veterans have suffered. They are our true American heroes.

We have, time and time again, mustered the budgetary resources to deploy and support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and lands beyond, and we salute those of our Armed Forces serving as we speak for defending this great Nation of ours.

America's sons and daughters, those who have volunteered to defend our national causes, did not hesitate for an instant to go. They went. They served. They suffered. They sacrificed their good health. They gave their all.

We are proud in West Virginia, as a strong, patriotic State, to serve up there at the top of the 50 States, on a per capita basis, of our number of young men and women that answer the call of duty for all wars.

Now, the bill for war has come due; but, alas, where has all of this body's patriotic fervor gone? It appears to be buried beneath a mound of budgetary spreadsheets and handwringing about deficits, about the need to trim back, about the need to cut back on deficits.

I say this House ought to take a different course, one in which we can stand united with those who fought with meritorious service on behalf of a grateful Nation. Let us pay the medical bills of America's sons and daughters. Let us do so with dispatch. Let us hire the doctors that America's sons and daughters deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about this issue over the last several months. We know it is not a new issue. We have heard that it has been going on through several different administrations, but that should not hinder us from stepping up to the plate and doing what is necessary today, not after we come back from our so-called vacation in August, but we should address it today before we go home.

So I urge that this motion to instruct conferees be accepted by this body, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. RAHALL. 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.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE DONALD NASSHORN

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence has awarded its prestigious Bronze Key Award to an outstanding community servant and leader in my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Judge Donald Nasshorn, for his outstanding contribution in the field and with the affiliated Council of Southeast Pennsylvania, Inc., where he was a member of the council's board of directors for 27 years and president of its board for 16 years.

During this time, Judge Nasshorn led the council through periods of growth and expansion of its services, including chairing the council's building committee, as it purchased three buildings to accommodate council programming, and for many years, he has been recognized as a champion of early intervention and recovery support services to those involved in the criminal justice system.

Currently, Judge Nasshorn chairs a Bucks County overdose prevention task force, and so we join in honoring Judge Nasshorn for his years of outstanding leadership, for his advocacy, for his compassionate service to our community, and for setting an example for others to follow.

SOLAR ENERGY AT THE TOLEDO ZOO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Toledo Zoo, recently voted the best zoo in America, on its dedication of a new 2.1-megawatt solar array.

The project is a win for everyone involved. It embraces the future. It will supply 30 percent of the zoo's electricity needs, and it makes use of a vacant brownfield site in the city that would otherwise be a financial and environmental burden.

It serves as a wonderful educational tool for the zoo's more than 800,000 annual visitors.

Unfortunately, this is success story that will be difficult to replicate in Ohio due to the backward energy policy recently enacted by Ohio's Governor and State legislature.

As America strives to regain energy security, we must embrace all energy options, especially innovative, renewable energy sources that will power our future into and beyond the 21st century.

Hats off to the Toledo Zoo for serving as a national leader in advancing this goal.

Madam Speaker, I will include for the RECORD a recent article from the Toledo Blade detailing this really incredible success.

[From the Blade, July 22, 2014]

RUDOLPH/LIBBE PROJECT: SOLAR ARRAY TO SUPPLY POWER TO TOLEDO ZOO

BROWNFIELD SITE WILL AGAIN BE PRODUCTIVE

(By Tom Henry)

A massive, 2.1-megawatt solar array that has put 22 acres of vacant South Toledo land back into production is to be dedicated today. It's the kind of comeback that supporters believe will become less common across Ohio because of a recent bill Gov. John Kasich signed into law discouraging investments in renewable power.

The ceremony for the Rudolph/Libbe project near the Toledo Zoo is expected to draw a contingent of area business and government leaders interested in seeing how land contaminated by past industrial practices, known as brownfield sites, can go back on the tax rolls and generate clean energy while reducing blight.

In this case, a group of local investors led by Rudolph/Libbe Cos.—a limited liability company called Anthony Wayne Solar Number 1—is doing that for one of the region's largest employers and one of its most popular destinations, the Toledo Zoo.

The solar array and property, adjacent to the north side of the zoo's main parking lot between Anthony Wayne Trail and Spencer Street, are owned by those investors, who have a long-term contract in place to sell electricity generated at the site exclusively to the zoo.

The project, developed by Rudolph/Libbe and a sister company, GEM Energy, will generate about 30 percent of the Toledo Zoo's annual electricity needs, Jason Slattery, director of solar for Rudolph/Libbe Inc., said.

''This project is a great example of the public and private sectors working together to benefit the zoo and the community,'' Mr. Slattery said. ''We took a contaminated brownfield site, a financial burden for the city, and turned it into a win for the city of Toledo and the Toledo Zoo.''

He and other supporters believe such projects will be harder to come by now, though, because of the two-year legislative freeze on renewable-energy mandates that Mr. Kasich has signed into law.

That legislation, known as Senate Bill 310, applies only to utilities, not companies such as Rudolph/Libbe. But Ohio became the nation's first state with renewable-energy mandates to enact a two-year timeout.

A 2008 law requires utilities doing business in Ohio to steadily invest more in renewable power through 2025, when at least 12.5 percent of the electricity they provide is supposed to come from clean sources such as wind and solar energy.

Renewable energy advocates fear that two-year hiatus will put out a message to the business community that Ohio is no longer receptive to such investments.

Rudolph/Libbe, one of the region's largest contractors, expects to be doing more work in Michigan and New York, which have strong incentives for solar projects, Mr. Slattery said.

The solar industry has had setbacks from the failure of a high-profile manufacturer, California-based Solyndra, as well as the deep financial troubles of local manufacturers such as Xunlight and Willard & Kelsey.

But Rudolph/Libbe's an installer, not a manufacturer.

Growth in solar nationally has transformed the company's business model.

Since 2008, Rudolph/Libbe went from virtually no involvement in solar to having 10 percent of its revenue come from it.

It believes solar-installation projects will eventually become the backbone of as much as 30 percent of Rudolph/ Libbe's revenue.

Although Rudolph/Libbe will likely have to rely on states other than Ohio for that sort of push, it still expects to line up some Ohio contracts during the two-year freeze and hopes state legislators regain their interest in what the company sees as a budding industry, Mr. Slattery said.

''We think the costs of doing solar is an unstoppable train and it's not getting off the tracks,'' he said.

Rudolph-Libbe's costs for solar projects have come down from $9 per watt to $2 per watt since 2008. More affordable prices have resulted in more business, Mr. Slattery has said.

For the project near the zoo, investors worked with the Lucas County Land Bank, an agency that strives to repurpose vacant land, he said.

The site, formerly in receivership, was once home to a Haugh-ton Elevator Co. factory, but it has not been used since the early '90s.

There are 28,500 solar panels on 15 of the site's 22 acres. Additional panels could be put on some the remaining seven acres in the future. Officials first want to assess the viability of adding more, after examining the amount of shade cast off nearby homes along Spencer Street during the four seasons, Mr. Slattery said.

The site is believed to be one of the nation's largest solar installations generating power for a zoo.

''This solar array supports the zoo's mission by using cleaner and greener energy, reducing reliance on nonrenewable energy while providing an inspiring example for zoo visitors,'' Jeff Sailer, Toledo Zoo executive director, said.

Rudolph/Libbe also developed the zoo's 1,400-panel walkway, called SolarWalk,

which was installed in 2010, as well as multiple other projects with the Ohio Air National Guard and ones with the city of Bryan and First Solar LLC of Perrysburg in recent years.

The zoo also has a wind turbine generating power for its main parking lot, and geothermal wells to heat and cool the aquarium.

Bill Rudolph, chairman of Rudolph/Libbe Cos., said the companies are ''honored to support the Toledo Zoo's mission of environmental stewardship through this project.''

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources has planted trees and shrubs near the fences to create a visual buffer and spruce up the aesthetics for area residents. Plans also call for native grasses to be planted across the site.

Union labor from northwest Ohio was used to build the project, which created about 60 temporary construction jobs.

PORT OF SAVANNAH

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time and for being down here with me today.

I hate that you can't see my charts today. They are not particularly colorful or exciting, but they are important in that they are going to tell the story of something that we have gotten done together.

Now, I don't want you to think I am just making something up down here on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker. I know you are probably thinking about 326 bills that we have passed here in the House that are still sitting over there in the Senate gathering dust, having received no action whatsoever.

You might be thinking about the work going on in the Rules Committee, where we are suing the President for his failure to implement the law as he crafted it, drafted it, and signed it. You might be thinking about the border crisis that is happening right now that has been marked by so much inaction.

I don't mean to say that there are not lots of things that need to be worked on in this body. There are.

□ 1415

I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to talk about some of the rare successes that we have had, and it is a success that is a long time coming.

I represent Metro Atlanta, Mr. Speaker, kind of the northeastern suburbs there in Metro Atlanta, and right down I–75 and then down I–16, you get to the great and historic city of Savannah. Folks think about Savannah for all sorts of different things. Whether it is Oglethorpe and his arrival, whether it is dyeing the river green on St. Patrick's Day, or whether it is the birth of the Girl Scouts in Savannah, lots of things do bring it to mind. But folks don't often think about the economic driver that the Port of Savannah is for the entire southeastern United States.

So often we talk about constituent interests on the floor, Mr. Speaker, what is good for this one district in Alabama or this one district in New York. What I want to talk about is the impact of the Port of Savannah on the economy of the entire southeastern United States.

You might not know, Mr. Speaker, from your part of the world, that it is the fourth largest container terminal in the Nation, and the largest single terminal operation in all of North America, the single terminal, one long dock there in Savannah. It handles 3 million container equivalents absolutely every cycle. Volume is up 7 percent this year alone.

When we talk about the number of folks it impacts, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 21,000 companies from across the United States of America bring their commerce in and out of the Port of Savannah. Here is what is so important about our ports, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if everyone internalizes their values. Savannah is a great example. Forty-eight percent of the container traffic in that port are imports coming into America, goods and services that American consumers want to buy, but 52 percent of the traffic coming in and out of that port are exports. Forty-eight percent are things that we are buying from folks overseas, but 52 are goods that were manufactured with American hands, putting paychecks into Americans' pockets and shipping those goods right back out overseas—48 percent imports, 52 percent exports.

Now, why am I talking about that? We have got an exciting opportunity going on in this hemisphere, Mr. Speaker. You may have heard the term Panamax ships. The new Panama Canal—and you won't be able to see these numbers, Mr. Speaker, so I will just go through them briefly. The new Panama Canal is going to accommodate ships that carry not twice the number of containers that ships carry today, not three times the containers, but almost 3½ times more containers than ships carry.

What does that mean? That means if you are the fourth largest container port in the country, as Savannah is, if you are the fastest growing container port in the country, as Savannah is, you had better get to work making sure that your equipment—your port, your docks, and your channel—can accommodate the newer, larger ships.

Today, the draft on the ships coming through the Panama Canal, Mr. Speaker, is just under 40 feet. The new drafts of these Panamax ships are going to be 50 feet—10 feet more, 25 percent more. It requires major changes and renovations in our ports. And guess what. When the State of Georgia recognizes that we have a critical economic engine driving our economy, a critical economic engine to the entire Southeastern United States, we can't just get together as the State of Georgia and decide we are going to do some dredging and make sure that our port is ready for these newer, modern, larger ships. We are not allowed to.

Why? Well, it has a lot to do with this building, the one down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and a couple over in southwest D.C. at the EPA and our friends over at the Corps of Engineers. There is Federal law after Federal law after Federal law that says to the State of Georgia, no, you cannot expand your port without our permission.

Now, that would be a source of great difference of agreement in this body about whether we ought to have the kind of Federal regulatory burden that we do in order to make those decisions, but, in fact, that is the law of the land today and so we must deal with it.

We are talking about deeper channels, and we are talking about wider docking berths. We are talking about trying to move, again, not twice as many, not three times as many, but three-and-a-half times as many containers tomorrow as we were moving yesterday. And we have been battling as Georgians—as folks from the Southeast United States, as people trying to grow the economy—we have been battling the Federal red tape machine not for a week, not for a month, not for year, but almost a decade.

I say ''almost a decade.'' It has really been more than a decade, Mr. Speaker. But it has been going on for a decade in earnest, and we have finally gotten to the finish line. We have finally gotten to a place where the paperwork has been signed and the checks are being written, where we are going to be able to do the kind of dredging and modernization that is necessary to continue the economic engine here in the country.

What we are going to do is deepen our port from 42 feet to 47. Now, I mentioned to you the draft of these ships is 50 feet. We couldn't get permission to dredge deep enough to actually handle the 50-foot depth there. If we can't handle that draft, then these boats are going to have to unload some of their cargo either in Charleston or down in Jacksonville, and they are going to have to come into Savannah light.

I couldn't make it happen that we could organize our port to actually handle the fully loaded ships in the new Panamax model, but we are going to deepen to 47 at a cost of about $700 million. Now, that is real money. It is real money, and it is real money that is coming in a cost share agreement. The State of Georgia is picking up more than $200 million of that. The Federal Government is also picking up a share, recognizing the importance of economic development across the region.

Cost shares are important, Mr. Speaker. I have been talking to some of our colleagues, and you may have had the same conversation. There is really no limit to the number of folks who are willing to take free money. If you offer free money, if there is a grant proposal

that is just going to give you something, folks are willing to raise their hand and say: Yes, give it to me.

If you ask people to put some skin in the game, then it creates a completely different dynamic for who is on board and who is thinking they want to opt out this time around.

Georgia is on board to the tune of $200 million because it is important. When things are important, we ought to be able to come together and get those things done. Again, this Port of Savannah, this Corps of Engineers project, this bit of the WRDA bill authorized in the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act, a rare episode of folks coming together and getting things done.

When we talk about what this means, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 11,000 jobs nationwide—11,000 jobs nationwide. I say ''nationwide,'' Mr. Speaker. Only about 2,400 of those jobs are going to be local jobs there around the port. But we can't get wrapped up in what is good for me and what is good for my community to the exclusion of what is good for us. We are all in this together.

Is Savannah going to have a disproportionate benefit for the investment in this port? Of course it is. They are also going to be disproportionately burdened. Their streets are going to be more crowded, and their housing prices are going be to affected. Everything is affected. But this is not a local concern. This is a national concern.

Mr. Speaker, the world is changing. The world is a dynamic place. Again, it doesn't take much to see that what was the amazing engineering marvel that was the Panama Canal has been set aside now as being too old, too antiquated, and too small to handle modern needs. We are now talking about this Panamax canal that is going to bring ships the size of which you and I have never seen, Mr. Speaker, to American ports in record time, saving fuel, making a difference to the energy economy, and making a difference to price for American consumers.

I am a conservative Republican from the Deep South, Mr. Speaker. I have a vision of what this country ought to look like, and it is a vision of a country where every man or woman can follow his or her own hopes and dreams, wherever those hopes and dreams may take them. It is a vision where the government doesn't put its foot on the throat of those young Americans who want to pursue those dreams.

But it doesn't mean that there is no role for government at all. When it comes to big infrastructure projects, the interstate highway system, for example, that transportation bill that just passed this House 2 short weeks ago, when it comes to our ports, when it comes to those big issues of infrastructure that matter to us all that aren't just about jobs in our local area but about jobs across this country, we have to come together to make a difference in those ways.

For those of us in Georgia, for those of us in the Southeast, this brought Democrats and Republicans together, Mr. Speaker. This brought State legislators together with the executive branch. This brought folks together from Alabama, South Carolina, Florida, and more. We can do those big things that matter. They are not easy. Sometimes they take a year or 2 or 3. But in my 3 years of service in this institution, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen anything get done that was worth doing that didn't involve someone working awfully hard to make it happen. And more times than not, it wasn't one person working awfully hard, it was two of us or three of us or ten of us or 100 of us who got together to make these things happen.

I am grateful to my colleagues for working with me to make sure the Port of Savannah is a success—again, not just a success for the city of Savannah, not just a success for the State of Georgia, but a success for the United States of America. It is an example of the kinds of partnerships that we can create and the kinds of differences we can make in the pocketbooks of families back home.

There are going to be families who receive paychecks that would not have received those paychecks otherwise because of our cooperation and success. There are going to be consumers who are saving money at the cash register each and every day because we were able to come together and build this much-needed infrastructure project.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is virtually mandatory that I come to the floor this afternoon because the two most serious, antidemocratic, and anti-home rule amendments are pending in this House. I am very hopeful that they will not be sustained when the full Congress gets a look at them, but they certainly have passed this House: an amendment from Representative THOMAS MASSIE of Kentucky that attempts to wipe out, eliminate, all the gun laws of the Nation's Capital—the Nation's Capital, a prime terrorist target; the Nation's Capital, where Cabinet members lunch in our public places, go to our theaters, and walk in our streets; the Nation's Capital, where there are 650,000 residents; the Nation's Capital, one of the big cities of America, and it is those big cities where gun violence is most likely to occur. That is the amendment from Representative MASSIE.

Then there is another amendment from Representative ANDY HARRIS, an amendment that flies in the face of what is occurring across the country, of course, as 18 States long before the District of Columbia decriminalized their marijuana laws. So, too, has the District of Columbia. But this Member is seeking to meddle in the affairs of the District of Columbia—the local affairs, local matters—and to somehow keep the local legislature from passing a local law just like the laws of those 18 States.

Now, I hasten to add that the Senate, the comparable subcommittee in the Senate, has considered this matter, and the Senate has passed what we call a clean bill, a clean appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

Of course, there is a kind of anomaly here. Why am I talking about the District of Columbia at all? Well, that is an anomaly that allows the District's budget—every cent of it raised in the District of Columbia—to somehow come here to be approved by Members that are unaccountable for having raised a cent of that budget.

□ 1430

So, yes, the Senate had to consider the District's budget. By the way, our D.C. budget is balanced. The D.C. budget has a large amount of revenue in excess of its annual taxes, a rainy day fund that would be the envy of most Members of this House, and yet it has to come to a House that has hardly been able to pass bills much less balance its budget.

So the Senate says we recognize you can handle your own affairs, like any other American jurisdiction, and they have quickly passed or approved the District's local budget. In addition, the Senate has also given the District both autonomy over its own budget so it wouldn't have to come the Congress in the first place, and what we call legislative autonomy.

In addition to having to bring its local budget here, the residents of the District of Columbia, when they pass their local laws, those local laws have to rest here for a certain period of time to see if there is any Member who wants to jump up and ask to overturn them. However, usually the process of overturning a local law of the District of Columbia does not come through regular order, through the House and Senate, although there is such a process that is allowed. It usually comes in the way in which Representative MASSIE and Representative HARRIS have interfered with the District. They simply try to use an amendment to an appropriation bill in order to overturn a District law, a kind of shortcut method.

Of course, if one looks at why the District budget is over here, the American people would be, I think, pleased to know that no one, not one Member looks at the budget. They recognize that they are incompetent to do so, not because they are inherently incompetent, but because nobody would want to look at somebody else's budget if

they have not had the opportunity to go through what they have gone through, and that is all of the hearings and the rest of it. So Congress doesn't care about the budget. They have the budget here in order to use it as a vehicle to overturn local laws, and that is what has happened with the gun amendment and with the marijuana decriminalization amendment.

Now, I want to speak about both responses from residents and about what these Members have done. The gun amendment is the most serious because what Representative THOMAS MASSIE from Kentucky has tried to do affects the lives and the public safety of the residents of this city. This is something you don't fool with. The reason that the Framers left such local matters, public safety, to local people, is because of what is at stake. Nobody in Washington, that is to say official Washington, can tell anyone in someone's hometown anything that they should want to hear about their own local public safety.

As it turns out, the District of Columbia is very proud of its low crime rate, its low gun violence rate, because like other big cities, earlier on, within the last 15 or 20 years, it was like other big cities. It had high gun violence rates, but those have been brought down.

And you can imagine that in a big city, keeping the city safe from gun violence is a very big deal, particularly when that city turns out not to be just any city, when it turns out to be the Capital of the United States. And yet what Representative MASSIE has done would make the District of Columbia the most permissive gun jurisdiction in the United States. What is almost laughable, if it weren't so tragic, is that, were his amendment to become law, the District of Columbia would have a more permissive set of gun laws than Representative MASSIE's own district in Kentucky. This gentleman lives in a county of 17,000 people. He is a cattle farmer. That is a different culture that I respect in his county, and yes, in his State.

All the people of the District of Columbia are demanding is the same kind of respect, reciprocal respect, and that is what you don't get when a Member decides not to attend to the business of his own State, but knowing nothing about your State, saying not one mumbling word to you, who represent the District, the only Member who represents this district, or to any local official, when you then decide in the most tyrannical way to use authority that essentially even this Congress never intended you to have because 40 years ago the Congress passed the Home Rule Act.

It recognized when the country was, frankly, being criticized for not using the same standard with its own Capital that it demands of the rest of the world. Its own Capital didn't even have a local government, a home rule government. It was ruled by three commissioners. The people of the District couldn't elect their government. It had no Member of Congress. What kind of democracy is that in your Nation's Capital? Well, Congress said that is not democracy.

So Members can cite all they want about the Constitution, which indeed said that because it is the Nation's Capital, there is jurisdiction in the Congress. But nothing in the Constitution said that Congress had to keep that jurisdiction and could never give the District democracy, and so it did. The Home Rule Act of 1973, with that act, from this Congress, this Congress said we shall no longer be the tyrannical lawmakers for people unaccountable to us, making laws for people who can't vote for us or against us. We give that up because it is inconsistent with our values of democracy, and we say it to the world: we give it up now. And so they did.

So any Member who tries to say we have the authority, it is like any tyrant in the world who says because I can do it, I am going to do it. Yes, you can do it if you want to betray your own principles.

Now, I note for the RECORD that these Members profess to be Tea Party Republicans. Their major standard in this Congress is that power, even power that the Federal Government legitimately has, shall be devolved, sent back to local jurisdictions and to States.

How can you call yourself a small government, local government, states' rights Republican and then be instrumental in putting the big foot of the Federal Government on a local jurisdiction—as it turns out, your own Nation's Capital—and just to make this more absurdly antidemocratic, in a Congress where that Member cannot even vote up or down on the Harris amendment or on the Massie amendment.

If, my friends, that is not tyranny, then the word has no meaning. Unaccountable, and you stand in the way of making the only Member who represents the District, where you are interfering, making her unaccountable too with no vote on this floor—is this America? No, it is the Tea Party Republican Congress.

The gun amendment that has been introduced by Representative MASSIE as a bald attempt to score political points, and he says so—I will quote from his own statement shortly—to make political points at the expense of states' rights, the rights of my own constituents, and most seriously, at the expense of their public safety.

What is Representative THOMAS MASSIE trying to do here in Washington, instead of finding things to do for the people of Kentucky? Well, this is what he is trying to do in the Nation's Capital: to allow carrying on the streets a gun, open or concealed, of any kind; assault weapon, any kind, no holds; allowing assault weapons, including .50-caliber sniper weapons, to be possessed; allowing magazines holding an unlimited number of bullets to be possessed.

Do you know how many motorcades of cars go through the streets of the Nation's Capital every single day carrying dignitaries at every level of government from across the world? They stop the traffic because the safety of these officials is so important to the Nation and to the world. So we are not only talking about our own Cabinet officials, we are talking about 20 million people who visit this city, prime ministers, heads of states.

Let me go on about what kind of gun atmosphere Mr. MASSIE wants here in the Nation's Capital.

Private sale of guns without any background checks. Any Tom, Dick, or Harry, rogue or criminal, could get a gun and bring it into the Nation's Capital.

The purchase of guns with no waiting period.

The purchase of an unlimited number of guns in one day.

That is what he wants here in one of the big cities, the Nation's Capital.

Well, all he has done is bring unintended confusion. He certainly has gotten a response from the city. The mayor of the city, the police chief was out of town but her assistant chief came to this House and held a press conference about the outrage of interfering with the chief and most important duty of the mayor and the police chief: keeping the streets of the District safe.

But this amendment isn't quite doing what Mr. MASSIE intended. In fact, both of these amendments, the Harris marijuana decriminalization amendment and the Massie amendment, show why amendments to appropriations bills really aren't the way to proceed. It is true that you can try to introduce a bill to accomplish the same thing, but amendments to appropriations contain a few words and they end up doing things you never expected. This was a 69-word appropriation rider that tries to overturn four complicated laws; you just can't do it with an amendment and get done what you are trying to do.

□ 1445

This is what we found. We are still looking at the implications of the Massie amendment. It appears that THOMAS MASSIE has made some of our laws less restrictive and some more restrictive.

Then there is another interpretation that says that the city may be left with only laws that have been declared unconstitutional, and of course, those are unenforceable.

Then looking at the language, another reading says that the amendment has not only blocked the four complicated gun laws intended, but has also blocked enforcement of laws that these laws amended, and these laws amended laws that have been found unconstitutional. That is just how complicated this is.

Now, what I think I have shown is that it is technically impossible to do what THOMAS MASSIE tried to do in 69 words. Never mind, though, if all you are bent on is undemocratically poking, inserting yourself into a district not your own, you are bound to make mistakes.

In order to do what THOMAS MASSIE wanted to do, he would have had to write a law as complicated as the District of Columbia's own carefully-wrought laws—gun laws are. Remember, their laws had to be redeveloped because of the Supreme Court decision that said that D.C.'s original laws were not constitutional, so they went back and revised their laws, and they came up with, yes, strict gun laws.

There have been challenges to those gun laws. The Federal courts have upheld the District's gun registration requirement, the Federal courts have upheld the District's assault weapons ban, and the Federal courts have upheld the District's ban on large-capacity ammunition feeding devices.

Why in the world would anyone have gone to court against those in the first place, I am not sure, but anybody who reads the Supreme Court decision as saying you can carry any gun, anywhere you want to, ought to read it again.

All the Supreme Court said was that you are allowed to have and own a gun in your own home, period. That is all the Supreme Court has said—not to carry those guns into the streets of big cities where gun tragedies occur on a frequent basis.

I make no challenge to where my colleagues stand on guns. I believe in a country full of diversity of all kinds. If you look at the great United States from East to West, with its extraordinary diverse geography, you can understand why there would be vast differences among residents on issues like guns.

Why in the world would we not want to respect those differences? This is the United States of America. It means, in the States & D.C., we have the freedom to entertain differences and to carry them out there. That is all the residents of the District of Columbia are asking—indeed, demanding.

Wherever you stand on guns is no business of mine, and I will never try to convince you in your own State how to behave with those guns. All that the people I represent are asking is that we be accorded the same respect.

Representative MASSIE came on this floor initially with a version of his gun amendment. The Speaker sitting there before him found his amendment to be out of order. It was unartfully written.

Normally, if your own party—the Speaker in the chair is from his party, the majority controls the floor—if your own Speaker says that your amendment is out of order, that is the end of it.

To understand the kind of Member we are dealing with—his own Speaker had ruled his amendment out of order—the sensible thing to do is what he was finally forced to do, go back, go to the staff who knows how to write these amendments, and say: write me an amendment that won't be out of order.

Instead, he stood his ground and said he wanted a vote to overrule his own Speaker, that his amendment was out of order. That so embarrassed his colleagues on the other side that people gathered around him trying to convince him he really didn't want to do that, there was another way, go back and rewrite your amendment.

What began as stubbornness was becoming a matter of embarrassment for the Republican majority because a vote to overrule the Speaker demands an immediate vote of the House. It was now 7 or 8 at night.

Members had been told there would be no more votes, so they were scattered throughout the region, in Maryland, in Virginia, and the far reaches of the District of Columbia. Had, indeed, they been called back, the most angry Member would not have been me, it would have been his own colleagues.

Finally, unable to convince him to accept the ruling of the Chair—and the people of Kentucky ought to know what kind of Member they sent here and perhaps do something about it—instead of accepting the technical problem and going back forthrightly and dealing with it, he demanded a vote anyway.

The vote could only be called a humiliation of the Member because the votes were by voice and both sides voted against the Member's amendment, including his own side over there, and the only one to vote for his amendment was him.

So what he did finally is what he had to do. He went back, and he rewrote his amendment, and, of course, he has come back, and it passed, but with the unintended and confused consequences I just indicated.

This is a Member, I say to the people of Kentucky, who has introduced all of six bills—just by way of comparison only, because you can't be judged by the number of bills you introduce—but he has introduced six, I have introduced 64. The difference is I have spent my time asking: What do my constituents need?

I bet the people of Mr. MASSIE's district in Kentucky need more than an amendment likely not to prevail at the end of the Congress that overturns all the gun laws in the Nation's Capital. Indeed, I want to know what that does for one single resident of THOMAS MASSIE's district.

He was asked by the press: Why would you do this? He said: Because I want to try to restore gun rights anywhere I can.

He thinks he can here, despite the Home Rule Act, where Congress gave up the authority to pass laws for the District of Columbia.

Well, he had an opportunity twice since the D.C. amendment passed to try to restore gun rights any way he could. A congressional staff member was arrested here in the House just a few days ago for bringing a gun into the Capitol complex. This person has been arrested. I can't believe, since he is a staffer, he intended to bring it here, but the law is the law, whether you are a staffer or a visitor.

Why hasn't THOMAS MASSIE introduced a bill here where nobody could say he lacks jurisdiction, a bill to allow guns to be brought into the House of Representatives? I challenge him, if he means what he says, that he wants to at least try to restore gun rights ''anywhere I can,'' then he must begin where he lives, right here on the House floor, so that no staff member will be embarrassed again. Here, at least, those who would be affected are accountable to him, as the residents I represent are not.

It looks like—if you were to judge by these incidents all within a week's time—there are people who believe that Representative MASSIE meant what he said because just a couple of days ago, a man—yet again, from South Carolina—brought a loaded Ruger LC9 semiautomatic pistol with a round in the chamber, into the Capitol complex, and he too was arrested, because it is a Federal law, 40 U.S.C. 5104, which makes it an offense to carry a gun in the Capitol complex with a penalty up to 5 years of imprisonment.

Do you want to do something for the people of Kentucky who may visit here or the people of America? Here is a law that THOMAS MASSIE has full jurisdiction to overturn, so I challenge him—if THOMAS MASSIE is looking for a way to restore gun rights ''anywhere I can,'' I challenge you to at least introduce such a bill here, if for no other reason, for consistency's sake.

Don't think that what Mr. MASSIE has done has not been noted in Kentucky. I am quoting from a Kentucky TV station—and maybe this is partly inexperience because we don't see more experienced Members who may agree with Mr. MASSIE coming forward so recklessly—but this Kentucky staffer says:

> First-term Republican Representative Thomas Massie said it is his business to try to overturn Washington, D.C.'s gun control laws.

Then it says—and this is a straight-out news report:

> Massie's congressional district stretches from eastern Jefferson County, Oldham, Shelby, and Spencer Counties, all the way to the West Virginia border.
>
> If the libertarian Republican has his way, his influence will stretch to the District of Columbia's gun laws.

□ 1500

That is how it was reported in Kentucky. There is an irony here that is not lost in his home State. Take the Courier-Journal in Kentucky, which ran an editorial that was headlined, ''Big foot government.''

It says, ''A couple of Members of Kentucky's congressional delegation who claim to want government out of

our lives want to force more of it on the District of Columbia. Tea Party favorites''—they also name RAND PAUL because he has introduced a bill (not an appropriation amendment) that has been set back in the Senate, but his is an entire bill to overturn the gun laws of the Nation's Capital.

Rand Paul wants to be President of the United States, and he is putting in bills, by the way, that are far softer than the gun bill—bills that you might expect from the Democratic side—in order to try to make Independents and Democrats think that he is more acceptable than his words have indicated he is in the past.

Continuing, The Courier-Journal, the biggest newspaper in Kentucky, says that the two of them, ''libertarian-leaning Republicans, are pushing measures in Congress to roll back Washington, D.C.'s strict gun laws adopted by its officials to try to reduce gun violence in the nation's capital.''

It goes on, but let me quote from another part of that editorial. ''Too bad their concern doesn't extend to the right of residents of Washington to have a vote in Congress. The delegate from Washington has no floor vote, which means Ms. NORTON could only complain about the gun measure, but not vote against it. That sounds like taxation without representation, something anyone who purports to love liberty ought to oppose.''

Mr. Speaker, not only taxation without representation, but the people I represent pay the highest taxes per capita to the Federal Government, $12,000 per resident, which is the highest in the United States.

One ought to understand our outrage when people from Kentucky or Maryland or anywhere else in the country who pay less taxes try to tell us how to conduct our local affairs.

The gun amendment certainly riled D.C. residents, but that amendment is one of only two such amendments. The other, of course, is the marijuana decriminalization law that I mentioned when I began.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when the marijuana decriminalization law passed, along with the gun law, The Associated Press had an apt headline: ''Guns Okay, Pot Dangerous.'' That tells you something about the Republican House of Representatives.

The residents of this region—where we have lived as one region—have built the same Metro and use the same Metro with taxes coming from the entire region, and even though we have differing views on many issues, we try to live as one region and not meddle into the affairs of our neighbors, so this marijuana amendment was a particular outrage because it came from a Maryland Representative.

The first thing that the largest D.C. rights organization in D.C. did was to call for a boycott of the Eastern Shore, which Mr. Harris represents. The Eastern Shore lives off of Maryland, Virginia, and D.C., in the summertime. They have got to make it then, or the Eastern Shore isn't going to make it for the rest of the year.

When D.C. Vote called for a boycott, it suggested that residents choose Rehoboth Beach, Delaware; or Chincoteague Island, Virginia; but not the Eastern Shore because it said: They don't support us; why should we support them?

Of course, there will be allies across the region who will hear that call and who will not go to the Eastern Shore this summer.

Residents continue to try in other ways to say to Representative HARRIS: stay out of our affairs, attend to your own.

Two dozen residents came here this week to file complaints with Representative HARRIS. They say he is acting like he is a member of the city council, so we are going to treat him like he is a member of the city council.

So they brought their complaints one by one, and Representative HARRIS' chief of staff had to stand there to receive these complaints from the residents of the District of Columbia.

Nathan Harrington, who is a teacher in the District of Columbia, said, now that he sees who has the power, he is coming to Rep. HARRIS because there are some vacant houses in his neighborhood and he demands that Representative ANDY HARRIS take care of those vacant houses, right away. ANDY HARRIS has got the power. He has shown us he has got the power.

Mr. Harrington said: either he represents us or doesn't. If he doesn't, then stay out of our business. If he does, take care of those vacant houses.

Representative HARRIS did not come forward to receive these complaints, but his chief of staff did stand there, with civility, and receive these office-hours complaints from D.C. Vote residents.

There were a number of other complaints that came to Mr. HARRIS' office. A resident said they wanted more visible street signs. One resident said they want more bike lanes. If you have got somebody who can put the big foot of the Federal Government on your back, then surely he can do little things like get you some bike lanes.

This may be tongue-in-cheek, but it does show you the residents of the District of Columbia are going to come at you in more ways than one, and yes, there is a sense of humor here, and then there is something very serious, like that boycott.

To its credit, when the boycott of the Eastern Shore was initiated by D.C. Vote, it sent word to its local chamber of commerce and to its local commercial section that it had absolutely nothing against them, that many of us had enjoyed the Eastern Shore, but essentially, we were powerless here.

I could note vote against the Harris amendment. I don't expect the residents of the District of Columbia to sit around and take it. You want to mess with us, we are going to mess with you. We are going to mess with you in your district, we are going to mess with you here.

We are first-class American citizens. We are not going to take it. We are going to do everything we can to blanket your State about how you are meddling in our affairs, instead of taking care of your state's business.

I didn't organize any of this. I am expressing the outrage of the people I represent, and let me tell you, while they made light with this constituent services day in Representative HARRIS' office, this is dead serious for us because our marijuana amendment wasn't passed because of some college students—and this is a big college town—lobbied the council about pot.

It was passed in the wake of two studies by very reputable organizations, The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the American Civil Liberties Union. They found that in this progressive town, 90 percent of those arrested for smoking marijuana were Black.

I can't tell you exactly why, but it probably has a lot to do with where the police presence is most likely to be, but these figures fly in the face of figures that show that Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate.

I don't know whether Members appreciate what a ''drug'' offense—and that is what a marijuana offense is—means to a Black kid. It is the end of his working life. He is likely to carry around a stereotype based on his color and often his gender, if he is a Black boy or Black man. He won't be able to explain away this drug offense—marijuana offense.

That is what got the city council to pass this law. So anyone who interferes with us on this issue is meddling with a serious racial issue in the District of Columbia, and we are demanding that you stay out of this very serious affair.

The amendment was passed to combat racial injustice. Twenty-three States have legalized medical marijuana, 18 have decriminalized marijuana, and two States have legalized marijuana. We will not be treated differently from any other State in the Union. The one thing we demand is equal treatment.

I must note that there is a growing sense among my Republican colleagues in this Congress that marijuana should no longer be criminally treated. We don't treat alcohol, which does far more harm, in a criminal fashion. While I am the last one to say smoke weed or cigarettes, I don't think people should get a criminal record for having done so.

We do not see any consistency among my Republican colleagues. When the Harris amendment came in committee, Republicans voted for it, and I want to say something about those Republicans.

KEN CALVERT of California, JEFF FORTENBERRY, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, DAVID JOYCE, DAVID

VALADAO, ANDY HARRIS—of course—and MARK AMODEI, these members, along with Mr. HARRIS, violated their own limited, small government, local control, states' rights principles by voting in committee for the Harris amendment.

I want to say a special word about MARK AMODEI of Nevada because he exceeded other Members in hypocrisy. He joined a majority last month on the floor in favor of an amendment blocking the Federal Government from interfering with medical marijuana in those States which allow it—because Nevada allows it.

□ 1515

He didn't want the Federal Government interfering with what had been sanctioned by his own state, but he was quick to interfere with the local affairs on a related substance right afterwards.

I call on my Republican colleagues to at least abide by their own principles and to show some consistency of principle.

Also passed recently was an amendment that prevents the Federal Government from penalizing financial institutions that provide services to legal marijuana businesses. If you have got a marijuana business in your State and the State says it is okay, then the Federal Government cannot keep financial institutions from dealing in bank transactions with these local marijuana businesses.

Forty-five Republicans voted for that amendment that passed. That is a large number of Republicans to cross the aisle in this House. The House has also voted to block the Drug Enforcement Administration from using funds to target medical marijuana operations in States where those operations are legal. Forty-nine Republicans voted for that.

Be consistent. If you are going to vote to keep the Federal Government out of matters involving marijuana where your State has sanctioned its use, then apply that same principle to the District of Columbia. That is why the Associated Press said: ''House GOP to D.C.: Guns OK, pot dangerous.''

Like the Massie gun amendment, the Harris amendment had unintended consequences, too. The District of Columbia marijuana decriminalization is legal because the law has passed its layover period of 60 legislative days. At the end of that 60 days, the law became legal. Now, the Harris amendment—seeks to overturn it. What happens when you use a pre-loaded Federal political bomb against a local jurisdiction is clear from what has happened with Representative HARRIS' amendment. That amendment now would not only block the District from enforcing its laws, it would block the District from issuing the fines that, with a sense of responsibility, were put in the law for those who, for example, smoke marijuana on the streets. There are unintended consequences because you don't know what you are doing when you meddle in the business, the local business, of another jurisdiction.

It is remarkable that Mr. HARRIS is a Club for Growth, Tea Party acolyte, who was known before he came here and is known now for his support of states' rights more than he is known for anything else; and it is remarkable to note that his own State, Maryland, has decriminalized marijuana. He is a Member who has the power in Maryland. Yet, he could not keep his own State from decriminalizing marijuana. So he tries to do in the District what he could not do in the State where he is accountable to the voters.

A recent article on Mr. HARRIS and the District of Columbia when these residents Constituent Services Day in Representative HARRIS' office:

> I thought this media stunt was going to be a colossally goofball effort that had little to no effect on Harris or his views, and we still don't know if it will, but on that day, his employees were clearly rattled, so mission accomplished.
>
> Moreover, Harris—who also has said that, to District residents, Congress is their local legislature—missed an opportunity to come across as something beyond another guy stuffed in a suit, overreaching his boundaries. By leaving the completely manageable demonstration to his marginally prepared aides, his stance on what the city's drug policies should be came across as even more aloof and more nonsensical than ever.

Look at how you are viewed. Think before you decide to insert yourself against your own professed—and often announced—principles into the affairs of a local jurisdiction not your own.

I am here this afternoon to serve notice on these two Members—and we are not through with them yet—or on any other Members who come forward that, yes, you can vote when I can't, but you cannot keep the residents of the District of Columbia from doing what they can to show you and to show America that we will not be treated as second-class citizens in our own country, not by THOMAS MASSIE, not by ANDY HARRIS, not by any Member of the House or Senate. Don't expect us to just lie down and take it. No red-blooded American would take what these Members have tried to do to this city with the gun amendment and with the marijuana decriminalization amendment.

In the name of your own principles—principles on which I agree that matters in the States and localities are for them, and my friends, maybe even some of the things we do here can better be done in the States—there is a democratic way to accomplish that mission, but it is not by an act of profound congressional bullying where you exert power to which even the local Member cannot respond except on this floor, with her voice—not even with a vote.

When THOMAS MASSIE decided that he wanted to overrule his chair, they didn't pull him off the floor. They let him have a vote. I will not have a vote on any matter affecting the District of Columbia. In the name of decency, if you are not going to give me a vote, stay out of the affairs of the District of Columbia.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family obligations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 10 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 24 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 4 and 5, 2013, February 10, 2014, March 4, 2014, and April 9 and 10, 2014 on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6604. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas in New Jersey [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0078] received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6605. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment of Imports (2014 Amendment) [Doc. No.: AMS-CN-13-0100] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6606. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Acting, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002][Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8337] received July 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6607. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0018] [CDFA Number: 84.133E-4.] received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6608. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Rehabilitation Research

and Training Centers [ED-2014-OSERS-0047] [CDFA Number: 84.133B-8] received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6609. A letter from the Electronics Engineer, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proposed Amendments to the Service Rules Governing Public Safety Narrowband Operation in the 769-775/799-805 MHz Bands; The Development of Operation, Technical and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, Sate and Local Public Safety Communications Requirements Through the Year.. [PS Docket No.: 13-87] [WT Docket No.: 96-86] [RM-11433].. recevied July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6610. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Tohatchi, New Mexico) [MB Docket No.: 13-250] (RM-11705) received July 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6611. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Digital Television Table of Allotments (Seaford, Delaware and Dover, Delaware) [MB Docket No.: 13-40] (RM-11691) received July 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6612. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 21, 73, 74 and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Series in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands [WT Docket No.: 03-66] [RM-11614] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6613. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Policy on Interpretation of Phrase ''Significant Portion of Its Range'' in the Endangered Species Act's Definitions of ''Endangered Species'' and ''Threatened Species'' [DOC Docket No.: 110131072-4385-02] [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0031] (RIN: 1018-AX49; 0648-BA78) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6614. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yellow-Billed Parrot With Special Rule, and Correcting the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo Special Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0075]; [4500030115] (RIN: 1018-AY28) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6615. A letter from the Regulations Specialist; FWS-Office of Subsistence Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska--2014-15 and 2015-16 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2012-0104;FBMS#4500065668] (RIN: 1018-AY85) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6616. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Gulf of Mexico Hammerhead Shark Management Groups [Docket No.: 130402317-3966-02] (RIN: 0648-XD281) received June 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6617. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: San Francisco Independence Day Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0283) (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6618. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Celebrate The Amboys Fireworks; Raritan Bay, Perth Amboy, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6619. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Freeport Chamber of Commerce Fireworks Display; South Oyster Bay; Freeport, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0240] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6620. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0501] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6621. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Summer Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0476] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6622. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0522] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6623. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bullhead City River Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0359] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6624. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Tennessee River, Mile 256.0 to 257.5; Florence, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0277] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6625. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0160] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6626. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Water Ski Show, Fox River, Green Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0536] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6627. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0377] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6628. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Menominee Fireworks; Green Bay, Menominee, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0539] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6629. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0482; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-17290; AD 2012-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6630. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0724; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-17299; AD 2012-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6631. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0416; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17303; AD 2012-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6632. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — The New York North Shore Helicopter Route [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0302; Amdt. No. 93-97] (RIN: 2120-AJ75) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6633. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1419; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-281-AD; Amendment 39-17297; AD 2012-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6634. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0036, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC09) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6635. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Signal Systems Reporting Requirements [Docket No.: FRA-2012-0104, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC44) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6636. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0063 (HM-250)] (RIN: 2137-AE38) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6637. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting by Passport Applicants [TD 9679] (RIN: 1545-AJ93) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6638. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — IRS Truncated Taxpayer Identification Numbers [TD 9675] (RIN: 1545-BJ16) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6639. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2014-0034] (RIN: 0960-AH67) received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 5203. A bill to enhance the operation of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5204. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to improve recreation opportunities and increase consistency and accountability in the collection and expenditure of recreation fees collected on public lands and forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5205. A bill to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAYSON (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5206. A bill to allow Foreign Service and other executive agency employees to designate beneficiaries of their death benefits; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5207. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the John P. Parker House in Ripley, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5208. A bill to make technical corrections to the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 5209. A bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5210. A bill to prohibit providing Federal funds for the National Endowment for the Humanities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5211. A bill to amend section 811 of Public Law 111-84 to apply that section to all contractors for all sole-source contracts exceeding $20,000,000; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 687. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the President's responsibility to address the border crisis; 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. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BASS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HALL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 688. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in poor countries have access to vaccines and immunization through the GAVI Alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 689. A resolution supporting an end to the ethnic and politically fueled violence in South Sudan and the successful implementation of a transitional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 690. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 691. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

289. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution No. 1256 honoring the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. PETE P. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 148: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 292: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 303: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 404: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 411: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 460: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 494: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 517: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 519: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 595: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 628: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 647: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 792: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 847: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 956: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1150: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1226: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1478: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1518: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1666: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1733: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1812: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1861: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1943: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1953: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1975: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1976: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2028: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2313: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2366: Mr. STEWART, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DENT, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BARBER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2453: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2457: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2529: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2536: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2594: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2654: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2656: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2673: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2738: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2761: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2780: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 2835: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2917: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2959: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 2996: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3155: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3333: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 3456: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3465: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3489: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3560: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3662: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3670: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3680: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3708: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 3747: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3775: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3782: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 3991: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4137: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 4148: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 4158: Mr. REED and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4188: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4190: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 4227: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4240: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4319: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4370: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 4430: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4515: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4577: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 4578: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4582: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 4618: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 4626: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 4674: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4682: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4740: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4741: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4771: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 4793: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4814: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 4815: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4818: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4828: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4829: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 4853: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4878: Mr. LONG and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4886: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 4888: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4916: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4920: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4948: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4960: Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4964: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4966: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4979: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4989: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 5005: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 5007: Ms. KUSTER and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 5024: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 5041: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5043: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 5044: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 5052: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 5059: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 5060: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 5062: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 5069: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 5071: Mr. NUNES and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 5083: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5086: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 5088: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5094: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5114: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 5126: Mr. POCAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5127: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 5128: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5129: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 5156: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 5159: Ms. CHU and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5160: Mr. YOHO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 5182: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 5200: Ms. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. BARR.

H.J. Res. 118: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 119: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 107: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Res. 208: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 281: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 431: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Res. 522: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 587: Mr. GRIMM.

H. Res. 620: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 640: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Res. 644: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 667: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 679: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3486: Mr. MEADOWS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

90. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Springfield, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 5836 supporting the Youth PROMISE Act (H.R. 1318 and S. 1307); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

91. Also, a petition of the City of Napoleon, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 041-14 urging state legislators to reject HB 5 and Senate Bill 282; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. Also, a petition of the California State Lands Commission, California, relative to a resolution opposing the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act (S. 2094); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 10 by Mr. PETERS on H.R. 3992: Jim Cooper, Gene Green, Bill Foster, Mike Thompson, Alan Grayson, John Conyers Jr., Raúl M. Grijalva, Richard E. Neal, Michael F. Doyle, Brad Sherman, David Scott, Filemon Vela, Tulsi Gabbard, David Loebsack, Corrine Brown, John Barrow, Ed Pastor, Sean Patrick Maloney, Terri A. Sewell, Colleen W. Hanabusa, John C. Carney Jr., and Eliot L. Engel.