United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 2014 No. 121

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 30, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen 49 years ago today, several weeks after I finished high school, then-President Lyndon Johnson signed into law two of the largest and most important health-related programs the country had ever seen, Medicare and Medicaid. Those programs were created nearly half a century ago because our Nation's leaders saw, time and time again, the hopelessness of people who had no way to provide the most basic level of health care for themselves and their families.

It was President Harry Truman who initially conceived of a health care safety net for struggling Americans. Nearly 70 years ago, Truman said: ''Millions of our citizens do not now enjoy good health. Millions do not have security against the economic effects of sickness . . . and the time has arrived for action to help them get that protection.''

Since the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, no achievement has been as significant and consequential as the Affordable Care Act. In addition to providing affordable health insurance, to some for the first time ever, the ACA has also provided for significant expansion of states' Medicaid programs so that individuals with incomes less than 138 percent of the poverty level could finally have access to basic care.

A Supreme Court case would make Medicaid expansion voluntary. Now, nearly half a century after Medicaid was created to help the least among us, 24 States in this country, 24 States believe it best to disenfranchise millions and deny them access to Federal dollars they rightfully deserve by not expanding their programs.

States that have refused to expand point to the increased costs as a main reason for their decision. But, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has committed to pay 100 percent—that is, 100 percent of the cost of expansion—for the first 3 years and then 90 percent beyond the first 3. Nationally, the States would see only a 1.6 percent increase in their share of Medicaid spending, a 1.6 percent increase to provide health care for millions of deserving individuals.

The benefits of expansion far outweigh the costs. In my home State of North Carolina alone, expanding Medicaid will save the State more than $65 million over the next 8 years and would benefit its economy by adding nearly $1.5 billion to the State's revenue. It would not only help to save jobs, but help to create them, too. That is just in North Carolina. And this same scenario is playing out in nearly half of all the States in our country.

The cost of not expanding is simply too great. Pungo Hospital, located just outside of my congressional district in Belhaven, has closed its doors, closed its doors because North Carolina refuses to expand Medicaid.

The decision by Governor Pat McCrory and the Republican-led State legislature has cost a woman her life. Portia Gibbs was 48 years old. She had a heart attack and died on her way to the nearest open hospital, which was an hour away.

Providing care to the sick and injured is a moral imperative that Harry Truman saw nearly 70 years ago when he first spoke about it. Congress and President Lyndon Johnson believed caring for the least among us was a moral necessity when Medicare and Medicaid were passed and signed into law.

At the signing ceremony 49 years ago, former President Harry Truman said of the people that would benefit from Medicare and Medicaid: ''These people are our prideful responsibility, and they are entitled, among other benefits, to the best medical protection available. We don't want them to have any idea of hopeless despair.'' That was President Harry Truman.

In response to Truman, President Lyndon Johnson said improving the health of all Americans ''calls upon us never to be indifferent to despair. It commands us never to turn away from helplessness. It directs us never to ignore or to spurn those who suffer untended in a land that is bursting with abundance.''

Those elected officials standing in the way of Medicaid expansion should

Printed on recycled paper.

simply reflect on President Johnson's words. In a country that has come so far—so far—Americans who struggle financially deserve better than that. They deserve better than to have their elected officials tell them that their worth in this world is tied to their ability to afford health insurance.

ISRAEL HAS THE RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak strongly and unequivocally in support of Israel's right to self-defense, the same right to self-defense we would assert if America were attacked and Americans killed by rockets and other weaponry.

Israel launched Operation Protective Edge in response to relentless and unprovoked rocket attacks launched from Gaza by Hamas, a brutally ruthless terrorist organization. In just the last 3 weeks, more than 2,500 rockets have rained down on Israel, and the targets of these rockets are not military but civilian.

2,500 rockets fired at any country is a lot. It is an act of war that triggers self-defense military responses. But 2,500 rockets fired at a country as small as Israel is even worse. To put the size of Israel in perspective, Israel is smaller than the Tennessee Valley of north Alabama that I represent. If anyone dared to fire even a single rocket at the people of the Fifth District of Alabama, much less if 2,500 rockets rained down on the Tennessee Valley, you can be darn sure that we would demand an overwhelming military response.

In Israel, Hamas fires at communities, at schools, at daycare centers, all with the same goal: to invoke terror by injuring and killing as many innocent Israeli citizens as possible.

Fully 80 percent of the Israeli population is living under the constant threat of missile attacks, having to run into the shelters constantly at a moment's notice, in the middle of the night, at all times of the day with mere seconds of warning. No country on Earth would tolerate such a situation.

So that we are clear, Hamas consistently places and fires its rockets within heavily populated areas, including schools and hospitals. Hamas does this to use their own civilian population as human shields. This means that every time they fire a rocket, they are committing not one, but two, war crimes: targeting civilians in Israel while using human shields in Gaza.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said it very well in describing the juxtaposition of Hamas firing from civilian areas in the hope of drawing fire and the use by Israel of the Iron Dome missile defense system: ''We use missiles to protect our people. Hamas uses their civilians to protect their missiles.''

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not emphasize how truly miraculous the Iron Dome missile and mortar defense system is. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet.

I thank the Tennessee Valley's incomparable defense workers who, working hand-in-hand with very bright Israeli engineers and scientists, made hitting a bullet with a bullet possible. Untold Israeli citizens' lives have been saved as a result of the Tennessee Valley's technological contributions to Israel and the Iron Dome defense system.

Since the beginning of Operation Protective Edge, Israel has discovered more than 30 offensive Hamas terrorist tunnels dug from Gaza under the border and into Israel. These tunnels have 60 different access points, and the entrances have been found in houses and mosques.

The purpose of the tunnels is to allow armed Hamas terrorists to emerge in Israeli communities to murder and kidnap civilians—defenseless mothers, fathers, and children, it makes no difference to Hamas. Hamas kidnaps, tortures, and murders, and seemingly enjoys it.

Israel's only solution, the only path to peace in the face of those who kill in the name of religion, is Israel's disarming of Hamas and the demilitarization of Gaza.

Israel is the only democracy in the tumultuous and dangerous Middle East. Israel is unquestionably America's most reliable ally in the Middle East. The people of Israel are engaged in a fight to protect their home, a fight for survival, and America must stand with Israel without hesitation.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the most fundamental right in any democracy since it is the right from which all others meaningfully derive.

Deny someone the right to vote, and you may deny them the right to speak, to associate with whom they choose, or to freely exercise their faith. For if these other rights are infringed, how may we seek redress but at the ballot box?

Not even the courts can secure our rights in the absence of an effective franchise. Congress established the inferior courts, and Congress may abolish them. The right to vote alone is foundation to all of the others.

So it is deeply disturbing to see the right to vote being diminished in many States. These new State laws restrict voter registration drives, eliminate same-day voter registration, reduce the early voting period, and require photo identification and proof of citizenship to vote.

In total, 34 States have passed laws now requiring voters to show some kind of identification at the polls. For many Americans who already are registered to vote and can provide this documentation, these new requirements may not sound burdensome. But although these new laws apply to all Americans, they disproportionately impact young, elderly, minority, low-income, and disabled voters.

Eleven percent of American citizens do not have a photo ID; 7 percent do not have citizenship documents. That means a significant number of eligible voters have been disenfranchised by these new laws.

It has been argued that it is appropriate to put a significant burden on people who simply want to cast their vote because voter fraud is widespread, but it is not. It is true that in jurisdictions which allow people to pay a bounty for new voter registration cards that voter registration fraud exists. But voter registration fraud is not the same as voter fraud, since these false registrations do not result in nonexistent people voting.

The fraud artists should be prosecuted for violating the law and cluttering up the voter registration rolls, but legitimate voters should not be disenfranchised. Rather, we should crack down on the bounty system that incentivizes this kind of misconduct.

These new and stringent voter ID laws will not stop voter registration fraud, but they will prevent legitimate voters from casting their ballots. Indeed, in many places, this is their very intention. They are the worst form of voter suppression, not voter protection.

The backward movement on voting rights is not confined to the States. The Supreme Court has also made it more difficult to ensure adequate protection from disenfranchisement.

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act required that nine States and many other counties and municipalities around the country with histories of voter discrimination obtain Federal preclearance before changing voter laws. However, the Supreme Court, in Shelby County v. Holder, ruled that the formula to determine which jurisdictions must get preclearance is out-of-date.

Immediately thereafter, Texas announced that a previously blocked voter identification law would go into effect and that redistricting maps would no longer need Federal approval, actions that could severely undermine minority voting rights in that State.

□ 1015

In January, the Voting Rights Amendment Act was introduced to restore and strengthen the protections of the VRA that were dismantled by the Supreme Court. This bill was introduced by Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER, demonstrating the bipartisan support for restoring a crowning achievement of the civil rights movement. I am a strong supporter of the Voting Rights

Amendment Act, and I am encouraged that Members of both parties see the need for this legislation.

As a country, we have made incredible progress in expanding the right to vote to previously disenfranchised populations. Now is not the time to turn the clock back. We should, instead, be moving forward, ever forward, and encouraging legal, eligible voters to fully participate in their government, in democracy, and in voting—not working to exclude them.

Congress must commit to passing the Voting Rights Amendment Act and ensuring that the ballot boxes in our States, in our Nation, and in our democracy remain open to all.

CENTRAL ALABAMA VETERANS HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this Congress and with this Nation a story of mismanagement, malfeasance, negligence, and coverup at the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System, or CAVHCS.

I know most of my colleagues can point to at least some problems at the VA systems in their State. But what has transpired in my hometown of Montgomery, Alabama, and central Alabama rises to a level of misconduct and mistrust I am not sure many other systems can match. And I do this not simply just to disparage the system for no reason. I do this to shine a light on some truly disturbing practices so we can finally clean up the mess. I do this so that the 50,000-plus veterans that depend on the Central Alabama VA can one day have confidence in the health care system we promised them.

After Phoenix, when the scheduling scheme began to unravel, it was revealed in early June that the Central Alabama VA had one of the worst wait times in the country. It was particularly bad for mental health patients.

I actually met with our local VA director, who acknowledged the discrepancies and tried to reassure me by leading me to believe that action had been taken to remove those responsible. It turns out that wasn't true. No one was fired. Mr. Speaker, if a Member of Congress can't get a straight answer from the VA, imagine what our veterans go through every single day.

In the wake of this clear breach of trust, we began digging deeper to find out what was really going on at the Central Alabama VA. The information that we received from sources who came forward was alarming. It is also consistent with reports gathered by independent inspectors and some great investigative reporters.

Here is what is being uncovered:

A Montgomery VA pulmonologist manipulated more than 1,200 patient records to show tests that never occurred. After being caught, the doctor was never fired or suspended. He actually was caught manipulating records again but somehow went on to receive a ''satisfactory'' performance review;

At least 900 unread patient X-ray tests, many showing malignancies, were lost over a 5-year period. When the tests were discovered recently, top hospital administrators tried to cover up the problem;

Email records show the Central Alabama VA director was alerted to the concerns over patient scheduling practices more than 8 months before taking action;

And finally, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the strongest evidence yet has emerged that the rampant scheduling manipulation at Central Alabama wasn't a misunderstanding at all but, rather, a facility-led standard operating procedure. More than 57 percent of staff surveyed at Central Alabama said they received ''instruction'' to manipulate patient wait times, 57 percent. Mr. Speaker, that is off the charts. The national average is 12.7 percent, and other systems near Montgomery aren't even close.

There is clearly a systematic problem in Montgomery, and it needs to be corrected. That is why I have joined with Senator RICHARD SHELBY to write the new Secretary of Veterans Administration, Robert McDonald, to call his attention to the Central Alabama VA. Specifically, Senator SHELBY and I are asking Secretary McDonald to review these instances of mismanagement, visit CAVHCS with us, and develop a plan of action to reform the Central Alabama system.

It is so important to remember that thousands of doctors, nurses, and public servants at the VA work very hard every day to give veteran patients the best health care that we can offer. Their service is honorable, and it is a shame that it is overshadowed now by a system that too often fails those it was created to help.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the American people to forget about this. We cannot allow the news media to move on to the next story. I hear from veterans every day who are depending on us to make this right. This will be an uphill battle. I know that. But it is a fight we have to fight. We have to change this culture of complacency. That starts with new leadership, and I look forward to working with Secretary McDonald.

THE BORDER CRISIS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks, many of us have visited my home State and have gone to places where I have gone over the decades of service and living in Texas, and that is to our great neighbors who live on the border. Many great citizens of the State of Texas and of the great country in which we live, they have lived and worked and played, and they have created an economic engine, cities like Brownsville, Laredo, Harlingen, McAllen, and many others. And they have, in fact, experienced over the years an influx of individuals coming to do harm.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and a member who has served as chairwoman and ranking member on a number of subcommittees, we have made great strides.

I am reminded of the low number of Border Patrol agents some many years ago, and now we are upwards to 25,000 hardworking Americans who serve on both the northern and southern borders.

They have met the challenge of a serious influx. First, the drug cartels. The violence on the Mexican side of the border. We have come together with Mexican Presidents and have worked with the Mexican national defense forces, and we have quashed, to a certain extent, the extensive violence. But yet, our Federal agents of the ATF, the DEA, FBI, and certainly other collaborative efforts have worked to bring this violence down.

We take note of the fact that El Paso is noted as the safest city in the United States, and it is on the border. We note that a great deal of commerce comes through the southern border, as it does the northern border.

Over the last couple of weeks, beginning maybe in 2013, we saw a new phenomenon, an unplanned phenomenon, a phenomenon driven by the devastating and destructive elements found in Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Central America, none of which were driven by a pointed pronouncement from the United States or the President of the United States, President Barack Obama. But elements who wanted to misuse and abuse the need for comprehensive immigration reform decided to misrepresent the laws of the United States of America.

Every Member of Congress has adhered to a particular theme. I started using it in the 1990s. We are a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants. And the laws are intended to be used to instruct how we guide our hearts and our laws. We still have the Statue of Liberty in the harbor of New York that says, we welcome the forlorn and those who are in need.

Unfortunately, bad information was given to desperate people. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker: desperate people. Desperate mothers and fathers who saw the beheading of young people, or people in their neighborhood threatened by MS–13 and other horrific gangs who say, if your child does not join, your child will be killed, or your little girl will be raped. Or maybe the 3-year-old that I saw down in Brownsville with a diaper on was given to someone just to save her life.

That is the misnomer and the abuse that has been going on in the debate

here. These are the real lives of children who fled with a more than credible fear of the loss of life. I am so disappointed sometimes in how we can reinvent truth, and that is that these children are fleeing because of what President Obama represented. That is not true. And it is important to tell the American people the truth.

They were fleeing because of the sheer unbelievable violence, insane violence, mixed in with the mistruths and misrepresentations of those who just wanted to make money and abuse the system. So now we have the surge, maybe 50,000 plus here in the United States. And we have to do something about it.

I listened to three young people yesterday. Most of us have not heard from the children because we were protecting the children's privacy. But these youngsters explained the arduous journey that they took and how they came here for nothing more than a better life, and that violence was all around them.

Yes, we need to work with Honduras and Guatemala and El Salvador. But we started out trying to do what was right. The President offered a supplemental. He knew it was right to have funding for the wilderness funding. He knew it was right to give the Border Patrol agents their appropriate moneys, and he knew it was right for enforcement to add more judges.

But what I would say is, what we have on the floor now, Mr. Speaker, is a pitiful example in H.R. 5230. This is a bad emergency supplemental. It is not even that. It is not worth voting for. America is better than this, and we need to do better than this with the supplemental to help these children and help America.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, to begin my short statement today, I would like to read you a recent headline from The Washington Times: ''Golden Hammer: U.S. squandered $34 million on failed Afghan soybean project.'' The first few sentences of this report read: ''Call it the great American soybean heist, the latest tale of U.S. taxpayer abuse to emanate from Afghanistan. Despite clear evidence that Afghanistan's arid soil was a bad place to grow soybeans, the U.S. Department of Agriculture spent $34.4 million tying to establish the crop in that country, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction.''

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, talking about the waste, fraud, and abuse of American resources in Afghanistan.

Yesterday I spoke on the House floor in memory of three members of the United States Army who died as a result of their service in Afghanistan. The deaths of these three men represent my greatest concern with our servicemembers continuing to remain in Afghanistan: that more and more of our men and women in uniform will be killed and wounded.

The loss of life and limb is far more important than the money that is being wasted. However, Mr. Speaker, our country is in a dangerous financial situation.

In addition to the soybean report, I want to read three more headlines that accentuate the waste of our taxpayer money in Afghanistan. From CBS News: ''Is the Pentagon wasting taxpayer money in Afghanistan?'' From the Center for Public Integrity: ''The U.S. military was no match for Afghanistan's corruption.'' And from the World Affairs Journal: ''Money pit: The monstrous failure of U.S. aid to Afghanistan.''

Mr. Speaker, how much more can the poor American taxpayer continue to spend on a failed policy in Afghanistan? I cannot emphasize enough that we have children, senior citizens, and veterans here at home that desperately need our assistance, yet we run out of money for their programs because we refuse to make cuts to the funds that are being funneled overseas, and especially in Afghanistan.

I say to the administration and to Congress that it is time to fix America's problems, not Afghanistan's problems, and not the world's problems.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want, again, to mention the three Army soldiers who were killed last week on July 25: Staff Sergeant Benjamin G. Prange, PFC Keith M. Williams, and PFC Donnell A. Hamilton, Jr.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, beside me, I have poster after poster of the cost of war. As a young kid named Tyler Jordan—this is actually from 2003, our early days in Iraq, a very unnecessary war—his father was a gunny sergeant named Phillip Jordan, and he was killed, and here is Tyler being given the flag that was folded after it was taken off his father's grave.

I don't know how many of these three names I just mentioned—I know one family, he had two little girls, maybe they got a folded flag—but it is time for Congress to wake up.

There is no need to have our young men and women overseas giving their life and limb and to see the money wasted overseas in fraud, waste, and abuse when we can use it right here to fix America's problems.

Please, God, continue to bless our men and women in uniform; and please, God, continue to bless America.

THE FUTILITY OF LITIGATING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, with just 1 day before the recess and many pending issues before us, the majority has focused on one issue and one issue alone: suing the President of the United States for essentially doing what they seem incapable of.

The lawsuit focuses solely on a small part of the ACA, one that Republicans themselves wanted to roll back. I am going to list my objections to this monumental waste of time on this poster.

First is standing. The S is for standing because the Speaker is trying to sue the President, and he does not have standing. He must show that there is some concrete harm to him that goes beyond the general interest in seeing the law enforced.

In fact, he should listen to conservative legal minds like Justices Roberts, Scalia, and Rehnquist, all of whom have expressed skepticism about a court granting standing to the House to sue the President.

It is absurd to think that the House of Representatives, as an institution, has been harmed by President Obama's attempting in good faith to implement the ACA. I understand their feelings might be hurt, but acting out only gets them negative attention, and the Americans agree that this is a waste of time.

The next reason that I object is the taxpayer waste of money. The last time the Republicans sued the President, it was over the implementation of DOMA, which went nowhere and cost the taxpayers $2.3 million. Like this previous fruitless lawsuit, this will bounce around the courts for years, making rich lawyers rich. That is the only jobs program the Republicans will have passed in Congress this year.

The next reason I object to it is that it is useless. Just what are the Republicans trying to accomplish with this circus? It is certainly not governing. As of June 30, this Congress has only enacted 125 bills into law—the lowest number of any Congress in history since 1973, when they started keeping data.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say, well, it is all about the Senate, but in five previously divided Congresses before this one, the average number of bills enacted at the same time period was 254—almost twice as many.

The next reason I object to this lawsuit is P, political stunt aimed at appeasing the fringe elements in the Republican Party that want to impeach the President. The same people calling for this lawsuit shut down the government last fall because they wanted to delay the Affordable Care Act, and it cost us over $24 billion. Now, they are suing the President over the fact that he did something they wanted him to do in the first place.

The only other group of people I know who scream that they want something and then throw a tantrum when they get it are toddlers.

The next reason I object to this lawsuit is that it is inconsistent. It is inconsistent because when George Bush

was proposing the prescription drug benefit and we were trying to implement that, he asked to have it delayed for 1 year—and guess what? The Republicans didn't object then.

Then the final reason that I object to this lawsuit is because it is a distraction. The Republicans are trying to distract Americans from the fact they have ruled over a do-nothing Congress.

While we are frittering away our last few days in session in this pointless and childish exercise, we are not creating jobs, fixing immigration, renewing the Export-Import Bank, doing tax reform, or even completing a full appropriations process.

Words fail me in describing the petulance of the other side. This toddler is more adult than some of my colleagues. She has figured it out. I suppose I will have to let her express her feelings.

GENOCIDE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share two pictures showing the tomb of the prophet Jonah in Mosul, Iraq. The first shows Jonah's tomb as it looked for centuries prior to last week. The second shows the site after it was destroyed by ISIS last week. Thousands of years of Biblical cultural history were erased in a matter of moments by Islamist terrorists.

This ancient site had once been the location of a church and then a mosque famous for its architectural beauty which stood there since the 14th century. The mosque of the prophet Yunus—built around Jonah's tomb—honored a figure who is sacred to Jews, Christians, and Muslims.

Jonah, who was sent by God to preach repentance to the people of Nineveh, is the subject of a book in the Hebrew Tanakh—the Old Testament—and multiple passages in the Koran.

While ISIS has targeted Christians for elimination in its destructive rampage through Syria and Iraq, this atrocity is an offense not just to Christians, but to all humanity. This is more than fundamentalism or extremism. It is nihilism. It is genocide. It is genocide of an entire people of faith in this region.

The world should be outraged at the crime against our shared cultural heritage, including the Islam that ISIS claims to represent. ISIS has destroyed millennia of history by detonating an explosive charge and turning this ancient site of pilgrimage to rubble.

However, it is not just Biblical sites and Christian churches that are targeted by ISIS extermination. It is exterminating the Christian people of this region. The Christian people of this region are being exterminated.

I want to share another picture. Do you see this spray-painted symbol on the wall to the right of the gate? That is the Arabic word ''nun'' which stands for nasara, a pejorative name for Christians. They are singling out Christians. ISIS has been marking the homes of Christians to symbolize their ultimatum: convert to Islam or die.

Similarly, ISIS has used the letter ''raa'' for rawafidh, a slur against Shiites that they also expelled from Mosul.

This is the sixth time in a week that I have appeared on this floor to call attention to the genocide that is taking place right before our eyes. The media is starting to pay more attention, but where is the Obama administration?

It has to make protecting this ancient community a priority. It needs to encourage the Kurds to do more of what they can to protect those fleeing ISIS and provide safe refuge. It needs to ensure that of the resources going to the region, that a portion should be guaranteed to help the Christian community. It needs to have the same courage as President Bush and former Secretary of State Colin Powell had when they called it genocide in Darfur because this is genocide.

For the sake of these communities and for the sake of the ancient, tangible heritage that is being destroyed daily by ISIS and Iraq, President Obama must speak.

President Reagan consistently made human rights and religious freedom a hallmark of American diplomacy. He famously described the U.S. Constitution as ''a covenant we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind.'' He understood that the promises enshrined in that document transcended time and place.

There is no more urgent time and place to speak out than now, given what is happening to Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq. We are seeing, during this Congress where everyone here is serving and during this administration, we are seeing the end of Christianity in Iraq, and soon, we will see the end of Christianity in the Middle East, where it all began.

HOUSE DEMOCRATS' ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, I held my Congress on Your Corner at the Litchfield Public Library, and there, I had conversations with folks young and old, and we talked about what matters to them and to their families, and I heard about their concerns with the pressing issues facing our country right now.

How can Washington jump-start our economy again? When will we rebuild our aging bridges and roads? What is Congress doing about our broken immigration system?

Here we are, 2 days before the Speaker's August recess, and there is a vote to sue the President. Yes, that is right, we are wasting time and taxpayer money voting on politically-motivated attacks against the President, rather than this House taking action to help the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we should be debating a long-term, sustainable solution to fund the dwindling highway trust fund, fix our infrastructure, and create jobs. We should work together to fix our broken immigration system and to address the humanitarian crisis at the border, and we should vote to enact Make It In America legislation that supports good-paying jobs right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, moms in my district and across this country ask me every day: When will this House allow a vote on commonsense gun violence prevention? Coming from a State that is working to regain jobs that were lost during the recession, I believe that we should cancel this recess to extend emergency unemployment for jobseekers in my State of Connecticut and all across America.

No; instead, we are wasting time and taxpayer money on a frivolous lawsuit, rather than working together—working together—to stop corporate tax inversions or close tax loopholes for companies that are shipping our jobs overseas.

The folks I listened to in Litchfield last Saturday morning deserve better. The American people deserve better. It is time to put partisanship aside and to put middle class families first. We should cancel recess. We should stay here and work together on policies to jump-start our economy and get the job done for all of the people we represent.

THE ORDEAL OF FIRST LIEUTENANT NADIYA VIKTORIVNA SAVCHENKO OF THE UKRAINIAN ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a solemn and pressing issue that unfortunately has not received the attention that is warranted. This issue is the illegal capture, transport, ongoing detainment, and upcoming trial of First Lieutenant Nadiya Viktorivna Savchenko of the Ukrainian Army by pro-Russian Ukrainian separatists and, now, the Russian Government.

Lieutenant Savchenko, whose first name Nadiya means ''hope'' in Ukrainian, is a true patriot and hero. She was born in 1981 in what was then the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and grew up in that Soviet Union-aligned Republic.

At the early age of 16, 1 year younger than myself when I joined the United States military, Nadiya joined the Ukrainian Army as a radio operator and started an incredible and groundbreaking career in service to a free and independent Ukraine.

Now 33, she has not only been trained as an elite paratrooper, she also became the first female air force pilot in

the Ukrainian military. Her exemplary time in uniform includes service in Iraq between 2004 and 2008 as a member of Ukrainian peacekeeping troops, during which time she served alongside and earned the respect of U.S. personnel, including Special Operations Forces.

In fact, her tour in Iraq overlapped with part of my own time serving in that theater. I personally know the hardships and exemplary work done by our coalition forces during that difficult period, including Nadiya's Ukrainian contingent.

She has since become a national hero and icon, serving in the 3rd Army Aviation Regiment and being recognized by Ukrainian defense forces and the United Nations. Nadiya also became a leading national figure in the Euromaidan demonstrations, which led to the fall of President Viktor Yanukovych.

□ 1045

After Yanukovych, pro-Russian forces began stoking anger and violence across Ukraine's eastern provinces and the Crimean Peninsula. Lieutenant Savchenko then joined one of many volunteer, pro-government units that were organized to supplement deployed government forces. As the leader in the Aidar Battalion, she served alongside Ukrainian military personnel and civilians alike to quell the Russian-supplied, -trained, -supported, and -supplemented separatist forces.

On June 28, Nadiya was captured by the separatists. After several days of unknown whereabouts, she resurfaced in Russia in the custody of the Russian Government on charges of murdering two Russian journalists. Access to her by family and Ukrainian officials has been very limited, and calls for her release based on her illegal capture, transport, transfer, and detention have gone unanswered. This is unacceptable. As Americans, we must recognize those who have fought alongside us and those who have stood up for democracy and freedom across the globe. Furthermore, we cannot let international law and due process be violated by any entity or nation.

For these reasons, I call on the United States Government and the United Nations to take immediate action to seek release of First Lieutenant Nadiya Viktorivna Savchenko. If she, a citizen of the sovereign state of Ukraine and a war hero, is to face trial, she must be granted the full ability to do so in an open, transparent, and unbiased venue such as through the international court system or be granted the privilege of a full and proper investigation by her own country. Lieutenant Savchenko deserves due process of law. I further call on Russia to comply with its international obligations and immediately release Nadiya Savchenko to her family or appropriate authorities.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a cochairman of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, I rise this morning to talk about how important expanding Medicaid is for my State and for every State in this great Nation.

It gives me great pride to be in the well of the House this morning speaking on the topic of expanding the Medicaid program today, the 49th anniversary of the date when the legislation creating the Medicaid antipoverty program was signed into law by President Lyndon Baines Johnson. More than 30 Members of Congress have joined the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus because we know that opening the way to health care for the poor is good, it is righteous, it is just, it is merciful. It is the right thing to do because, according to Matthew 25:40:

> Whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.

And for those who have not a care about the poor, then you should know also that expanding Medicaid to more poor people will stimulate the economy by creating jobs in the burgeoning health care and other ancillary industries. More jobs mean more spending, which leads to more profits. For those of you who are only concerned about your bottom line, then you should also know:

> Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord, and he will reward them for what they have done.—Proverbs 19:17.

The stimulation of economies is exactly what expanding Medicaid has accomplished in the 27 States that have expanded eligibility. It is exactly what will happen in every recalcitrant State when their political leaders finally come to their senses and choose to accept the Federal funds to expand their Medicaid systems, the funds having already been paid into the system by their own taxpayers.

So 27 States, a majority of the States of this great country, looked at the facts and made the choice to help their people be healthier and therefore lead more productive lives. Expanding Medicaid in those States provided health care coverage to approximately 10.5 million people who otherwise would not have had it, according to Families USA.

Despite the politics, this is a bipartisan issue, as we see when Republican Governors in Arizona and Ohio, for example, expanded Medicaid. As a result of their action, almost a million people will have access to affordable health care. States led by Republicans and Democrats that expanded Medicaid should be commended for their actions. In California, almost 3 million people have benefited by getting access to health care when their State expanded Medicaid. These are just some of the success stories.

The Federal Government will cover 100 percent of the costs of expanding Medicaid today, and 90 percent of the cost for the duration of the program in every State. Expanding Medicaid will bring billions of Federal tax dollars back into States that will help develop the health care infrastructure and improve the economy.

It will also help low-income Americans access health care. We must remember that the people who will benefit from expanding Medicaid are no less deserving of health care than anyone else.

In my home State of Georgia, expanding Medicaid would mean access to health care for 684,000 poor people, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. The Georgia Budget and Policy Institute estimates that expanding Medicaid will bring $65 billion in new economic activity to Georgia over 10 years, which will support more than 56,000 new jobs throughout the State. My Governor reacted to this news by signing a bill eliminating his own authority to expand Medicaid. I can't think of a time that a chief executive has willingly given away some of his authority.

We know why Governors and State legislators are choosing to deny access to health care for their people. It is politics, pure and simple.

I am here today to urge every State to expand Medicaid. I urge my colleagues and those watching at home to contact their Governor and their State legislator in support of expanding Medicaid.

CONGRESS LEAVES WITH WORK UNDONE

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am concerned about and I think every American is concerned about is the reputation of the Congress of the United States in the eyes of the American people. We know what our approval ratings are, and we are well aware of it; but we often don't take a moment and pause and say what are the things that we could do to have the American people once again view this Chamber, the people's House, as a place of honor, as a place that is actually doing the people's business.

Here we are, 48 hours away from a recess. We are going to be going back and talking with the people in our districts. Each one of us represents around 700,000 American citizens. We are going to go home and we are going to spend some time talking with those citizens, and I think that is appropriate. However, I also think it is appropriate for us to get our work done, and I want to talk this morning, Mr. Speaker, about a key fundamental requirement of the law of this Congress, and that is to provide the Nation and the American people with a budget that is fiscally secure and to provide

for spending bills under the law so that the money that the taxpayers are sending to Washington, D.C., they are aware of how that money is being spent.

This is 2014, Mr. Speaker. Leaving for the entire month of August was a tradition, as I have read, brought to this Chamber because of the extreme heat of Washington, D.C., prior to air-conditioning. But here we are in 2014, the building is air-conditioned and the lights are on. It is a relatively comfortable place to work. We could stay here and actually finish up some of the work of the people.

For example, in 1974, four decades ago, the Congress of the United States passed a budget act and the President signed into law a budget act that required the Congress to actually pass a budget and to do its spending bills and complete them by September 30. In four decades, here we are on the 40th anniversary of that law. In four decades, it has not happened even one time when the Congress did its work and completed its spending bills within the amount of time allotted under the law. The American people are struck by that.

How can the Congress of the United States ignore the law? How can the Congress of the United States say we are going to find ourselves in agreement, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate and the President, and we are going to agree to do these things? Well, quite frankly, the law had one weakness: it had no enforcement trigger in it.

A few years ago, a good friend of mine, a gentleman from across the aisle, Congressman JIM COOPER from Nashville, Tennessee, wrote a piece of legislation called No Budget, No Pay. A couple of years ago, we finally signed that bill into law—a part of it into law—and for the first time since I have been in Congress, the Senate of the United States actually passed a budget because they found out that if they didn't, there would be an enforcement trigger that happened.

I have recently written a bill called the Do Your Job Act, which would require the Congress to do all 12 of the spending bills prior to the end of the year or they can't recess for more than 24 hours. They have to stay here and do their job so the American people can see firsthand what our priorities are.

I came to Congress in 2011, and in the 4 years I have been here, we have been required by law to pass 48 spending bills. The U.S. Senate, in those 4 years' time, has passed two. The House has done quite a bit better. They have passed 24. But they are required to pass 48. This year, the Senate has passed zero. They have done none. The House of Representatives has passed seven, and has referred another four out of committee that are ready to go. We ought to stay here and pass those bills and send them to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. We ought to be here doing the people's business for the good of the American people. We should stay here and do our job.

HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise to introduce the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014.

The Congressional Tri-Caucus, over the past 10 years, has been tireless in its effort to educate Congress and the country about the disproportionate burden of premature deaths and preventable illnesses existing in our minority communities. Towards that end, the Tri-Caucus developed a national strategy for the elimination of racial and ethnic health disparities. The keystone of this strategy is the Tri-Caucus Health Equity and Accountability Act, first introduced in 2003 and every Congress since.

HEAA, in many ways, is unique. First, the bill and its introduction rotates each Congress among the three caucuses. This year, as chair of the CHC Health Task Force, I have the distinct honor of carrying on the tradition by introducing the bill for the 113th Congress.

Second, and most importantly, HEAA outlines the collective institutional knowledge of a diverse group of policymakers, health professionals, and advocacy organizations from throughout the country on what policies are needed to halt, reduce, and eliminate health disparities.

At the beginning of each new Congress, the HEAA working group convenes and several hundred minority and health advocacy organizations meet on a regular basis to discuss the bill and update it based on new research and recommendations to meet the ever-changing needs of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

Also, just as the bill introduction rotates each Congress between Member offices, the leadership of the HEAA working group rotates among advocacy organizations. In the 113th Congress, this effort was spearheaded by the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, whose members I commend for their deep commitment to social justice and for their tireless work on this bill, which included coordinating the input of over 350 health and minority advocacy groups.

The HEAA is a principled living road map that can be used by policymakers and providers alike. For example, the Affordable Care Act contains many groundbreaking policies first introduced in HEAA, including expansion of Medicaid eligibility, increased resources for community health centers, and institutionalizing Federal efforts to achieve health equity.

Nevertheless, while the ACA has made a significant impact on access to quality health care, many inequities and obstacles remain that prevent the elimination of health disparities in our country. That is why the HEAA of 2014 provides Federal resources and advanced policies to improve health outcomes in all populations regardless of race, ethnicity, immigration status, age, ability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or English proficiency.

□ 1100

The HEAA is made up of ten titles proposing a wide spectrum of health initiatives that address disparities and mental health and specific high impact minority diseases.

The bill also provides guidelines for improving the health outcomes for women, children, and families, and targets resources to communities striving to overcome negative social factors.

Finally, the bill includes recommendations to enhance data collection, technology, accountability, and evaluation; increase workforce diversity; and ensure access to culturally and linguistically appropriate care.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Tri-Caucus and members of the HEAA working group believe no one's health or life expectancy should be determined by the color of their skin or the Zip Code in which they are born.

The Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014 is a consensus blueprint of the most comprehensive and strategic plans to eliminate health disparities in our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014.

RISE OF ISLAMIC FASCISM

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we are watching the rise of Islamic fascism on a scale unprecedented in modern times. It may be wrapped in different symbols and trace genealogy through a different line, but at its core, it is fascism. Listen to its virulent anti-Semitism, the explicit promise of genocide against Israel, the utter rejection—indeed, disdain—for fundamental principles of democracy and human rights and justice. There can be no doubt what is happening.

European fascism might have consumed all of Europe except for one gritty holdout: for more than a year Great Britain stood in the breach. Had it fallen, the consequences would have been unthinkable.

Today, one gritty holdout stands against the rise of Islamic fascism in the Middle East. Israel is the only island of democracy and civilization left in that region, and it is standing alone and in the breach.

The current conflict between Israel and Hamas offers a clear distinction between good and evil.

Israel took control of the Gaza Strip as a result of the Six-Day War in 1967. It granted self-governance to the region in 1994, and in 2005, unilaterally withdrew its forces.

The resulting Hamas government has since militarized Gaza and used it as a launching site for continuing and escalating attacks against the civilian Israeli population, with the avowed objective of wiping Israel off the map.

The Arab Spring welcomed by the Obama administration brought the Muslim Brotherhood to power in Egypt. During its brief tenure, it opened a road for the mass importation of weapons to Hamas. These weapons, and others smuggled in by sea, were strategically placed in schools and hospitals and fired upon Israeli cities without provocation.

As Churchill once said of Britain: Israel did everything it could to secure peace. Perhaps it did too much.

The result was thousands of rocket attacks and many terrorist incursions by Hamas aimed solely at the civilian population. Israel finally did what any civilization must do under such circumstances: it finally fought back.

Hamas has deliberately staged its attacks from hospitals, schools, and mosques, using children as human shields, leaving the Israelis the Hobson's choice of enduring the killing of their own population or taking out the instruments of destruction that are deliberately sited in schools and hospitals. They have chosen to defend themselves.

There is absolutely no doubt of Hamas' objectives and that of its allies: they have been crystal clear and unwavering on their intention to destroy Israel and kill every Israeli. They seek to eradicate the Jewish homeland, whose history in the region stretches back more than 3,000 years.

Their allies have been intent on annihilating every Christian and Jew in the Middle East, and they are well on their way toward achieving this goal. It would be the height of naivete to believe that it will stop. Yet, this administration, and many on the Left, seem to view the two sides as moral equivalents. Many on the Left even portray Israel as the aggressor.

Israel has made the decision to by force demilitarize Gaza for its own survival. It is now making serious progress and degrading Hamas' ability to make war. That is the only true path to peace.

Yet, the Obama administration is now working to halt Israel's progress and allow Hamas the time to resupply and regroup and resume its attacks. This serves only the objectives of Hamas and is a prescription for prolonged war and bloodshed.

Hamas has broken every cease-fire it has agreed to, and Israel has abided by every cease-fire, often holding return fire for hours after Hamas has broken these accords. There is no reason to believe that Hamas will abide by future cease-fires the moment it has recovered its war-making capabilities.

Why would this administration interfere in this manner, the effect of which is to take sides against the only pro-Western regime left in the Middle East?

Today, all that stands between a peaceful and free world and a fanatical fascist caliphate stretching from the Bosphorus to North Africa is the state of Israel and the influence of the Western democracies, particularly that of the United States.

In 1929, Churchill warned of Britain's irresolution in the Middle East. He said: ''Any appearance of lack of willpower on the part of the British government or of lack of confidence in its mission in these countries blows like a draught of air on the dull, fierce embers.''

Mr. Speaker, at this perilous hour, let us not repeat the mistakes of history.

ADDRESS OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS NOW

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I stood at the back of the Senate Chamber and watched a critical debate. Under the leadership of Chairman RON WYDEN of the Senate Finance Committee, his partner, Ranking Member HATCH; Chairwoman BARBARA BOXER from California, CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut, BOB CORKER from Tennessee, and Senator TOM CARPER from Delaware held forth on critical legislation to be able to help America deal with our infrastructure crisis.

America—it is no secret—is falling apart and is falling behind. It is well overdue for us to have a robust, important 6-year reauthorization to deal with our transportation needs.

We can't do that unless we resolve the funding conundrum. We have been limping along. We can't even get through the current 27-month extension without a summer slowdown, cutting back on critical Federal funding for contracts around the country.

What the Senate did was tackle this issue head on. They had a funding proposal that was fairly debated, where they were able to provide enough funding to get us through the end of the year, but not so much that it allows this Congress off the hook to slide into the next Congress, and probably the Congress after that, but instead, face up to our responsibilities now.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation of Senator CORKER from Tennessee urging us to be grownups and move forward, and Senator BOXER talking about the critical needs and not to be waylaid by this fantasy that somehow the Federal Government should abandon its commitment to a National Transportation Highway System that we initiated under President Eisenhower, that somehow that is a thing of the past, turn our back on it, slash transportation funding, and just kind of wait and see what happens around the country—she was eloquent and forceful. Again, we have watched Senator MURPHY and Senator CARPER be focused on that which we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, we need to address and embrace the bipartisan Senate vote yesterday: 79 bipartisan votes to be able to do our job, avoid the summer shutdown, and do so in a way with a funding approach that is much more sustainable and reasonable, not the so-called pension smoothing that is ill-advised on so many levels.

Two weeks ago, Democrats in the House of Representatives were united: 99 percent supported what is, essentially, the Senate outcome. That didn't prevail on the floor of the House in a motion to recommit that I offered. But Democrats didn't pick up our marbles and quit. We actually provided the votes necessary to keep the issue alive and send the suboptimal Republican approach across to the other body. There weren't enough Republican votes to pass it, but we kept it alive hoping that we could see what happens on the Senate side, that we might have a stronger more reasonable proposal.

That optimism and cooperation on the part of the Democrats in the House was rewarded because we have this bipartisan proposal, which is, in fact, better, supported by 79 Senators.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to be able to address this bipartisan approach from the Senate. Allow us to vote on it. It ought to be the first step in our being able to avoid the summer shutdown and be able to get on with the 6-year bill.

Rarely have we seen the stakeholders so united. The American Trucking Association, the road builders, the U.S. Chamber, building and construction trades, the bicyclists, and the engineers. We watch across the country the people who build, who maintain, and depend on our infrastructure united, supportive of the approach that has emerged from the United States Senate. Even as we speak, they are contacting congressional offices, urging Members support the bipartisan Senate approach.

I respectfully urge the Republican leadership to allow those voices to be heard, to heed the stakeholders, heed the American people, give them a bill worthy of voting on. It will pass overwhelmingly, and we will be doing our job.

SPURRING TEACHER EDUCATION MOVEMENT FOR STEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, every country must deal with and answer the

question: What does it take to be prosperous and to have prosperity for future generations?

There are many answers to that question, but one of the keys is science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM fields—in our educational system.

The United States needs to be able to compete in these fields on a global scale, and children of all schools should have the opportunity to develop these skills no matter where they live.

Recently, teachers in the Second District of New Mexico brought up the question: What about us? Can we use funds that are set over here in the Education Department to develop better skills in the STEM areas?

Those questions were not answered in a completely positive way—that maybe it was not possible. Therefore, the teachers put forward an idea that maybe we should just get the flexibility in, a practical suggestion for an important concept.

Teachers and educators in the Second District provided firsthand experience and developed the idea into a concept. Several teachers formed an ad hoc working group. Brian Claar from White Sands Schools, Lindsey Guerrero and Marci Hearn from Gadsden Independent School District, Marci Behrens from Las Cruces Public School District, as well as Susan Brown, Nicole Delgado, and Christina Abeyta from the New Mexico State University STEM Outreach Center, all came together and developed that concept into a proposed legislation.

Working with my staff, they actually got the bill written, and on June 25 of this year, I introduced H.R. 4973, titled: Spurring Teacher Education Movement for STEM Act, also known as the STEM for STEM Act.

H.R. 4973 increases flexibility for teacher development funds under the Rural and Low Income title of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. It allows the funds to be used for teacher development in teaching STEM.

The STEM for STEM Act also expresses the need for the U.S. to compete on a global scale. A teacher should have the high-quality professional development opportunities in STEM to increase their content knowledge and improve student learning.

Professional development is essential for providing teachers and educators with growth opportunities that then are presented to our children.

□ 1115

Teacher professional development enriches the learning environment for students and educators alike. It is important for us to say thank you to those teachers who make it possible for America to compete into the next generation.

Hopefully, this bill, H.R. 4973, will provide a small element of help for the rural areas that stretch across the Western part of this country.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of comprehensive immigration reform and the growing humanitarian crisis we are facing at our southern border.

It is the job of the Congress to face and resolve challenging issues like our broken immigration system. We ought to pass the bipartisan Senate bill that would provide commonsense solutions to address not only reforming our immigration system, but to deal with this immediate humanitarian crisis at our border.

Instead, the Republican House leadership refuses to allow a vote on comprehensive reform and has come up, instead, with a plan that would change the law passed in 2008 to combat human trafficking. In addition, this partisan bill will provide limited funding for this fiscal year.

Again, House leadership plans to pass a short-term fix, so that they can go back to their districts next month and say: well, we tried to fix this crisis that we are facing.

This is not how we should be solving our Nation's problems. Each day that our immigration system remains broken, jobs are lost, and our economy suffers. It is time to set politics aside and focus on fixing our current immigration system. In fact, failure to address reform is making it more difficult to deal with the thousands of unaccompanied children arriving at our southern border in hopes of finding safety.

The humanitarian crisis that we are facing is in part a result of the increasing turmoil in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, where drug trafficking, human trafficking, and violence is rampant. Families have been tortured and killed, and today, there are people who are literally running for their lives.

Atrocities are being committed in those countries, and they must bear the responsibility of addressing and resolving their issues. Mexico also has a role to play.

We in the United States must now face the humanitarian crisis this violence is causing at our southern border. In a joint statement, President Obama, along with Presidents from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, pledged to reduce criminal activity in Central American countries by promoting greater social and economic opportunity.

It is my hope that these leaders stay true to their word and demonstrate leadership by addressing the humanitarian crisis taking place within their own countries.

These young unaccompanied children must be treated in a humane and dignified way. Ultimately, these children's fate rests in the hands of our immigration judges, and those children who are not granted asylum must return to their countries. Playing politics with this grave crisis, as some are doing, is not productive.

It is the height of hypocrisy that Republicans want more border security, but have refused to allow a vote on a comprehensive immigration reform bill that would in fact provide more funding to secure our borders. That makes no sense. We have spent billions of dollars on border security, but clearly, our border is not yet secure.

The comprehensive immigration reform bill passed by the Senate in a bipartisan fashion requires that a long-term plan be developed and executed with an initial $8.3 billion in funding to focus on securing the borders today and an additional $6.5 billion in funding to be spent over the next 6 years to in fact secure our border.

What we need now, more than ever, is an open and honest discussion on the House floor about the relationship between immigration reform and this humanitarian crisis. Therefore, I urge my Republican colleagues to join together, in a bipartisan fashion, like they did in the Senate, to find an effective and humane short- and long-term solution to this crisis, which is directly related, in my opinion, to fixing our broken immigration system.

ABLE ACT

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I want to bring attention to proposed legislation known as the ABLE Act, or Achieving a Better Life Experience. It is something that is important to me and to a lot of Members of the House.

I first filed this legislation 7 years ago. Since then, we have come a long way. Today, 377 Members of the House and 74 United States Senators are cosponsors of this legislation. There is no piece of legislation in the Congress today that enjoys more bipartisan, bicameral support than the ABLE Act. Tomorrow, the Ways and Means Committee in the House will take up this legislation, and I hope that they will pass it with a favorable vote.

Just what is the ABLE Act? It is a piece of legislation that attempts to help those individuals with disabilities achieve their full potential. How does it do that? Well, it allows individuals with disabilities to set up a tax-free savings account. They take that account, it grows tax free, and they can use the proceeds, as long as they meet qualified expenses.

Those individuals face challenges that you and I can sometimes hardly imagine. They might be medical, transportation, education, or housing needs. We already allow other individuals to use tax-exempt savings accounts to help them.

If you want to save for retirement, you can set up a tax-free savings account called a 401(k). If you want to set

up a tax-free savings account to help you go to college, you can do that through what is called a 529. If you want to help with your health care, you can set up a health savings account. It seems only fair that we level the playing field and allow those individuals the same opportunity.

Let me introduce you to someone by the name of Sydney Leach. She lives in Jacksonville, Florida. Today, she is a fifth-grader at Crown Point Elementary School. She has Down syndrome. When she was born, her proud mom and dad, Stacy and Jeff Leach, made a commitment to make sure that she would not only have a happy life, but that she would be able to realize her hopes and her dreams and her full potential.

Soon they realized that when you raise a child with Down syndrome, you face challenges that a lot of people can't imagine. Unlike her classmates, she had to have special behavioral counseling. She had to have special medical care. She needed individual counseling. So it was difficult.

Her parents then found out that if you have Medicaid, you are limited to $2,000 for the amount of assets that you can have in your name. If her parents or loved ones wanted to give her a gift, they jeopardized the care that she needed.

So the ABLE Act seeks to correct those inequities. It says that you can, number one, set up a tax-free savings account and let those proceeds grow. Number two, it won't count against your $2,000 limitation on assets.

This is America, home of the American Dream. Individuals with disabilities ought to be able to live the American Dream, just like you and I. They ought to be able to have an education and work on their own, if they can. They ought to be able to save for the future. The ABLE Act allows them to do just that.

We live in a great, prosperous country. Sometimes, we are called upon to speak out for the people that can't speak out, to stand up and seek justice for those that can't seek justice on their own.

The ABLE Act will have a positive impact on millions of people with disabilities all across this land. That is worth fighting for. I hope soon the ABLE Act will become the law of the land.

HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, last September, I was honored to welcome the Tri-Caucus Health Disparities Summit to my home State of New Mexico. The Center for Health Policy at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque brought experts from all over the country together to talk about what they are seeing as providers, researchers, and patients; and we heard that communities of color continue to face substantial cultural, social, and economic barriers to obtaining quality health care and achieving equitable health outcomes.

Several of my colleagues in fact joined me at that summit, and we all pledged not to just acknowledge these disparities, but to act to provide the tools and resources necessary to achieve health equity. That is what the Health Equity and Accountability Act does.

It is a comprehensive bill, developed with significant stakeholder input, that would build on the gains of the Affordable Care Act and put in place the policies and the infrastructure needed to eliminate health disparities.

The bill sets national standards for culturally and linguistically appropriate care and includes programs to address diseases that disproportionately impact minority communities. It also provides grants and scholarships to build diversity in the health care workforce and extends funding to strengthen the health IT infrastructure in minority communities.

These provisions are just part of a larger strategic approach because problems like this really are more systemic. We can't just add some funding here or make a policy change there and walk away. This takes thoughtful, comprehensive policy to make a substantial long-lasting difference on issues like this.

I would like to commend my colleague, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD from California, for her leadership on this bill. It is not easy to put together a bill of this size in consultation with dozens of Members' offices and more than 300 stakeholder groups, but she managed to do just that, and I thank her for putting together one of the best versions of this bill I think Congress has had before it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CHAPLAIN JENNIFER NIELSON

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Chaplain Jennifer Nielson of the 108th Sustainment Brigade. I believe it is important that we recognize and value the work performed by our country's military chaplains.

Following an initial deployment as an enlisted soldier, Jennifer Nielson became a chaplain while waiting to fulfill a second deployment in Kuwait. As a resident of the capital city of Springfield, Illinois—which I am proud to represent—Jennifer has served as a Wounded Warrior chaplain, providing support for our Nation's veterans, and has organized yellow ribbon events welcoming home our returning veterans.

Currently, Chaplain Nielson is working with the National Guard's Family Program Division, providing support and counsel in Illinois. Because of her unyielding support and compassion, I am proud to recognize her service today.

As we take time this week to recognize the chaplains who have bravely provided spiritual guidance to their fellow servicemen and -women throughout history, it is important that we also acknowledge those who carry on their traditions and thank them for their service.

Chaplain Nielson has faithfully served her country for the Illinois Army National Guard, and I am proud to honor her and the rest of the dedicated chaplains supporting our troops across the globe.

HONORING TEACHER CYNTHIA DIPERT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss today if I weren't able to honor a former teacher of mine who made an impact in my life that she may never have known.

When I was 7 years old, my family moved from Des Moines, Iowa, to Taylorville, Illinois, and almost a week later, I was sitting in a brand-new classroom as a second-grader at South Elementary School in my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois.

A young graduate student teacher who was doing some work in that classroom came up to a very shy boy who was determined not to talk to anybody in class that day. That was me. When she knelt down beside my desk, all the heads of my classmates around me turned and welcomed me as one of the new kids in that second grade class.

□ 1130

That confidence that Mrs. Cynthia Dipert gave me that day was confidence that built up throughout my elementary school career, junior high, and high school. Frankly, maybe that instance—maybe that gesture of compassion that Cynthia gave me that day—helped lead me here to this great institution we call the House of Representatives.

Now, Mrs. Dipert went on to teach my daughter. I always enjoyed going to parent-teacher conferences when my daughter was in Cynthia's class. Then we saddled her with my twin boys in the exact same class, and I thought I would enjoy going to parent-teacher conferences then, too. However, I walked in one day, along with my wife, and we asked Cynthia, Why is a bloody hand hanging from the ceiling? It was fake, of course. She said, Oh. Your son sits there, and I am reminding him that he needs to raise his hand before he talks.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we might need to have props like that here in the House of Representatives sometimes.

It is hard for me today to stand here and think about those fun times I had and the impact that Cynthia Dipert had on so many kids—my own, me, and those of so many people in my hometown of Taylorville—as she is not going

to be able to have that impact any longer because, just under 2 weeks ago, Cynthia passed away.

I stand here on the floor of this great institution to tell her thank you and to tell her thank you for the service that she has provided so many people in central Illinois.

Rest in peace, Cynthia Dipert.

God bless you all.

THE CANCER OF ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, once insightfully and eloquently observed that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

In the wake of the current conflict between Israel and Hamas, there has been a disturbing outbreak of the cancer of anti-Semitism in many parts of the world.

In France, there have been firebombs directed at synagogues, a radio station, and a library, amongst other incidents that have taken place in a country which is home to the third-largest Jewish community in the world.

In Germany, there has been hate speech permeating rally after rally all throughout the country, including at one where the chant was: ''Hamas. Hamas. Jews to the gas.'' This is disturbing language in any location, but it is particularly disturbing given the context of what we know occurred in Germany.

In England, there has been an epidemic of violent crime directed at the Jewish community, an exponential increase rivaled in recent times only by a similar outbreak of hate crime that took place in 2009 during the last conflict in that region.

Now, in a civil society, reasonable people should be able to disagree without being disagreeable, but anti-Semitism is not a legitimate form of criticism. It is a cancer that needs to be stamped out in the same way that racism and sexism and homophobia—whenever and wherever it might be found—need to be crushed to the ground.

I urge this Congress to speak out to condemn and to do everything possible to eradicate this outbreak. As Dr. King observed, injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 30, 2014 at 8:56 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment, H.R. 5021.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 108.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 30, 2014 at 9:31 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 4028.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 106.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 103.

That the Senate passed, S. 2577.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Alphonso Jackson, Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Hast thou not known? Has thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the Earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of His understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might, He increases their strength. Even the youth shall faint and be weary. The young men shall utterly fall. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary. They shall walk and not faint.

Dear Heavenly Father, I thank Thee for this day.

I thank You for the privilege to stand in this hallowed place and invoke Thy presence. I pray now that You would bless these men and women that serve in the House of Representatives. Please grant them with a double portion of wisdom and understanding as they seek Your will in the affairs of this great Nation.

I pray that they accomplish what Moses instructed the leaders to do in Deuteronomy 1:16: ''Hear the disputes between the people, and judge them fairly.'' I ask these blessings in the name of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. ALPHONSO JACKSON

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today guest chaplain, Reverend Alphonso Jackson, Sr., of the Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights in my district. I hope you will all join me in thanking him for honoring us with today's opening prayer.

For over 30 years, Reverend Jackson has dedicated himself to serving God, his family, and our community in Richmond Heights, a community created for African American World War II veterans so that they could use the GI bill.

Founded 50 years ago by Reverend Ferguson, the Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights has grown to more than 4,000 members and continues to flourish under his leadership.

Reverend Jackson also helps strengthen his community outside his church by serving as moderator for the Seaboard Baptist Missionary Association of Florida, second vice president to the Florida Baptist State Convention, and president of the Richmond Heights Community Alliance.

We can all look to his words today for guidance as we work to resolve our

country's most pressing issues, and I invite you to join me in honoring the words of his prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

EBOLA

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Nancy Writebol, a dedicated Christian missionary from Charlotte who chose to run toward danger.

Ms. Writebol and her husband, David, serve as missionaries with SIM at a hospital in Monrovia, Liberia. They turned down the opportunity to evacuate when Ebola struck Liberia. Instead, Nancy volunteered to help sanitize the medical personnel and their equipment as they worked in the Ebola isolation ward.

This week, Nancy learned that she, too, has contracted Ebola. Like the people she volunteered to help, Nancy is now in isolation. Although stable, she is battling an illness that kills 60 percent of the victims. Nancy and David could have chosen the easy route. Instead, they chose a higher calling of sacrificial love and service.

Please join me in praying for Nancy's complete recovery and giving thanks for the Writebols, Samaritan's Purse, and the SIM mission agency for working tirelessly to help Ebola victims and others in need in Liberia.

DEMOCRATS' MIDDLE CLASS AGENDA

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, the economy is rebounding, but many of our constituents are still feeling the effects of the recession. Millions of people are still unemployed after losing jobs that never came back during the recovery.

The recently passed Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is a step that will help prepare Americans for in-demand jobs based on the needs of local businesses, resulting in a more skilled workforce and greater business productivity. But our failure to fully embrace and address this challenge is unacceptable. So today I rise to highlight the importance of investing in the true engine of our economy, the American worker.

We have a great opportunity to build the middle class with a jump-start agenda that focuses on American workers. This agenda incentivizes U.S. job creation, increases infrastructure investments, and raises the minimum wage, all of which will help workers find quality, stable employment. We still have a lot of work to do to rebuild our economy, but investing in American workers is the right path forward.

TONY GELDENS: DUTCH RESISTANCE FIGHTER, AMERICAN PATRIOT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Tony Geldens was a Dutch boy when on May 10, 1940, the Nazis invaded and occupied the Netherlands. Persecution of the Jews began immediately by the occupiers. Jews were required to wear yellow Stars of David on their clothing. Jews were shot, beaten, and sent to concentration camps.

Tony and a few of his Boy Scout friends joined the Dutch resistance. Tony began a 4-year career of being the Robin Hood of the Netherlands. He would steal supplies and food from the Nazis and give them to local Jews and citizens, much to the risk of his own safety. He hid Jews and helped rescue American and Allied pilots that had been shot down over the Netherlands. He would help the pilots through the Dutch underground and help get them safely to England.

Tony was arrested, beaten, and imprisoned numerous times by the Nazis, only to escape. He was on trial by the Nazis when the Canadians liberated his hometown. Numerous Jews and Allied pilots lived because of Tony Geldens.

Tony moved to America in 1967, married Anna, had five kids, and finally became a U.S. citizen in 2000. He wore the American flag lapel pin every day of his life.

He was an architect and political and community activist. My very good and personal friend Tony Geldens died yesterday in Kingwood, Texas, at the age of 90. Tony will be missed deeply. He was quite an individual.

And that is just the way it is.

REPUBLICAN LAWSUIT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, with just 2 days left until the Congress leaves for a 5-week recess, I rise today to urge my colleagues to take the little time we have left to address the issues that are most important to the American people.

As we speak, Republicans in Congress are wasting taxpayer money and time on a lawsuit against the President. Over what? Because they disagree with his political ideology. From the very day he was elected, the Republicans have been determined to delegitimize this President, even at the cost of their constituents not receiving their unemployment insurance extension and other things. What is it, Mr. Speaker, about this President that will have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle resort to anything to delegitimize him?

He is the President of the United States, elected by the majority of the people in this Nation. And I say that he should be respected, as every other President in this great Nation has been.

STOP DISABILITY FRAUD ACT OF 2014

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every worker in America pays a portion of their hard-earned wages into the Social Security Disability Insurance program for promised benefits if he or she becomes too disabled to work.

While providing a vital safety net, the disability program is plagued by major fraud. This fraud reveals significant weaknesses in the program that put at risk not only billions of taxpayer dollars but also the benefits on which millions of disabled Americans rely.

At a time when the program revenues will cover only 81 percent of benefits in 2016, not one dime should be lost to fraud, waste, or abuse. That is why as chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I am introducing the Stop Disability Fraud Act which makes fair, commonsense changes to combat fraud and better protect taxpayers and beneficiaries. Americans want, need, and deserve no less. I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

DO YOUR JOB

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the GOP majority, our immigration system is still broken, offshore tax loopholes are still open, criminals can still buy guns on the Internet, and corporations can still pay workers poverty wages.

When you have no record to run on, when you have destroyed what little faith Americans have left for this institution, what do you do? You sue the President for doing his job, when the problem is that you refuse to do your own.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP is guilty of recklessly abandoning 3.5 million job seekers who need unemployment insurance to feed their families, guilty of putting gun industry interests ahead of public safety, and guilty of willfully neglecting the priorities of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, in the condominiums of south Florida, my constituents sometimes turn to Yiddish to find the perfect word. They have a message for the GOP majority: Stop this mishegas—craziness—and do your jobs.

EXECUTIVE OVERREACH

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, article I of the Constitution vests the power to make laws in the United States Congress. The President is given the responsibility to faithfully execute the laws passed by the Congress. President Obama has failed to understand this vital distinction. The President is not able to unilaterally bend the law to his own goals and desires.

Take, for example, the latest news reports indicating that he plans to expand amnesty and extend work permits and visas for millions of illegal aliens, all by using executive orders. These are not lawful actions. These are the power-hungry actions of a President who refuses to work with Congress.

By suing President Obama for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the land, we are saying, stop. The people's representatives will not turn a blind eye to the lawlessness of this President. We will do whatever it takes to hold him and future occupants of the Oval Office accountable. We must make it clear that the U.S. Congress is a coequal branch of government and one that represents we, the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the President.

THE BUFFALO BILLS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in my western New York community, there is no shortage of pride for our NFL Buffalo Bills. Taxpayers are currently investing millions into the existing stadium, and the community is engaged in discussions about future ownership and potential construction of a new stadium.

Despite this, outside interests are making moves to pull the team out of Buffalo, and antiquated rules turn TV screens black on game day. Both threaten to take the team away from its loyal fan base.

Our legislation, the Furthering Access and Networks for Sports Act, eliminates the antitrust exemption that gives NFL teams the ability to black out home games that haven't sold out and ensures that local fans will be able to watch their teams from home.

The people of Buffalo have stood by our team. And the next owner of this franchise, the Buffalo Bills, must be one that will stand with this community for generations to come.

□ 1215

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, article I of our Constitution says Congress makes the laws, article II says the President enforces them, and according to article III, the judicial branch resolves conflicts between Congress and the executive. That is the system the Founders gave us. That is why the House of Representatives is taking the President to court to stop his unlawful actions.

According to legal experts, legislators sued the executive branch 41 times. Sixty-eight percent of the time, they were brought by Democrats, including the Rules Committee ranking member, who joined a 2006 Democratic lawsuit against President Bush. Now, you would think the Democrats could have better spent that time working to avoid the Great Recession of 2008.

President Obama unilaterally delayed the legislative mandate in the Affordable Care Act without consulting Congress. This is only one of many areas he has abused his executive authority, with the latest abuse leading up to the current border crisis.

No President of either party should ever abuse their power. That is why this lawsuit is so necessary.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Democrats overwhelmingly supported a sustainable solution to the current shortfall in the highway trust fund, but when the entire House didn't adopt it, the Democrats provided the votes to move the issue on to the Senate, confident that with more time and discussion, we can do better, especially working with the vast army of stakeholders who build, maintain, and use our Nation's transportation system.

Our cooperation and confidence yesterday was rewarded as the Senate overwhelmingly passed what was essentially the Democratic motion of 2 weeks ago. With the artful and strong leadership of Chairman WYDEN, Chairwoman BOXER, Ranking Member HATCH, Senators CARPER, CORKER, and MURPHY, they carried the argument, and they carried the day. The result was 79 votes for a sustainable solution.

Mr. Speaker, the stakeholders are united. They are out now across the country, arguing that we allow the House to vote on the Senate proposal. Let's commit to working together to solve this transportation problem.

RECOGNIZING HOBE AND SUE WILLIAMS FOR THEIR WORK IN THE DAILY BREAD COMMUNITY KITCHEN

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hobe and Sue Williams for their service to the people of the great State of Tennessee.

Hobe and Sue founded the Daily Bread Community Kitchen in Morristown, Tennessee, in November of 1994 in response to what they saw as a growing need for feeding the poor. Upon opening, the Daily Bread managed to feed around 50 people a day.

Today, the nonprofit feeds over 350 people a day, every day except Sundays, and has just renovated their building, providing them with an even greater opportunity to serve their east Tennessee neighbors. Twenty years later and staffed with 150 volunteers, the Daily Bread continues to provide for those most in need.

At age 89, Hobe Williams, with his wife, Sue, by his side, have no immediate plans to retire and continue to work hard for the people of east Tennessee. East Tennessee is a better place to live and our community is stronger because of the dedication of people like Hobe and Sue Williams.

God bless you, Hobe and Sue, for your service and friendship, and I wish you all the best with the newly-renovated building.

ANOTHER LOST SUMMER

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House is about to go out for 5 weeks, but first, they are going to sue the President and hope that we don't pay attention to the unfinished business of this country. I only have 1 minute, so I am going to have to read it fast.

Let me list for you some of the bills they are not going to address: comprehensive immigration reform, propping up the highway trust fund, funding the Federal Government, reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank, providing additional resources to fight wildfires in the West, bipartisan Federal IT procurement reform, raising the minimum wage, extending emergency unemployment insurance, reauthorizing terrorism risk insurance, comprehensive tax reform, modernizing the Voting Rights Amendment Act, and ensuring equal pay and nondiscrimination of the workplace.

I have run out of time, but our constituents have run out of patience with this majority.

MAJORITY LEADER ERIC CANTOR AND ISRAEL

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and to support a country I know is so dear to his heart.

Yes, Leader CANTOR has been focused on making life better for the American people, and his recent contributions in the areas of workforce training and pediatric research will have a lasting impact on generations to come.

He has also been a mentor and a friend to many new Members of the House. He and his wife, Diana, have led several freshman trips to Israel for many years, and I was very fortunate my husband and I were able to participate on one of those trips last summer.

Seeing this innovative nation and preeminent ally is truly a life-changing experience. In Israel, I found a people that craves peace for all of its citizens of all faiths, even when faced with enemies who want nothing more than to erase Israel from the map.

I want to say, loud and clear, that Members of this body are committed to Israel. We stand together with Israel and its obligation to defend its people from attacks from the terrorist group Hamas.

We are so grateful we have had a member of our leadership team so committed to a strong and thriving Israel. Leader CANTOR's efforts in Congress have lived up to the title he holds. He is a true leader. This is a tribute to that strong leadership for Israel.

VETERANS DESERVE CARE AND BENEFITS

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent revelations of corruption and scandal at the VA have cast a dark cloud over a Department that should be held to the highest possible standard.

We cannot forget the cost of war does not stop when the last bullets are fired. We have an obligation to make sure that every last veteran gets the care and benefits that he or she earned on the battlefield.

The compromise that is before us today is an important step forward. It provides emergency funding for access to timely care and invests in the VA's long-term capacity to address veterans' needs, but still, there is more to be done.

I regularly meet with young veterans in San Diego who are having trouble adapting to civilian life. These are some of the brightest, hardest-working men and women in the United States, and yet they often find it hard to prove that the skills they developed in the military have prepared them for work or school.

To help them, we need to take a broader look at the challenges veterans face entering the workforce, getting an education, and managing their finances as they transition out of the service.

I certainly look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that our veterans have the tools they need to succeed. It is the least we can do.

RECOGNIZING NAVAL CHAPLAINS

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our military chaplains. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Congressional Prayer Caucus, I am blessed to often witness firsthand the importance of a strong chaplain corps.

Two chaplains I have encountered recently are prime examples: Navy Commander Roy Hoffman and Navy Captain Michael Gore.

Commander Hoffman serves as the senior chaplain aboard USS *Ronald Reagan*, an aircraft carrier with over 4,000 sailors, most of whom work long, exhausting hours, only to return to cramped racks for a brief rest.

Commander Hoffman and his staff support these sailors through traditional prayer and worship, as well as counseling, mentorship, and community outreach.

As senior chaplain at the Naval Academy, Captain Gore is a valuable resource for the thousands of midshipmen facing rigorous academics and training as they prepare to be leaders in our military.

Serving in our All-Volunteer Force can be challenging, and the presence of chaplains like Commander Hoffman and Captain Michael Gore is critical for maintaining strong morale across our military.

Please join me in showing support and gratitude toward all of our military chaplains.

MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, too many middle class families are still struggling to make ends meet. Income inequality continues to grow, and unemployment remains unacceptably high, particularly in my home of State of Rhode Island. Our constituents deserve solutions that will promote job creation and increase economic opportunities for everyone.

One of the most important things that we can do for our country is to ensure that our workers have 21st century skills for a 21st century economy. In particular, I have been proud to work across the aisle to expand career and technical education, securing a $52 million increase for funding for Perkins Act career training programs this year alone.

However, skills training is only one piece of the puzzle. We must incentivize companies to bring jobs back home, increase the minimum wage so that full-time workers aren't living in poverty, and invest in infrastructure to ensure safety, boost commerce, and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, economic opportunity should not be subject to partisan politics. It is time to act on these commonsense policies and provide all Americans with the means to make it in America.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an ongoing employment challenge facing our Nation's veterans. When I go back home to Oklahoma, I speak with a lot of local veterans who can't find jobs.

It is unfortunate because these men and women are some of the hardest-working individuals you will ever find. I know because I have hired veterans in my private sector business, and I currently have two congressional team members who are veterans.

So I can tell you they are motivated and they are ready to work, but we must remember that serving our Nation is no easy task, and these men and women are facing transitional challenges. On top of that, our wounded warriors battle a whole host of adversities, but with the right training, I have seen our veterans do amazing things.

In my district, companies like Baker Hughes—one of the world's largest oil field service companies—are training and hiring veterans and seeing tremendous results.

So I stand here today to encourage both the private and public sector to come together to give our Nation's heroes a fighting chance for their incredible service to this great Nation.

GOP LAWSUIT TO NOWHERE

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the baseless, misguided, and partisan lawsuit that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor for a vote today. This lawsuit is just a continuance of the outright disrespect and disdain that the House Republicans have given President Barack Obama since he was elected.

While millions of Americans are waiting for Congress to renew emergency unemployment insurance and raise the minimum wage, we are here debating a senseless lawsuit. I am disappointed by the shameful partisan politics that is being played.

In contrast, I am proud of the work that we are doing as House Democrats trying to put the American people first with our Make It In America agenda and working to jump-start the middle class. With a long laundry list of things we need to get done, it is time to promote the people's business, not our political parties' business.

Enough is enough. With only 2 days left before our 5-week recess, we need

to be doing the business of the American people, not the business of our political parties.

COMMENDING SAMARITAN'S PURSE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the dedicated work undertaken by Samaritan's Purse, an international Christian aid group based in Boone, North Carolina. Specifically, I want to bring to your attention Dr. Kent Brantly, who has been heading up Samaritan's Purse work with Ebola patients in Monrovia, Liberia.

Tragically, Dr. Brantly, along with fellow American missionary Nancy Writebol, has contracted the Ebola virus. Both are currently fighting for their lives in an isolation ward in an African hospital.

Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues and all who hear this to join me in prayer for Dr. Brantly, Mrs. Writebol, and the more than 1,000 other patients who have contracted Ebola in this outbreak, which has already claimed over 600 lives.

The disease continues to spread, and Dr. Brantly, true to the selfless spirit of his missionary calling, has asked that his case not be treated differently from any other. Let us keep all those affected in our prayers.

DO-NOTHING GOP

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Republican Speaker JOHN BOEHNER will adjourn the House, and Congress will leave town for 5 full weeks. I rise to urge Speaker BOEHNER to cancel this recess and keep us in session, so we can address the urgent issues facing the American people.

Democrats have a clear list of priorities that will jump-start the middle class. We want to renew emergency unemployment benefits, raise the minimum wage, fix our broken immigration system, reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, invest in repairing and rebuilding America's infrastructure, and make sure women earn equal pay for equal work.

We have an opportunity to lift millions of hardworking Americans out of poverty, create jobs, and grow the economy by passing these bills that will help the middle class.

It is a complete dereliction of duty for Speaker BOEHNER to adjourn the House and leave town without addressing any of these issues, but what is even worse, instead of getting these things done for the American people, the Republicans will take up a bill to sue the President for moving too slowly to enact a bill that they oppose, that they have tried to stop over 50 times.

You can't make this stuff up. The American people deserve better, and the American people cannot afford 5 weeks of inaction.

□ 1230

ALARMING SITUATION ON OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the situation on our southern border and the influx of unaccompanied migrant children is both tragic and alarming. Even more concerning is the lack of leadership coming from the White House.

We also know that a law passed in 2008—the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization—has further complicated the administration's response. The law guarantees minors from Central America a court date and assistance for temporary relocation as they wait out their pending appeal. Unfortunately, a large number of these individuals evade attending these proceedings. Few minors are sent home, and most are able to stay for years, if not permanently.

The current situation is a stark reminder of just how flawed the Senate's immigration reform bill is. Granting amnesty to millions would merely reinforce the perception that, if you come to the United States illegally, you will be rewarded. Unfortunately, billions in new spending will not reverse the perception of a lenient enforcement environment in the United States.

What we need is for the White House to enforce the laws, secure the borders, and put aside political games and start working with Congress in a bipartisan manner.

NOTARIO VICTIM RELIEF ACT

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, while America waits for House Republicans in Washington to bring immigration reform to a vote, we cannot forget about the invisible casualties of our broken immigration process, notario fraud victims.

While there are many communities and religious organizations that are providing legitimate immigration-related services, there is also a growing number of nonlawyers posing as legal consultants, and they are known as ''notarios,'' and they are not licensed to give legal advice. Notarios are basically scam artists who prey on immigrant communities.

This week I introduced H.R. 5228, the Notario Victim Relief Act, which would allow victims of notario fraud to reopen their cases and immigrate lawfully. The bill is just the first step toward stopping fraudulent immigration services in our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of H.R. 5228 and help the victims of our broken immigration system.

THANKING JAY KROEZE

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank a constituent from the wonderful little town of Biglerville, Pennsylvania, for his service and sacrifice to spread the cooperative principle of concern for community.

Jay Kroeze, a lead lineman at Adams Electric Cooperative, volunteered for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation in Haiti as part of the Caracol Community Electrification Project. He spent 2 weeks in northern Haiti building and upgrading more than a mile and a half of power lines to help communities receive affordable, safe, and reliable electricity.

To date, more than 4,800 consumers in the northern part of Haiti now have access to electricity. Some now have TVs. A few have water treatment plants. Doctors can provide better care to patients, and residents have opened their own small businesses.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International currently is providing support to USAID in Haiti to bring safe, reliable, and affordable electricity to areas in northern Haiti.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I commend Jay Kroeze and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International Foundation for their tireless efforts in Haiti and around the world.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT SUCCEEDS IN KENTUCKY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Kentucky has been a national model for how the Affordable Care Act can succeed. Through Kynect, our State exchange, more than 413,000 Kentuckians have gotten health insurance, nearly 310,000 of them for the first time.

These two maps show how health reform has reduced the rate of the uninsured in the Commonwealth's 120 counties. The orange and red in the top map show counties with pre-Affordable Care Act uninsured rates of 14 percent to more than 20 percent. Some of the most impoverished areas, such as eastern Kentucky, also had the highest uninsured rates.

The bottom map shows Kentucky today under the health care law. Only one county still has an uninsured rate

of more than 14 percent. In three counties in the heart of Appalachia, the uninsured rate plummeted from more than 20 percent to less than 5 percent, as shown in blue.

Mr. Speaker, overall, in just 6 months, the Affordable Care Act reduced the total number of uninsured Kentuckians by nearly a half. Behind every number, behind every red county turned blue or green are the stories of a person or family getting the health care they need. That is success by any standard, but most importantly, Kentucky standards.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, some of our military have been sent emails telling them not to eat or drink in front of their Muslim brothers who are with them during Ramadan. I have never heard the military come out and say don't eat leavened food in front of your Jewish colleagues during Yom Kippur or Passover. I have never heard the military put out something such as be careful what you are eating in front of your Christian brothers during Lent because they may have chosen to do without.

Last Christmas, soldiers at Camp Shelby in Mississippi were told during a diversity briefing that they could not use the word ''Christmas.'' A VA hospital in Texas refused to accept holiday cards from boys and girls because the cards mentioned ''Christmas'' or ''God bless you,'' and a nativity scene near a lake on Shaw Air Force Base in South Carolina was removed after someone complained.

So you might understand why Ron Crews, executive director of the Chaplain Alliance for Religious Liberty, is a bit surprised by the Pentagon's recent behavior.

There is a good Biblical word for this: hypocrisy.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I sit on the Natural Resources Committee here in the House, and through our investigations into our treasured national parks, my colleagues and I have discovered a number of tragic choices and changes that are in store for all of us and our children.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Glacier National Park's glaciers will melt and be no more.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Joshua Tree National Park's Joshua trees will disappear from the park named after them.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Rocky Mountain National Park's forests are dying because mild winters cannot kill pine beetles, which are devastating the park's trees.

Climate change is upon us now. We are paying for its effects today, regardless of the number of votes this body takes to deny what is happening before our eyes.

COMPETING FOR JOBS

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, counties and States around this country compete every day for jobs. How they do it is not complicated. They adjust their tax and their regulatory burdens to attract businesses, and those that do the best job attract the most jobs. The problem is that they are competing for a declining pool of jobs in America because Washington is not competitive. We need to adopt that competitive attitude right here.

In times of war, we forget partisanship and pull together. In truth, we are in an economic war. Countries around the world have teams of people that work every day to beat us economically. The House has passed 39 jobs bills in this Congress which are gathering dust in the Senate. Surely HARRY REID and the President can find one among these 39 bills they can work with to make our country more competitive and put our people back to work.

COMMEMORATING 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, thank you President Johnson, and happy birthday to Medicaid and Medicare. I am excited about the lives that have been saved, and I am looking forward to the full expansion in all 50 States of Medicaid in 2015, its 50th birthday.

I will tell you, when President Johnson signed Medicare into law, less than 50 percent of our seniors had health insurance and 35 percent lived in poverty. Now, over 52.4 million Americans are given health care benefits through Medicare, Medicaid, regardless of their condition, and then for some also when their income is very low.

Mr. Speaker, 43.6 million Americans age 65 and above have Medicare and Medicaid, including 8.8 million disabled. Our seniors are able to be in long-term living because of Medicaid. By the time the baby boomers reach 65, it is expected that 80 million people will be covered by Medicare.

What is the common sense and lack thereof of the States that have not accepted expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act? Mr. Speaker, Medicare and Medicaid together save lives. I am interested in saving lives. Let's stand up for the Affordable Care Act, Medicare, and Medicaid to save the lives of Americans.

ISSUES CONGRESS NEEDS TO ADDRESS

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise deeply disappointed in Congress this week. There are real issues that Congress needs to address for the American people. But instead of addressing the long-term issues of comprehensive immigration reform, comprehensive tax reform, our debt and deficit, getting our economy going, we are considering suing the President of the United States and beating the drum of impeachment.

Where were my Republican colleagues when President Bush was issuing his egregious executive orders? The hypocrisy here is appalling.

We need to provide long-term funding for the highway trust fund, the Export-Import Bank to keep the American businesses competitive, Federal education programs to prepare our people and children for the next generation and workforce. We need to pass a long-term solution for our doctors. We need to provide funding to address the wildfires that are ravaging the Western United States, including my home State of Oregon. We need to get the unregulated amount of money out of politics.

We need to get back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 676, AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 935, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2014, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2014

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 694 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 694

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing 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. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening

motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014,—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 964 provides for consideration of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013.

On Monday, the House had a full and thorough debate on H.R. 935. While the bill did not gain the two-thirds majority necessary to pass by suspension, it did receive 253 bipartisan votes.

□ 1245

It is important we pass this bill in order to reduce the regulatory burden that has been placed on the nearly 365,000 pesticide users, and this rule allows us to do that.

The rule also allows the House to consider H. Res. 676.

This resolution will allow the Speaker to initiate litigation for actions by the President—or other executive branch officials—inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution.

The fact that we have to sue the President simply to ensure that he is working within the constraints of the Constitution, to me, Mr. Speaker, is troubling, but that is the situation we are facing.

While there have always been disagreements between the legislative and executive branches about how expansive the President's authority is, the Constitution is explicit that Congress writes the laws and the President's role is to ''take care'' that those laws are faithfully executed. No President may have both powers.

Our Founding Fathers understood the danger of having a President who not only enforced the laws, but made them. An executive with those powers would easily infringe on citizens' liberty. Our Founders saw this firsthand. That is why they were fleeing to come to this country and form this country. They knew the Executive would try to exceed the power afforded under the Constitution, even when it is occupied by someone who previously taught the limits the Constitution puts on Presidential power. That is why they were so careful in delegating among the three branches.

This system of checks and balances has served America so well for so long. Now, I am sorry for the civics lesson, but it is clear that some on the other side of the aisle have temporarily lost sight of how important these checks and balances are to the functioning of this House and to the legislative branch in general.

But that wasn't always the case. When Representative CONYERS, for instance, was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he remarked:

> We are coequal branch of government, and if our system of checks and balances is going to operate, it is imperative that we understand how the executive branch is enforcing or ignoring the bills that are signed into law.

Representative NADLER, for his part, cautioned:

> And I hope that anyone who thinks that inquiring into the excesses of the executive branch and into what appears to be a concentrated effort in every different aspect of law to destroy the power of the Congress and the judiciary and to limit our power to protect the liberties of the American people against encroachments by the Executive are a waste of time, I hope they will rethink what they are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, I read these quotes to illustrate the concern of the executive branch overstepping its authority isn't confined to just one party or one President. This is a legislative versus executive issue; it is not a Democrat versus Republican issue. And, to be frank, the legislative branch has been on the losing end of this for quite some time.

But my point is that we shouldn't be so callous or shortsighted as to not defend our article I powers simply because the President in question happens to belong to one party.

If we don't take action now, what stops future Presidents—Republican or Democrat—from eroding our powers further? Congress, itself, has shown little opposition to the harm it has done to the separation of powers over the years. That is why it is critical that we take action now. This should be a cause that the legislative branch can unite around, not divide over.

Instead, we have Members of Congress standing in applause when the President says he will bypass Congress to enact his agenda. Mr. Speaker, half of this body stood up in applause. It should be done in defiance. Here we have Members of Congress cheering for the President for basically saying he is going to eliminate their purpose here.

This isn't the first President whose actions have raised the alarms of an overreaching executive, and it is clear if we do nothing, it will not be the last.

I urge my colleagues to defend our role in government, and to stop the assault on the separation of powers.

Let's finally say to the Executive: ''Enough is enough.'' Let's finally say: ''Support the Constitution, support the separation of powers, and support this rule.''

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Today, we are taking up the very serious issue of the constitutionality of separation of powers, but the rule also covers the deregulation of pesticides. I think that should be noted here as well, because one is as ridiculous as the other.

This is a ridiculous lawsuit of one House of Congress seeking to sue the President for not implementing a law they have tried everything to kill.

The majority has wasted time, money, and energy on legislative proposals designed to distract us from the real problems of the United States.

Instead of tackling climate change, ensuring that college is affordable, and modernizing our crumbling infrastructure, the majority wants to sue the President for doing his job. The record is clear. This has been judged the most recalcitrant and useless Congress in history.

This lawsuit will be a monumental waste of time, energy, and funds. This is a political maneuver timed to peak as Americans go to the polls in November for the midterm elections. This lawsuit is a drumbeat pushing Members of the Republican Party to impeachment.

Last week in the Rules Committee, Democrats attempted to amend this resolution. In the pursuit of transparency and accountability, we offered

several amendments that addressed the cost of this lawsuit.

The majority in the Rules Committee voted down every amendment that the minority offered. With this closed rule, we have set a new record, by the way, for the most closed rules in a single Congress. On the committee level, on the House floor, and in the minds of our citizens, this is a closed process, a partisan maneuver, and nothing but a political messaging opportunity.

This lawsuit is a gimmick, which even legal scholars of the majority's own party say will fail, including the conservative writer and former Justice Department official Andrew C. McCarthy. He wrote about this lawsuit and said it is:

> A classic case of assuming the pose of meaningful action while in reality doing nothing.

Democrats in the House and the American people could not agree more.

The House minority has three main concerns about this lawsuit: first, the cost; second, the partisan nature; and third, the lack of legal standing and the implications for our constitutional separation of powers.

First, the cost. Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, which not a single Republican voted for, the majority has mounted a Herculean effort trying to repeal, dismantle, and discredit it. It seems that they will spare no expense attempting to take health care away from millions of Americans.

Not only did they shut down the government to deny Americans health care, it took from this economy $24 billion to pay for that shutdown. In addition, with over 50 votes on the House floor to undermine the Affordable Care Act, the majority has spent more than $79 million on that voting effort.

When the minority of the Rules Committee requested from the majority the proximate costs of this lawsuit, we got a response that read: ''A lawsuit is a small price to pay.''

Cost is not a hypothetical question, because there are real consequences for our country.

The minority and the American people still would like to know how much will this cost and where will the money come from. We asked directly through letters and by offering amendments to the resolution, and we have gotten no clear answers.

What cuts will come from what programs that Americans depend on to pay for this ridiculous lawsuit? The majority will spend money on more than 13 hearings, 50 briefings, 25,000 pages of documents produced, and allocated $3.3 million for a Select Committee on Benghazi. All that money for Benghazi, but they won't give us a concrete answer on where the funds will originate to pay for the lawsuit.

In a similar lawsuit, when Republicans defended the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, they paid their lawyers $520 an hour. I choke over that figure. At that rate, we would have paid over $1 million a year for a 40-hour workweek. If we are spending that kind of money, we ought to do it out in the open, and that amendment was defeated on party lines.

The majority does not intend to make this lawsuit anything but another opportunity to attack the President, which leads me to our second concern: its partisan nature.

As I said, no Republican voted for the Affordable Care Act. After strenuous efforts to take health care away from millions of Americans, the majority plans to file a lawsuit that, if successful, would result in the faster implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The inconsistency is breathtaking. Let me reiterate that. After not a single vote for health care, with over 50 votes to kill it, they are suing the President of the United States because he did not implement it faster. I don't know if anybody can make sense out of that, but all this effort to derail a law that is working. Just 2 days ago, The Washington Post reported in an article, titled ''Medicare finances improve partly due to ACA, hospital expenses, trustee report says,'' that the Affordable Care Act has extended the life of Medicare by 4 years because of the savings, and that will only get better.

I would like to insert this article from The Washington Post dated July 28, 2014, into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 2014]

MEDICARE FINANCES IMPROVE PARTLY DUE TO ACA, HOSPITAL EXPENSES, TRUSTEE REPORT SAYS—OUTLOOK FOR SOCIAL SECURITY, HOWEVER, REMAINS THE SAME

(By Amy Goldstein)

Medicare's financial stability has been strengthened by the Affordable Care Act and other forces that have been subduing health-care spending, according to a new official forecast that says the fund covering the program's hospital costs will remain solvent until 2030—four years later than expected a year ago.

The annual report, issued Monday by trustees overseeing the government's two largest entitlement programs, found little change overall in the finances of Social Security. The trustees warned, however, that the part of Social Security that pays monthly benefits to people with disabilities is especially fragile and, without changes, will start to run short of money for benefit checks in 2016.

Taken together, the findings provide a nuanced portrait of the fiscal future of these two programs, which act as cornerstones of social insurance—and a buffer against poverty—for older people and other vulnerable Americans. The trustees welcomed the improved financial prospects for Medicare but acknowledged that the underlying reasons are not yet entirely understood. At the same time, they exhorted Congress to take steps to prevent both programs from collapsing in the long term.

''Neither Medicare nor Social Security can sustain projected long-run program costs,'' the trustees said in a message accompanying their reports.

For the past few decades, Democrats and Republicans have fretted about the unsustainability of the Medicare and Social Security programs. They have appointed high-level commissions, proposed legislation and tried to stoke public fears that benefits might not be available for their parents—or themselves. But Congress has not restructured either program to withstand long-term fiscal pressures, and the issue has been absent lately from the agendas of both parties.

At a news briefing Monday, Cabinet secretaries and two public trustees reiterated the call for Congress to act. ''[We] must make manageable changes now, so we do not have to make drastic changes later,'' Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said.

''It is getting very late in the game'' to find a bipartisan consensus, said the trustees' only Republican, Charles P. Blahous III, who worked on Social Security and other economic issues as an aide to President George W. Bush. ''A solution much further delayed is a solution much less likely to occur.''

Both programs are being strained by the nation's demographics. As more baby boomers reach retirement age, people 65 and older are making up an increasing percentage of the country's population, with proportionally fewer working-age Americans chipping in payroll taxes.

Medicare's finances are facing other pressures, too, including from scientific advances that lead to new treatment and therapies, the report said.

The trustees' forecast said that the trust fund that pays for hospital care—Medicare Part A—has been strengthened significantly, with the date when it is predicted to start running short of money extended by 14 years since the Affordable Care Act was enacted in 2010. The report also predicted that the insurance premiums that older Americans pay for the portion of Medicare that covers doctors' visits and other outpatient care would probably remain the same for a third year in a row.

Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Mathews Burwell said that it is impossible so far to gauge how much of that trust fund's improved fiscal health was due to the health-care law as opposed to other changes in the health-care system that are slowing cost increases. She said both had a role. The ACA, for instance, is slowing payments to Medicare Advantage, the part of the program in which older Americans join private health plans, while other provisions focus on curbing hospital readmissions.

The report said that spending on hospital stays last year was less than expected, although trustees noted that analysts have not determined whether this trend reflected broad economic trends or stemmed from specific changes in the practice of medical care.

If Medicare is unchanged by 2030, the year it is projected to become insolvent, it would then be able to pay 85 percent of its beneficiaries' hospital bills, a proportion that would slip to 75 percent by 2047, the forecast said.

For Social Security, the trustees predicted that the program's two separate trust funds will, combined, have enough money to pay all the retirement and disability benefits it owes until 2033, the same time horizon as in the last two annual forecasts. They forecast that Social Security will be able to afford checks for retirees and workers' survivors until 2034—nearly two decades longer than the part of the program that pays disability benefits.

Social Security's expenditures last year exceeded its income from payroll taxes, as it has each year since 2010, the report says, although interest so far is making up the difference.

This year, President Obama backed away from an idea he broached in his budget last year to save money for Social Security by changing the basis on which inflation is calculated for the program. But his 2015 budget proposal reprises the idea of charging more for care under Medicare to older Americans who are relatively well-off—an idea that Congress has not touched this year.

In calculating Medicare's future finances, the trustees for the first time acknowledged that Congress has each year overridden scheduled reductions in Medicare doctors' fees—cuts that, if adopted, would lower payments for doctors' services by 21 percent in 2015. In the latest report, the trustees assumed that such cuts would continue to be waived.

The trustees noted that their new forecast was released 49 years to the week that President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the law that enacted Medicare, a major component of the Great Society programs of the mid–1960s. Social Security was a response to the Great Depression of the 1930s.

Last year, Medicare insured 52 million Americans, including 43.5 million age 65 and older and nearly 9 million younger people with disabilities. Social Security last year provided benefits to 41 million retired workers and their families, 6 million survivors of workers who died, and 11 million working-age people with disabilities.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll from the Commonwealth Fund found 77 percent of people were pleased with their new coverage. Republicans themselves have a 74 percent satisfaction rate with the new plan that they have bought.

The House majority is going to spend unknown millions of dollars coming from somewhere to stymie a law their own party Members support.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this article from Talking Points Memo, citing a survey from July 10, 2014, entitled: ''Survey: Most Republicans Who Bought ObamaCare Coverage Like Their Plans,'' into the RECORD.

[From Talking Points Memo Livewire, July 10, 2014]

SURVEY: MOST REPUBLICANS WHO BOUGHT OBAMACARE COVERAGE LIKE THEIR PLANS

(By Dylan Scott)

About three-quarters of Republicans who obtained health insurance under Obamacare are satisfied with their coverage, according to a survey published Thursday by the Commonwealth Fund.

The survey found that 74 percent of Republicans said they were very or somewhat satisfied with their new coverage. Overall, 78 percent of Americans said they were satisfied: 73 percent of those enrolled in a private plan and 84 percent of those enrolled in Medicaid.

There was a minimal difference between the previously uninsured and the previously insured: 79 percent of the former were satisfied and 77 percent of the latter were, according to the survey by the group, which is generally supportive of Obamacare.

Those surveyed also reported being better off: 58 percent said that they were better off now than they were before, while 9 percent said they were worse off. And 81 percent said that they were optimistic that their new coverage would help them get the health care they need.

Some of the survey's broader findings, on the overall drop in the number of uninsured and the percentage of Obamacare enrollees who were previously uninsured, generally fell within other findings. It found that the uninsured rate for adults under 65 fell from 20 percent to 15 percent since Obamacare enrollment began. It also found that 63 percent of Obamacare enrollees had been previously uninsured.

The survey, conducted from April 9 to June 2, covered 4,425 U.S. adults.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is also obvious to the American people that this is a political stunt. A recent poll, commissioned by CNN, shows 57 percent of us oppose this lawsuit. That is right: the majority of this country recognizes it for what it is: a political scheme. They recognize that there is no basis for this lawsuit.

And our third concern is the legitimacy of standing, in the legal sense, as well as the constitutional principles that the Supreme Court has said limit the kind of disputes that a court can consider.

Perhaps the best authority for the inadequacy of the majority's claim to standing is one of the majority's own witnesses at our Rules hearing, the Florida International University College of Law professor, Elizabeth Price Foley. Professor Foley wrote in a February article:

When a President delays or exempts people from a law—so-called benevolent suspensions—who has standing to sue him? Generally, no one. Benevolent suspensions of law don't, by definition, create a sufficiently concrete injury for standing.

That's why, when President Obama delayed various provisions of ObamaCare, his actions cannot be challenged in court. Congress probably can't sue the President, either.

If the majority's own witness doesn't think that Congress has standing, what judge will?

Finally, one of the most dangerous possible consequences of this lawsuit would be an unprecedented transfer of powers from the legislative to the judicial branch.

This concern for maintaining the separation of powers as it was written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers is exactly why courts have established what is called the ''political question doctrine.''

It says that courts should stay out of fights between the other two branches of the Federal Government and should defer to the other branches when the Constitution says the matter to be resolved is the responsibility of the President or the Congress. That couldn't be clearer, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1300

The mismanagement of our Nation's funds is deplorable, the partisan nature of the stunt is a abundantly clear, and our constitutional balance of powers is in jeopardy. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the closed rule which, yet again, distorts the legislative process and stifles debate even on the most important issues.

Mr. Speaker, we will ask the House to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to bring up four bills: first, the Bring Jobs Home Act; second, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which pays women equal to men for the same job; third, a bill to increase the minimum wage to $10.10; and finally, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which makes it easier for young people to pay their college loans.

These are the priorities of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and align themselves with those priorities instead of this lawsuit, which is surely a waste of time, money, and resources.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate law of our great Nation is not just the important work that we undertake here in the House. Above all else, it is the Constitution that we all swear to preserve, protect, and defend. Above everything, it is the Constitution.

The first words of the Constitution, article I, section 1, are the following:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

It doesn't just say ''some.'' It says all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States. No other entity of our Federal Government has the power to write law, not the executive branch or the judicial branch—only Congress.

Article I, section 7 states the following:

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves, he shall sign it, but if not, he shall return it.

So if he approves, it shall become law. If not, he vetoes the law and sends it back to Congress. Nowhere is the President given the authority to rewrite the law on his own.

Article II, section 3 places the following responsibilities with the President:

He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks the third branch of government, the judicial branch, to solve problems arising from the President's failure to faithfully execute the law and, specifically, aspects of the Affordable Care Act, as he is required in article II, section 3 and to have exercised power expressly given to Congress to write the law under article I.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders, in their genius, put in place this system of checks and balances for a very, very important purpose, which is to make certain that no one person could both impose and then enforce the law—because that type of action amounts to

tyranny, Mr. Speaker. In short, we have no king in this Nation. In America, we have a President. We do not have a king.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the people of the 10th District of Michigan and someone who is sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, I believe strongly that I have a responsibility to support this resolution, so that the courts can affirm that legislative power is vested in this House—the people's House—and not in the White House.

As the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I will have the responsibility to verify that any contracts with those who will litigate this case comport with the rules of the House. That is a responsibility I take very, very seriously.

As such, many on the minority side have asked how much this will cost. My answer is that we don't know yet because no contracts have been negotiated. We don't know how long such litigation will take to conclude, but the questions I would ask are: What price do you put on the adherence to the rule of law? What price do you place on the continuation of our system of checks and balances? What price do you put on the Constitution of the United States? My answer to each is: priceless, Mr. Speaker.

I am certain that this process will move forward with due diligence, will be conducted within the rules of this House, and it is my firm hope that in the end the courts will uphold the constitutional principles that are the bedrock upon which our great Nation has been built.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we remember why we are here today. We are here today not because of the majority's commitment to the rule of law, but because of politics. We are here because the Republican leadership of this House is trying desperately to placate the far right-wing of their base.

They are trying to placate a vocal and organized faction that refuses to accept the fact that the American people elected Barack Obama twice as President of the United States. They are birthers and Tea Partiers and minutemen militia members and supporters of nullification, but here is the problem: they will never, ever, ever be satisfied.

Listen to this finding from a poll taken just this month: 41 percent of Republicans surveyed believe that President Obama is not really an American citizen. That is percent. That is the base of the modern-day Republican Party, and it is ugly. If you are really concerned about the balance of power between the executive branch and the Congress, there are ways to address it.

Just last week, I worked with the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House and of the Foreign Affairs Committee to reaffirm the proper role of Congress in matters of war and peace. I brought a resolution to the floor under the rules of the House, and it passed by a vote of 370–40. That is the way we should do our work around here, not this nonsense about lawsuits.

It is the same with the Affordable Care Act. I know my Republican friends are devastated that the bill they hate so much is actually working. Millions of people who didn't have health insurance are now covered. Millions of people can now get preventive care. Millions of young adults can now stay on their family's insurance plan.

Being a woman is no longer considered a preexisting condition. Insurance companies can no longer discriminate against the sick, and as we learned just yesterday, the Affordable Care Act has already helped to extend the life of the Medicare trust fund by 4 years.

The entire Republican majority in this House was built on opposition to the Affordable Care Act, and yet it stands. The fact that it stands makes the Republican leadership do desperate and irrational things. It makes them vote to repeal the ACA over 50 times. It makes them decide it is somehow a great idea to sue the President for the way he is implementing the law.

It saddens me to see how low a once great party—the party of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt—has sunk. Instead of addressing the real and pressing needs of our country—passing an immigration reform bill, raising the minimum wage, passing a long-term highway bill—they have been reduced to government shutdowns and lawsuits and partisan stunts and gimmicks.

This is show business at its worst. Enough of this stupidity. I say to my Republican friends: Do your job, do the people's work, this is shameful.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding, and I want to commend my colleague from Michigan, Congresswoman MILLER, for explaining our motivation on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule, in support of the underlying resolution, and in support of this effort to restore every branch of this government to its proper constitutional bounds.

This is not about politics. If there were a Republican President doing the same thing, I would feel just as strongly. This is about the Constitution.

Our Constitution was drafted deliberately to ensure that the greatest power in our government resided closely with the people. That is why the portion dealing with Congress was placed first.

In article I, the Framers placed the ultimate power of creating and changing laws with the Congress, and they particularly empowered the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Every 2 years, Members of this House face the voters, and our actions in this body are judged. No other member of this government must submit to the people more regularly.

For too long, this body, under the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans, has ceded parts of our constitutional authority to the executive branch and the agencies that are, at best, remotely accountable to voters. It is time for that to stop. Today, we take a step to make it stop.

This lawsuit is about actions—the actions of an administration that has claimed more power than it has been given, even when we have already given it more authority than we should have.

I bear no animus to this President, but I strongly disagree with many of his policies, his stated priorities, and, ultimately, his actions. This lawsuit is not entered into lightly. It is not our first response, but rather, it is our last resort.

I will vote ''yes'' on this rule and this resolution, not for electoral gain, but rather to preserve our Constitution and the separation of powers enshrined therein.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1010, the minimum wage increase, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking President Obama.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. I do not, Mr. Speaker. I want to reiterate my earlier announcement that all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only, and we are not yielding for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, hasn't it been the tradition of this House that the Speaker yields to Members who want to make unanimous consent requests during the course of debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the pending resolution, all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start our middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking our President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1010, the minimum wage increase, in order to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

□ 1315

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit against the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, H.R. 4582, to strengthen the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010, the minimum wage bill, to give America a pay raise and to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan attack on the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to consider H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which would help the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentlewoman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010. America deserves a raise by raising the minimum wage, which will jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this unprecedented, partisan lawsuit against our President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up—and I am pleading to bring up—H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States of America.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act—for men and women, same job, same pay—to jump-start this middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit, which we don't need, attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentlewoman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act and a minimum wage increase, which would jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentlewoman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010, a minimum wage increase, to jump-start the middle class, instead of the partisan lawsuit attacking the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida would want to yield time for that—to jump-start the middle class—instead of this partisan, pointless lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded time for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to immediately bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the resolution authorizing the Speaker to bring a legislative branch lawsuit against the President.

Never before in the history of the Congress has there been institutional litigation between two coequal branches of government—never.

Don't my Republican friends understand that the House's acting alone cannot by itself enforce a legislative enactment? It must be bicameral.

This resolution will establish a precedent unknown in our jurisprudence. It is an abuse of power. It will threaten the separation of powers principle and the checks and balances that we have long cherished in this country.

Do you want the judiciary to become the arbiter of disputes between Congress and the President? Our branches are coequal.

Do you really want to cede to the courts the authority to resolve disputes between the branches?

Would you want the President to sue the House for missing a budget deadline? Where does it end?

How do you plan to pay for this litigation? This resolution would give the Speaker a blank check to pay legal costs and expert costs, which would add to the deficit.

I call on House Republicans to talk to objective legal scholars, to read the literature and court decisions, to protect the integrity of our Federal system, and to reject this dangerous legislation.

This is a very sad day in the House. I know what you are doing, and the American people know what you are doing. You are using this legislation in your constant effort to discredit President Obama. Every day that President Obama has occupied the Oval Office, you have attacked him. You have attacked his ideas, and you have attacked those who surround him and his Cabinet. You are denying the American people a functioning government.

I sincerely believe that you are trying to set the stage for a despicable impeachment proceeding should you hold the majority in the House and gain the majority in the Senate. Shame on you, House Republicans. Shame on you.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and on final passage.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the only people I hear talking about impeachment in this Chamber are the Democrats. The Democrats must want the President impeached as far as I can tell.

My favorite piece of art in this Capitol Building is a picture in the rotunda of a group of our forefathers, who gathered together because they could no longer bear living under a monarchy, and they decided that they would fight for freedom. They signed the Declaration of Independence, knowing full well that they were signing their own death warrants if they were caught and tried for treason.

Our forefathers fought a Revolution against the greatest military power on Earth in order to escape the bonds of a monarchy. At the end of the bloody Revolution, the last thing they wanted was another king. They wanted freedom. To protect that precious freedom, they designed a government where power rested with the people based on the separation of powers.

The legislative branch makes the laws. The President enforces the laws. President Obama has decided that he cannot be bothered with the separation of powers. He has bragged that, if Congress will not accept his priorities, he has a pen and a phone, and he will make the law. He may have a pen, but the people have the Constitution. Our forefathers recognized that one man who can both make the law and enforce the law is not a President—he is a king.

Thomas Jefferson once said that freedom does not disappear all at once; it is eroded imperceptibly day by day.

The prosperity of our great country sprang from our freedom. Our form of government, set forth in the Constitution by our forefathers, has protected that very fragile freedom for 200 years.

My friends across the aisle worry about the price of a lawsuit to protect our freedom. Our forefathers paid dearly for that freedom. Many paid everything. Our freedom is in peril. We cannot stand by and watch the President shred our Constitution.

I stand in support of House Resolution 676.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the fact that only Democrats are speaking of impeachment.

Just today, The Hill newspaper announced that a most respected and admired member of the Republican Conference said of the lawsuit, spearheaded by JOHN BOEHNER:

> Theater is a show. Why not impeach instead of wasting $1 million to $2 million of the taxpayers' money? If you are serious about that, use what the Founders of the Constitution gave us.

He was referring to impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from the Empire State for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this lawsuit is nothing more than a waste of time and a cover-up with respect to the House Republicans' failure to effectively govern.

You have failed to create jobs. You have failed to increase the minimum wage. You have failed to deal with our broken immigration system.

□ 1330

You have failed to extend unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who have been left on the battlefield of the Great Recession. You have failed to deal with our crippling transportation and infrastructure system.

Mr. Speaker, your majority has failed to do what is in the best interest of the American people, and so, to cover up the mess, you are taking us on a joyride through the article III court system. It is an effort that will crash and burn. Yet, nonetheless, you are willing to waste millions of dollars of taxpayer money in order to make a down payment on impeachment.

Instead of engaging in responsible legislative action, the majority has chosen to act up and to act out in order to satisfy the thirst of the blame Barack Obama caucus.

Shame on you, Mr. Speaker. It is time to get back to the business of the American people.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been kind of scratching my head as to why it is we are filing this lawsuit. Why is it that the independent House, the Speaker of the House, second in line for the Presidency, instead of passing a bill, is filing a lawsuit? I think I have kind of figured it out. The power of the majority is being used in a way to make that power useless and impotent.

They can pass any laws they want in this House. They can repeal any laws they want in this House, in fact, have repealed health care 55 times. But once it goes across this hall into the Senate, it dies. It is not taken up. If it were taken up, it would never be signed by the President.

I have got another idea. Instead of filing a lawsuit, let's do our job. We have got some disagreements. We think—and I think the American people believe, and I know the President agrees—we should raise the minimum wage. You don't. Let's work it out.

We believe—and the President believes, the American people believe—we need comprehensive immigration reform. Let's take it up and have a vote.

We believe it is time for equal pay for equal work.

What are we afraid of? Why don't we take it up?

Is the judge going to help us decide this, or should we have an out-of-court settlement, which, in our case, would mean we actually have a discussion, a discussion that includes the members of the Republican Party who have different points of view, as opposed to simply the narrowest views from the most gerrymandered of districts. It means we talk to Democrats on the House side of the floor. It means we work with our counterparts in the Senate. It means we do our job.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have got a job to do that can't be done by a judge. You have got a job to do that won't be resolved in a court of law. It will be resolved here in the United States House of Representatives. And the fact that we disagree and the fact that the issues between us are difficult and contentious is no excuse for us to not do our job.

The Republicans represent a lot of Americans, but the Democrats represent at least half of America. And never in the history of this country have we made progress by refusing to legislate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, just when we think the level of dysfunction by the Republican majority in this House can't get any worse, no, they surprise us and find a way to prove us wrong. They are going to cap off 7 months, Mr. Speaker, of the worst do-nothing Congress in this Nation's history, and Republicans have now decided to chart a dangerous and unprecedented path by suing the President of the United States. The American people have to hear this. Suing the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker. And for what? Because the President is doing his job?

So when House Republicans are not doing their jobs, they choose to sue the President of the United States. And the American people do see this for exactly what it is.

So we move from one political stunt to the next, Mr. Speaker, from shutting down the government—that is what Republicans did—to a lawsuit, and then onward to impeachment. This do-nothing Congress, Mr. Speaker, suing the President of the United States.

We should be working to make college more affordable, to enact comprehensive immigration reform, equal pay for equal work, raise the minimum wage, renew unemployment benefits, improve the Nation's infrastructure. And instead, House Republicans are suing the President.

I thought this was a fringe element, Mr. Speaker, of the House Republican majority, but it is not. It is the majority. But somehow, Republicans in the House of Representatives—you know what? We get it. The Republicans in the House don't like the President. They don't like the President, Mr. Speaker. But they are suing the President of the United States.

Shame, shame, shame.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question because defeating it will allow an amendment that provides for consideration of legislation that will, in fact, create jobs, grow the economy, support small businesses, ensure equal pay, and alleviate the financial burdens on working families today.

There are so many things we can and should be doing right now to spur the economy for the American people. We need to help workers. We need to help them find opportunities. We need to achieve higher pay for their hard work.

Instead of considering those many bills, this Republican majority continues to waste this institution's time by pushing a partisan lawsuit against the President. This is the first time in history that a branch of Congress has tried to sue a President. My God, what a legacy you leave.

Americans are tired of partisan dysfunction. They want to see us working to solve their problems, and defeating that previous question will allow us to have a vote today on something very important to American families, and that is equal pay for equal work.

Women in America face overwhelming financial challenges. They are more likely to be poor, make minimum wage, go bankrupt, less likely to have retirement security. Women still only make 77 cents, on average, for every dollar made by men. That is $11,000 lost wages every single year, and over the course of a career, that adds up to $434,000 lost.

I have introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act in every Congress since 2007. It passed the House twice with bipartisan support. It would ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

A famous American once said, and I quote: ''Mind you, I believe in marriage and children and home, but I'm not one of the kind that think that God made women to do nothing but to sit at home in the ashes and tend to babies. He made her to be as good as man, and he made her better too . . . If a woman can do the same work that a man can do and do it just as well, she should have the same pay.''

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that was Buffalo Bill Cody, and he said that in 1898, 116 years ago.

Women, Mr. Speaker, are tired of waiting.

Let us not waste our time on the partisan lawsuit against the President. Let us defeat the previous question and today give women a vote on equal pay for equal work.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I will place into the RECORD an exchange of letters between myself and Chairman SESSIONS and between Ranking Member BRADY and Chairwoman MILLER of the House Administration Committee. This exchange of letters catalogs our repeated requests for an estimate of the projected cost of this partisan enterprise and the identification of accounts that will be cut to pay for it. As you will note, the responses to our letter provide no information about the cost estimate and no indication from where the funds will come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Within the draft resolution to initiate a lawsuit against the President, we learned that you intend to seek authorization to ''employ the services of outside counsel and other experts.'' Such authority clearly falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and as such, I am writing to express my expectation that Republicans will be open and transparent about the use of taxpayer money in pursuing this highly dubious and partisan lawsuit.

As evidenced by House Republicans' conduct in the $2.3 million failed effort to defend the discriminatory and unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act in the courts, strong bipartisan oversight is clearly necessary in any plan to hire outside counsel. The Republican majority must not be permitted to use taxpayer dollars as a slush fund to award a no-bid contract to high-priced, politically connected Republican lawyers without any transparency or accountability to the House or the American people.

Our opposition to the deeply partisan basis of your lawsuit in no way diminishes the need for normal oversight of the terms of any contract signed by Republican Leadership obligating the House to pay millions of dollars to private attorneys. Therefore, I expect you will honor regular order through my committee, even with this highly irregular lawsuit.

The American people deserve to know how and where their tax dollars are being spent, and House Administration Committee Democrats insist on regular consultation and transparency in the selection criteria and process, cost, and lobbying connections of any counsel or experts hired in the name of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBERT BRADY,
Ranking Member,
Committee on House Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT A. BRADY,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER BRADY, I write in response to your July 14th letter to the Speaker of United States House of Representatives expressing concerns about the draft resolution to initiate lawsuit against the President. As always, the Committee, and Republicans, will be open and transparent about the use of taxpayer money. I will, however, note that there is no higher use of taxpayer funds than protecting and defending the United States Constitution which both you and I took an oath to uphold and defend.

All appropriate and applicable procurement procedures will be followed in the award of any contract for outside counsel for a lawsuit. Regardless of your partisan political feelings on the lawsuit, I am sure that you would agree that the United States House of Representatives, as an institution, deserves full and zealous advocacy in the defense of its prerogatives as a co-equal branch of our government and in defense of the Constitution.

Rest assured that I will not unilaterally ignore or rewrite laws passed by Congress.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, We understand that the Committee on Rules will meet in the coming weeks to consider amendments to the proposed resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House to sue the President of the United States.

Before that meeting is scheduled, the Members of our Committee must have the answers to two important questions:

1) What is the anticipated cost of the lawsuit against the President?

The draft resolution places no limit on the amount of taxpayer funds the Speaker may dedicate to his lawsuit against the President. The American people have a right to know—before the House votes to initiate such a lawsuit—how much money will be allocated to this exercise.

We do not expect you to provide a detailed budget for the lawsuit, and we understand that unforeseen variables will influence the ultimate cost. But there is no reason to assume that the House of Representatives cannot do what every American family must do—use its best judgment to estimate future expenditures. The President's Office of Management and Budget must provide such estimates every day. We do not see why the House of Representatives should be exempt from the ordinary budget discipline of estimating the cost of its own activities. We request that you provide to the Committee, in advance of our markup, your best estimate of the anticipated cost of the lawsuit to the American taxpayers.

2) Which accounts will be cut in order to pay for the lawsuit against the President?

The draft resolution authorizes the Speaker to hire outside lawyers to assist him in his suit against the President. Yet the resolution does not provide any new resources. Therefore, funding for the lawsuit must be transferred from other Legislative Branch accounts.

Before the Members of the House cast their vote on this resolution, they should know which of their legitimate legislative activities will be curtailed in order to divert funds to this entirely partisan enterprise. We request that you provide the Committee, before the markup, your best estimate of the legislative branch accounts that will be reduced to cover the anticipated cost of the lawsuit.

We have learned in too many cases what happens when the House fails to disclose the anticipated cost of such activities in advance. The American public only learned, after the fact, that the House had wasted $2.3 million on its misguided intervention in the Defense of Marriage Act litigation. Another example is the resolution to launch yet another investigation of the Benghazi matter. When the Rules Committee considered this partisan legislation, we asked repeatedly—and in vain—for a cost estimate. We learned after the vote that the House plans to spend as much as $3.3 million on this duplicative and wasteful effort this year alone—more than the budgets of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs and the House Committee on Ethics.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that the anticipated cost of the Speaker's lawsuit against our President be disclosed to the American people before we vote on the resolution authorizing it We are making this request so far in advance because we want to ensure there is ample time to make the assessments necessary for a fully informed estimate. No meeting should be scheduled on the draft resolution until the answers to these questions have been made public.

Sincerely,

LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,
Ranking Member.
JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Member of Congress.
ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Member of Congress.
JARED POLIS,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. LOUISE SLAUGHTER,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Rules, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES MCGOVERN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JARED POLIS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MRS. SLAUGHTER AND MESSRS. MCGOVERN, HASTINGS, AND POLIS: Thank you for your letter dated July 17, 2014, outlining your questions regarding H. Res. 676, which authorizes House litigation. Specifically, you asked to be provided with information regarding the anticipated cost of a lawsuit against the President as well as which accounts would supply such funding. As demonstrated by our nearly five hour hearing last week, it is my intent to conduct this process in a thoughtful and transparent process.

In regard to your first question, it is too early in the process to calculate an exact dollar amount that will be spent on all elements of the litigation process. H. Res. 676 authorizes the Speaker to initiate litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to retain outside counsel or experts, if needed. The resolution does not require either action, nor does it authorize or appropriate any new funding. Decisions regarding legal action and whether to retain outside experts would occur after passage of H. Res. 676.

However, in the Defense of Marriage Act litigation referenced in your letter, the House of Representatives defended that law in court in close to two-dozen cases across the country. After consultation with the interested parties, I fully expect potential legal action brought under this resolution to be far narrower in scope than that case, which suggests that total litigation costs should be lower as well.

It is also important to note that I anticipate that all contracts surrounding any litigation authorized by this resolution will go through the approval process previously used by the House Administration Committee for Office of General Counsel initiated contracts. Funds spent on outside counsel have been and would continue to be included in the quarterly Statements of Disbursements, which are publically available.

I can more clearly answer your second question. I do not anticipate that any new funds would need to be appropriated in this fiscal year. Funds spent on such litigation would come from the account of the Office of General Counsel, which falls under House accounts. If those previously existing funds were found to be insufficient, the appropriate House officers, in coordination with the Appropriations Committee, could then transfer funds from other House accounts with anticipated savings.

While I am confident that any use of taxpayer money will go through an open and transparent process, we must ensure that the House of Representatives has the flexibility necessary to hire the most qualified experts available to defend the Constitution. A lawsuit against the President for failing to fulfill his constitutional duty to faithfully execute the law is a small price to pay for defending the separation of powers and the American people.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, The Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday the Committee on Rules filed a report to accompany the resolution (H. Res. 676) authorizing the Speaker, on behalf of the House, to initiate or intervene in certain litigation against the President of the United States or other federal officials. The Committee on House Administration (CHA) received an additional referral of the resolution due to its implications for the operations of the House, especially the potentially enormous depletion of appropriations intended for other purposes.

As you know, a number of provisions in this resolution—particularly those concerning the hiring of outside counsel and consultants, and the spending of money on their hiring—are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, where I serve as Ranking Minority Member. Our Committee has held no hearings, meetings or markups of this resolution.

Yesterday, with the concurrence of our chairman, Representative Miller of Michigan, the Speaker discharged the House Administration Committee from further consideration of the resolution. This occurred despite the fact that all three House Administration Democrats last week formally invoked the extraordinary Rule XI procedure calling for a special committee meeting to consider the legislation. So we now confront a situation in which CHA, the ''money committee'' on this subject due to our jurisdiction over House accounts and officers, will not be heard.

I also now that the Speaker has not provided this Committee with a good-faith estimate of how much this lawsuit or lawsuits could cost taxpayers.

In my view, this mad rush to confront the President in court represents yet another ill-conceived, ill-considered action pursued merely for political purposes. It will cost the American people millions and inevitably deplete the legislative resources otherwise available to support the work of all Members of this House. In light of the haste we have already witnessed in this process, I urge you to allow consideration of amendments on the floor, and also to permit a motion to recommit with or without instructions so that we may either have the opportunity to return H. Res. 676 to the House Administration Committee for substantive review or offer instructions proposing changes relevant to our Committee's concerns.

Respectfully,

ROBERT A. BRADY,
Ranking Member,
Committee on House Administration.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT A. BRADY,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BRADY: Thank you for your letter dated July 29, 2014, discussing your concerns with provisions in H. Res. 676 that fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and requests regarding floor consideration of the measure. Unfortunately, my office did not receive your letter until roughly 15 minutes before the start of the Rules Committee meeting to provide for floor consideration of the resolution.

The provision that you specifically reference authorizes the Speaker to initiate litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to retain outside counsel or experts, if needed. The resolution does not require either action, nor does it authorize or appropriate any new funding. As I stated in my letter dated July 23, 2014 to the minority members of the Rules Committee, I do not anticipate that any new funds would need to be appropriated for this fiscal year. It should also be recognized that this is a limited, targeted measure that seeks to address an important constitutional issue.

You also expressed concerns with the process, but the Committee on House Administration was discharged from further consideration of the measure pursuant to an agreement between Chairman Miller and myself, which has been the standard practice used by both Democratic and Republican majorities. Our exchange of letters can be found in the committee report accompanying H. Res. 676.

While I appreciate your requests for specific elements in the rule, I feel that the Committee adopted an appropriate rule for consideration of this important measure. H. Res. 676 is a critical first step in an effort to defend the Constitution and compel the President to faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if people are supposed to think that this is really a genuine concern by the House of Representatives and not a partisan gimmick, then why didn't the majority consult with Democrats or the Senate beforehand and say: We want to do this on behalf of Congress. Will you talk with us about participating?

That idea of joint participation is long gone from here, and I regret to say that.

But that didn't happen. It was cooked up in some meeting where we probably discussed how to win back the Senate, or whether to impeach the President, or how the campaign fundraising is going and so forth.

You are not fooling anyone. This is about politics and the elections, and you know it and I know it and, polling shows it, all the people in the country know it.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, for the time and also, more importantly, for her great leadership in so many ways. In so many ways, it has been about her advocacy for the priorities of the American people.

So today we have on the floor of the House legislation that is a serious matter about suing the President of the United States instead of doing the people's business, which is what Ms. SLAUGHTER and others have advocated for, whether it is bringing good-paying jobs home, creating jobs by building the infrastructure of America, reducing the cost of higher education for families, investing in our children, raising the minimum wage, passing legislation to have equal pay for equal work, everything that would increase the financial stability of America's families. Instead, we are wasting the taxpayers' time and money on the floor of the House on a matter that is serious but is a waste of time.

There are those who have said that this initiative to sue the President of the United States is about a step toward impeachment. Others who say, no, it is instead of impeachment.

I told the Speaker that I had a similar situation years ago—not similar in terms of the subject, because I think there is no basis for this and no standing in this House on the subject of suing the President, but similar in that there were calls by some to impeach President Bush when we took the majority and people were very unhappy about the Iraq war and the false claims made to draw the American people into support of that war effort, which proved to be untrue. It wasn't about people in your caucus clamoring for suing the President. It was about hundreds of thousands of people in the streets objecting to the war in Iraq and the false basis on which we went in.

But when I became Speaker, and people clamored for the impeachment of the President, I said what I advised the Speaker to say right now: Impeachment is off the table. If this isn't about impeachment, that simple sentence will be a clear one: Impeachment is off the table.

Why hasn't the Speaker said that? Why are there those in your caucus who won't deny that that is a possible end in sight for this ill-fated legislation that you bring to the floor?

We are going to adjourn tomorrow for 5 weeks, leaving unfinished business here. We need to solve problems for the American people, to create opportunities for them, but that kind of legislation is nowhere in sight, whether it is job creation, reducing the cost of higher education, equal pay for equal work, raising the minimum wage, some of which I already mentioned.

We have precious few hours remaining to act on the priorities of the American people and finish the ''can't wait'' business before the Congress. So much needs to be done: the humanitarian situation at the border, which

provides an opportunity for us to do the right thing; the highway trust fund, to deal with it appropriately and give it the proper amount of time instead of rushing it through. But once again, Republicans are putting the special interests and the howls of impeachment-hungry extremists before the needs of the Nation.

□ 1345

The lawsuit is only the latest proof of House Republicans' contempt and disregard for the priorities of the American people. It is yet another Republican effort to pander to the most radical rightwing voters at taxpayers' expense: $2.3 million spent defending DOMA, a doomed case; more than $3 million on the select committee to exploit Benghazi—by the way, something that had been investigated again and again at the very admission of leaders on the Republican side. Why are we doing this? And then this, which we don't have a pricetag on that they will reveal to us.

Again, why would you sue somebody unless you want to prove something? And why would you go down that path unless you wanted to do something about it?

But the fact is, Republicans in Congress have no standing in this suit. Most constitutional scholars have admitted or do admit that. Even the Republicans' expert witnesses have in the past said you don't have standing on it.

Middle class families don't have time for a Republican partisan grudge match with the President. They know that this is a funny thing because—well, funny in the one strange interpretation of the word ''funny.'' But a couple of weeks ago on the steps of the Capitol, House Democrats were there to launch our middle class jump-start about some of the issues I raised—job creation here in the U.S., affordability of college, early childhood education, all of those things, equal pay for equal work, raise the minimum wage. We were doing that on the steps of the Capitol. And in the Capitol buildings, the Republicans were launching their lawsuit against the President. What could be more different in terms of addressing the needs of the American people?

We made the point that this was all happening on the same day. But the fact is, that difference of focusing on progress and job creation and process and do nothing is what we live through here every single day. And today is another one of those days on the floor of the House.

So let us recognize what this is. Serious, serious, on a path to nowhere, or maybe, amongst some of your ranks, a path to impeachment. But if we just want to talk about the lawsuit, it behooves the Speaker of the House to say, Impeachment is off the table. I hope we can hear that soon, and then we will see what the merits of this case are. It has no standing. It has no merits. It has a political basis. And let the American people judge it for what it is.

If you don't want to hear people use the word ''impeachment,'' as your people have done, then tell them, Impeachment is off the table. That is what I had to do. That is what this Speaker should do.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of this legislation.

Unemployment. The deficit. Outsourcing. Higher education. Immigration. Tax reform. Gun control. Medicare. Social Security. Transportation. A continuing resolution. Ukraine, Syria, Nigeria, Libya, Israel, Gaza, Iran.

Instead of talking about any one of these, what are we spending one of the last 14 scheduled voting days before the election to discuss? We are talking about suing the President for implementing a policy that the majority supports. Go figure. What a colossal waste of time. What a colossal waste of taxpayer money.

We know why the majority is focusing on this instead of trying to solve the country's problems. It is because they have no solutions. We haven't heard any, unless you are keeping them in a secret black box.

Their only goal is to indulge the partisan impulses within your own party, 57 percent of whom want to impeach President Obama. The House of Representatives is apparently taking its marching orders from Sarah Palin. Good for us.

The fact of the matter is that the American people are tired of the relentless partisanship that has led the Congress to having a lower approval rating than head lice.

Our constituents want us to solve problems. That is one of the reasons we get paid. Our colleagues in the Senate today are voting on legislation I put forward to end tax breaks. We can't even get a hearing on this side of the building. These are commonsense solutions.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to conclude by reading something, Mr. Speaker. And if you don't know where this came from, that is part of the problem:

Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith that the dark past has taught us,
Sing a song full of the hope that the present has brought us;
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march on till victory is won.

Your problem is, most of you don't even know where it came from.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again would remind all Members of the House of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to ask: Why did the majority shut off all amendments to this resolution? And more importantly, why have they even blocked a traditional motion to recommit? That is something that we generally always give to the minority on both sides of the aisle, a motion to recommit.

Now, I think the reason is—you know, being somewhat cynical, and I will admit to that after what we have been through here—but the cynic would say that they don't want us to have a motion to recommit because our side might bring up a motion, which it would be our privilege to do, that might put the Republican Members on record on impeachment. Now, I don't know that. We got no answer as to why we were not given the privilege of a motion to recommit.

But there is one thing we do know. We know that this lawsuit is going to cost unknown millions and will be an unconscionable waste. We know that that cost is going to come out of programs that have already suffered grievous cuts over the last few years and on which people oftentimes depend for their very lives.

We know that it is pretty partisan because the Democrats were never consulted at any point on this issue, and we know that it is flawed because experts have told us that there is no way in the world that the House of Representatives has any standing on this issue and that a good Federal judge will send it back to us almost immediately.

We know it is a distraction, and we know that what it distracts us from are the serious, serious issues that all of us hear about every day from our own constituencies.

Do you think anybody ever calls me up and says: Why don't we impeach the President or go after the President because it is raining today and it surely is his fault? No, we don't hear that.

I hear about, I am having a hard time getting a new job. I need help to pay for my child's education. I hear a lot of times, my daughter's unemployment benefits have run out. She is facing eviction. I don't know what I am going to do. I hear from people who talk about the children who have come to this country—many of them unaccompanied, by themselves—in an absolute inhumane wave of human suffering that we need to pay some attention to.

I know that out there today, we have had floods in my part of the country in upstate New York that have devastated entire water projects and sewer projects, and something needs to be done. But we won't do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question and please vote ''no'' on the rule. This is one of the

most important issues that we have ever faced during our time in Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot here today. A lot of it, I don't know exactly where they are coming from. But we have heard a lot of things today.

Democrats would like to believe—or would like the American people to believe, or go to that narrative—that Congress hasn't done its job. Well, you have to remember that the House of Representatives is one-half of that. The Senate is the other half.

Now, if you think about it, we have sent 40 jobs bills over to the Senate, where they are gathering dust on Leader REID's desk. We have passed seven of the appropriations bills here in the House. The Senate, zero. We have passed important tax legislation to ensure our economy continues to grow and that companies continue to hire.

We will be voting today on a veterans package to help our veterans. And tomorrow, for the second time, we are going to consider a bill as it relates to the highway trust fund.

So perhaps the Republicans in the House are getting the job done with support of Members on the other side of the aisle. How many bipartisan bills are sitting there in the Senate just languishing away because there is a decision made just not to move anything forward from the House? That is unfortunate because that hurts the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of things that are supposedly what we want to do. But here is what I believe we are trying to do today. It is about defense of the Constitution. It is pure and simple. It is about the protection that is given by the Constitution to the two houses of the legislative branch and to the President of the United States and the executive branch and to the judiciary, and that separation of powers is within the Constitution. That is what we are fighting for.

Forget about all this other stuff that has been thrown up as a smokescreen. We are fighting to defend the Constitution.

And people say, well, you know, it could cost money. Well, thank goodness. Thank God that our Founding Fathers didn't say, well, you know what? It is a reach too far. It will cost too much. It could cost our lives. They didn't make that decision. What they said was, it is important for the future of this country that we live by the Constitution, that we design a Constitution that will endure into the future.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that this Constitution has endured and has provided the guidance for this country to move forward every day. It is not by happenstance. It is by the fact that we are supposed to live by and defend the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a deputy sheriff, if we just said, You know what, I don't agree with the free speech portion of the Constitution, we would have stopped free speech. I had to defend people, stand there and put my body in front of people who were opposed to what the people behind me were saying that was repugnant to us and to most Americans. But I had to put my safety at risk for their free speech. And you know, I could have said, You know what, I don't agree with that. That is just part of the Constitution. Let's not worry about free speech. But we didn't do that. We didn't rewrite the law. We didn't rewrite it.

You know, yesterday or the day before—I am not sure which day it was—but in the Rules Committee, we heard an impassioned description from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER), who was the speaker of the house in Florida, who was sued by the Governor in regards to the implementation of law. And guess what? That body won.

And thank goodness that the house won in the Supreme Court of Florida and that they just didn't say, You know what, you don't have standing. So forget about that.

A lot of people are trying to presuppose what the Supreme Court is going to say or do. I would suggest to you that I am willing to go along with whatever the Supreme Court says. Now, I may not like it. But I am willing to go along with it because I do believe they are the ultimate arbitrators as to what is constitutional and what isn't.

□ 1400

It is amazing that this document that we are talking about, that there is a question about it, that there is a question about the separation of powers.

I would like to read a quote from then-Senator Barack Obama:

> We have got a government that was designed by the Founders with checks and balances. You don't want a President that is too powerful, a Congress that is too powerful, or a Court that is too powerful. Everybody has got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation.
>
> The President can veto it or sign it, but what George Bush has been doing as part of his effort to accumulate more power in the Presidency, he has been saying, well, I can basically change what Congress passed by attaching a letter that says I don't agree with this part or that, I'm going to choose to interpret it this way or that way.
>
> It is not part of his power, but it is part of the whole theory of George Bush that he can make laws as he goes along. I disagree with that.

Once again, quoting then-Senator Obama, Senator Obama says:

> I taught the Constitution for 10 years. I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I don't know what happened on the trip from the Capitol down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, how that changed, but I guess the Presidency can change your view of the world. It may not be an accurate view of the world, but it can change it.

I think what then-Senator Obama said rang true then and rings true today. It is about the separation of power, and let me tell you something, my friends on the other side of the aisle should be standing there with us because, for too long, this House has now become irrelevant. Congress in general is becoming irrelevant.

When I got elected just over 4 years ago, I came up here with a purpose. I came up here with a belief in the Constitution and that there is separation of powers between the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch, but now, I hate to say it, in my 4 years, I have become disenchanted with the fact that this House for way too long has just had a ''cooperate and graduate'' kind of attitude, and I don't think we should do that.

That is why, today, the buck stops here. We have got to make a stand in regards to is the Constitution relevant, is this House relevant. If not, we should just all go home. There is no reason to be here.

I have three sons that serve their country and that have put their lives on the line for this country, not by their own choice—I mean, they serve their country at their choice—but when they go off into war, it is at the direction of the President.

It is a direction to protect this country, and they do so willingly. They raised their hand to say they are going to support and defend the Constitution. I raised it as a police officer outside of Chicago, I raised it as a deputy sheriff, I raised it as sheriff, and I raised it here when I got sworn in as a Member of this body.

I take that seriously, and I take it seriously when anybody thinks they can trample on the Constitution. I take it seriously when anybody thinks that they are above where we need to be.

This legislation is about empowering the Speaker of the House, if he so deems it, to sue the President. I happen to agree with that. Mr. Speaker, we can talk all day—at least I could—in regards to why it is important that this House protect its prerogative in regards to passing legislation and reminding the executive branch as to what their duties are.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about Democrats and Republicans. Let me tell you something, I wasn't here before this. I got here 4 years ago. I don't care if it is a Republican or Democrat or Independent or whatever. I believe in this institution. I believe in the Constitution of this country, and I believe we should do everything in our power to defend it no matter who is trying to usurp it.

So I encourage my colleagues for the last time to support this rule, to support this institution, and to support this Constitution. It is about are we really serious about the checks and balances that our Founding Fathers so rightfully created.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 694 OFFERED BY MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Bring Jobs Home Act (H.R. 851). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 851, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 377). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 377 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013 (H.R. 1010). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 1010 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act (H.R. 4582). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851, H.R. 377, H.R. 1010, or H.R. 4582.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5195) to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5195

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR END OF CALENDAR YEAR 2014.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and ending on December 31, 2014, an additional 1,000 principal aliens may be provided special immigrant status under this section. For purposes of status provided under this subparagraph—

''(I) the period during which an alien must have been employed in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(ii) must terminate on or before December 31, 2014;

''(II) the principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with paragraph (2)(D) not later than December 31, 2014; and

''(III) the authority to provide such status shall terminate on December 31, 2014.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—Clause (i) shall not be construed to affect the authority, numerical limitations, or terms for provision of status, under subparagraph (D).''.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY FEE INCREASE FOR CERTAIN CONSULAR SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, not later than January 1, 2015, shall increase the fee or surcharge authorized under section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note) by $1.00 for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas and machine-readable combined border crossing identification cards and nonimmigrant visas.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 140(a)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note), the additional amount collected pursuant the fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—The fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5.5 years after the first date on which such increased fee is collected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5195, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5195 makes available through the end of calendar year 2014 1,000 visas for the Special Immigrant Visa program created by the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009. The 1,000 visas are in addition to 3,000 that Congress already allocated for fiscal year 2014.

The main eligibility requirement, Mr. Speaker, to receive a Special Immigrant Visa under this program is that the Afghan principal applicant must have worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government for at least 1 year in Afghanistan.

The State Department has indicated that it will issue all 3,000 of their originally allocated visas by the beginning of August, and the Department currently has around 300 approved applications simply waiting for additional visas to be allocated. That number will rise as State continues to process applications over the next few months.

We must remember that simply because a visa cap is reached does not mean that Congress must automatically allocate additional visas. In fact, Congress rarely does so in immigration programs.

I understand that proponents of this legislation claim that individuals waiting on a visa are in harm's way due to their work for the United States Government and the drawdown of U.S. forces in the region, but as with any immigration program, Mr. Speaker, we must also be cognizant of our duty to ensure the safety and security of the United States by making sure that anyone issued a visa is not a threat to our public safety or national security.

So when there are calls for this program to be extended once again before the balance of fiscal year 2015, the Judiciary Committee will be conducting oversight over the program. Such oversight will allow us to make educated decisions on how many, if any, special immigrant visas should be allocated for fiscal year 15.

I look forward to that oversight and urge my colleagues to support this bill that we have under consideration. I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your consultation with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 5195, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, which involves the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs under House Rule X. As a result of those consultations, I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that bill, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 5195, the Foreign Affairs Committee does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this, or any other, legislation. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5195.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5195, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program

It is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has Rule X jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 5195. I am, therefore, most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of the bill so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include your letter and this reply letter memorializing our mutual understanding in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5195.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5195 accomplishes the important goal of allowing these additional 1,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visas to be issued before the end of the calendar year.

As has been mentioned, this program was established in 2009 to protect Afghan nationals who were placed in grave danger because they were employed by or assisted the United States Government. Having benefited greatly from their faithful service, Members on both sides of the aisle recognized that we owed a debt of gratitude. We owed these people and their family members the opportunity to live safely and freely.

The Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program has not been without its problems. Many of us have come together over the years to complain that the process for issuing the visas was too slow and cumbersome.

Mr. Speaker, from the start of the program through fiscal year 2012, only 1,051 of the 8,500 visas authorized by statute had actually been issued to deserving Afghan nationals. In October of 2012, The Washington Post reported that more than 5,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visa applications were sitting in a backlog waiting to be adjudicated.

Secretary Kerry recently stated that because of ''unconscionably long processing times for applicants, some deserving people were simply falling through the cracks.''

Now, recently, the program has undergone major improvements. In this fiscal year alone, the State Department has issued more Afghan Special Immigrant Visas than in all previous years combined. The process is now moving swiftly enough that we are coming right up against the cap of 3,000 visas that we set earlier this year in the approps act.

That is where this bill comes in. By making these visas available to Afghan nationals who are facing danger precisely because they provided service to our country, to America, this bill will help ensure that we stand by our commitment to protect those who helped to protect us.

I think it is worth noting that keeping our commitment to these people—the large majority of whom acted as our translators in the field—is not merely a good in and of itself. It is important that the United States stands by its commitment here because we ultimately have to work collaboratively with people all over the globe.

We must ensure that the message we send through our actions is that we honor those who take great personal risks to assist our men and women serving overseas and we do not forget what they do.

Mr. Speaker, I support today's bill. I hope to work with my colleagues to support future extensions of this program, if necessary. I urge my colleagues to also support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a champion on this issue.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for helping to bring this to the floor very quickly, also to the Majority Leader-elect KEVIN MCCARTHY for his hard work and also to my good friend on the other side of the aisle, Representative BLUMENAUER, who has had a passion for this program since even before I got here.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we just get debating a lot of tough things, it is great to see times when Republicans and Democrats can come together and do things for those that fight hard on behalf of our country and on behalf of theirs.

The Special Immigrant Visa program was designed to provide safe refuge to the countless brave Afghan men and women who willingly put their lives on the line and served shoulder to shoulder with our servicemembers in Operation Enduring Freedom.

This program is critical to our national security and to our servicemembers and veterans in any future engagement that will likely come at some point in the future.

The SIV programs provide lifesaving protections to those who served in U.S. missions and now are in danger as a result at the end of that service. The Taliban are hunting these people down as we speak here today.

Because it is in our national security interest to keep these promises and protect our allies and simply because it is the right thing to do, I want you to think about for a second: In a time of war, what can American soldiers and American marines, airmen, and sailors do in order to communicate with the local population and to get them on our side versus a very tough and determined enemy? Of course, the basic thing to that is to be able to speak to the local population.

So you think about, in many cases, these young men and women—these translators that, in some cases, wouldn't even put on anything to obscure their face and would stand side by side with American soldiers against Taliban in very tough areas, many of them, now as America withdraws its mission from Afghanistan and winds down its mission, now find themselves under threat every day.

Whether we agree or we disagree with the war in Afghanistan and anything like that, the reality of it is this: we all can agree that those that were willing to stand by us and to stand against this very, very bad enemy well deserve to come here.

□ 1415

We of course want to ensure that we are going through the proper process, and I want to commend the State Department for recently improving their ability to process these applicants and to do so correctly and safely. But I also would remind folks that when we talk about the United States of America and who do we want here, people who are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with our soldiers and defend our cause and defend their cause are the ones we would like to see in the United States of America enjoying their freedom as well.

I mentioned earlier the threats that these people live under. It is estimated that multiple people are being killed every day who engaged in this kind of effort on behalf of the United States. So I want to commend everybody in this body for standing together to say that we need to stand with those who stood with us.

Recently there was a very interesting news special that talked about the reality of what was going on, and it interviewed a lot of these translators. Something that struck me the most was somebody who had been denied a visa, or at least it had taken a very long time to get, but he still had faith.

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

Mr. HOLDING. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. He stood up and said that he had faith that he was going to make it to the United States of America because the United States of America came to his country to help them, and he knows that the United States of America will do the right thing. It is inspiring to see that kind of belief in our country that we have, but to see it shared by people in war-torn areas.

So again to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, thank you. Representative BLUMENAUER, thank you for your friendship and your hard work.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding me the time to add my voice to this bill which addresses an issue of national security and affirms our moral commitment to those who have risked their lives on our behalf.

I especially want to give a shout-out to Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. KINZINGER for their diligence in getting this measure to the floor.

During our war in Afghanistan, our forces have been assisted ably and loyally by some Afghan nationals who have been essential to the mission and the lives of our military, especially Afghan interpreters. Now that we are leaving Afghanistan, these brave partners and their families face a mortal threat from the Taliban. They are relying on us to uphold our commitment to return their loyalty—and now that time has come—by allowing them to relocate to the United States.

This Special Immigrant Visa category recognizes the extraordinary debt we owe these partners. As Ms. LOFGREN mentioned, for a number of years, that category suffered from administrative neglect, and the visa process was hardly functional. In the past year, though, important improvements have been made to the processing system and many more of our Afghan allies are being admitted to the United States.

Among them is Janis Shinwari, who served a translator alongside U.S. troops and saved the life of U.S. Army Captain Matt Zeller, with whom he now has a lifelong bond. Janis is now a member of my staff in my district office in Alexandria, Virginia. He continues to hear the desperate stories of his fellow translators who are in great peril and desperately seek to leave Afghanistan. Unfortunately, there are no visas left for the many deserving Afghans who are still in this administrative limbo. In fact, State estimates that we will hit the statutory cap on visas this summer with thousands of applications still outstanding.

The 1,000 visas authorized under this emergency measure are necessary. This bill is critical, but it does not represent the end of our responsibility on this issue.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to ensure that an appropriate number of visas are authorized for 2015. We have to stand by our friends and ensure that those who

have the courage to work with us in future conflicts know that they will not be abandoned.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act, which would add 1,000 new visas for Afghans who served American troops.

This program was designed to provide safe refuge to the many Afghans who put their lives on the line and served with our troops in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. I served personally with several Afghans who literally bled for us and who still aspire to immigrate to America in conformity with our laws—exactly the kind of immigrants which we welcome.

This program is also critical to our national security and to our troops who, in the future, will again serve around the world and need support from local nationals. If we don't stand with these brave Afghans now, how will our troops in the future get the support they need?

Indeed, many Afghans who served with American forces are now hunted by the Taliban and other terrorist groups. Adding a thousand visas this year may be the difference between life and death for some of these brave Afghans, particularly as America withdraws our troops from that country.

Friends, colleagues, I urge you to support this bill because it is in our national security interests to keep our promises and protect our allies, and it is the right thing to do.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the author of this bill, who has been a tremendous advocate to make sure that America does the right thing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her leadership in working with us on this challenging problem.

Mr. Speaker, in a way this represents an amazing, positive development. I have been working in this area for 10 years, dealing with the plight of the foreign nationals that too often America was at risk of leaving behind. But in the course of our work, what has been celebrated here is that actually the challenge today is the result of the administration listening to Congress and improving a system that was fatally flawed—there is no polite way around it—but they have worked hard to improve it. As a result, the visas we have granted have expired. They are gone now. There are no more to be issued. These additional 1,000 visas are critical to be able to get us through this gap.

It is, Mr. Speaker, I think, testimony to the fact that people here in Congress can cross party lines, can work together cooperatively on problems where we are focused. I appreciate the kind words of my friend, Congressman KINZINGER. We wouldn't be where we are right now without him, his focus and his commitment.

I should probably talk about his staff, Michael Essington and Zach Hunter.

There are a list of people who are heroes in this fight that I hope we can spend a moment or two acknowledging because we did get cooperation from Majority Leader MCCARTHY, his security adviser, Emily Murry.

Chairman GOODLATTE, who has returned to this on numerous occasions, we wouldn't be here without him.

Leader CANTOR and his staff, particularly Robert Story Karem, who helped us navigate a similar crisis for the Iraq program last fall.

Our whip, STENY HOYER, and his policy members, Daniel Silverberg and Tom Mahr, were there. At times when there is a lot going on, there is a lot of controversy, there are competing interests, but they kept their eye on the ball to move this forward.

We have got some critical people in the outside world, the NGOs, particularly the Iraqi Refugee Assistance Project, and their gurus, Becca Heller and Katie Reisner, who helped provide the details, the push.

And I have to admit that there is a champion in my office, my legislative director, Michael Harold, who is as responsible as any one single person who just would not give up, late nights, early mornings, weekends, dealing with things that none of us want to know that happened behind the scenes. But the point is that we are here.

I am hopeful that this signals not just a new era in terms of our being able to get past this, but that we take a comprehensive look at the Afghans and the Iraqis that are left behind because we are facing additional deadlines, and we shouldn't have to go through this on a repeated basis. It takes time that could be better spent more appropriately.

I am confident, at the end, we will do the right thing, but we shouldn't go down to the deadline. We shouldn't create doubt in the minds of people who are waiting desperately, who are trying to evade the tender mercies of the Taliban and al Qaeda, who have long memories and who have hunted these people down. They have captured them and they have killed their siblings. They have tortured them, beheaded them. That is not a fate that they deserve.

I was at the National Airport when Janis Shinwari and Captain Matt Zeller were united, and it is a moment I will never forget. But our moving forward now with this legislation and committing ourselves to the big picture, doing it right on a cooperative basis, means that it will make the difference of life or death for thousands of others that are waiting in this pipeline, and it will make all of us feel better as we conclude this summer session that we are doing it on a note of the sort of thing that we should do, how we should do it, and why we should do it.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), who has herself served our country in the armed services.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is a proud moment that we are witnessing here today as we see a bipartisan team of leaders here in Congress who have so passionately been committed to this issue, taking action and finding a solution, not in an ideal way in this crunch time, but nonetheless finding a solution that will change people's lives.

When I first joined the military, one of the first lessons drilled into us as young privates by our drill instructors was the importance of teamwork, that we cannot be successful as individuals and how crucial it is for us to work as members of a team towards that singular mission. One team, one fight.

These Afghan interpreters and their families put their lives on the line right alongside our troops, not carrying arms, not carrying ammunition to defend themselves, but placing their lives in the hands of our servicemembers as they worked together to complete that mission. Through that sacrifice, they became a member of our team. They felt pain with our losses, and they felt victorious in our successes.

The very least that we can do is to take this small step and honor our commitment to our team members by passing H.R. 5195. This is one step towards keeping our promise and just beginning to repay the debt to these Afghan people who have served and sacrificed alongside us.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for allowing me a chance to share some words today, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

To my colleagues Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. BLUMENAUER, thank you for your continued leadership on this issue and many others. It has been through your persistence and perseverance that this day comes, and you deserve quite a bit of gratitude and recognition for your work.

Throughout the war in Afghanistan, U.S. servicemen and -women worked alongside thousands of Afghan partners who were employed as translators, as drivers, as cooks, as NGO staff, cultural advisers, and janitors. These Afghans risked their lives on a daily basis to come to work. They faced the very same violence, attacks, and threats as U.S. troops, but bravely put themselves in harm's way to aid in our shared mission.

As has frequently been the case in the past, when the United States began

to withdraw troops from Afghanistan, Congress created a Special Immigrant Visa program open to foreign nationals who served in critical roles and supported the American war effort. To date, more than 9,000 Afghans have benefited from the Special Immigrant Visa program. I am pleased to hear that the State Department has accelerated the processing time for these special visas in recent months, especially since there are over 6,000 still in the pipeline. However, as a result of this progress, the State Department is quickly running out of visas previously authorized by Congress.

The bill before us today will authorize 1,000 visas for the remainder of 2014 so that the State Department can continue processing applications for Afghan men and women who assumed enormous risks to aid our troops. Most importantly, this bill sends a message that the United States is a loyal partner, that we keep our word and we honor our promises, that we stand with those who stand with us in an ongoing fight for a fairer, freer world.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), and then I am prepared to close.

□ 1430

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

I won't take much time, except to say it is very inspiring—as I think it is important to note when it happens—to see both sides of the aisle talking about such a very important issue.

I think it is important to note that when we exit the shores of the United States, Americans stand together with those that stood with us.

This is going to be a very important message to our current allies, and, again, something that is important to understand, as we all know, as history repeats itself, that at some point into the future, and we hope it is far out into the future, America will find itself engaged in something similar again where we need the indigenous population to help us to give them freedom and to defeat evil terrorism, or whatever it may be at the time. This is a message that we are sending to future conflicts that we will stand with you.

This is also going to, Mr. Speaker, save the lives of American soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors in the future, as they have somebody that can help them to communicate with the local population and win the trust.

Again, for everybody involved, I want to just once again say thank you.

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

I will just thank all of the people who worked so hard on this, certainly on both sides of the aisle, and, most especially, Mr. BLUMENAUER, who has just been ceaseless in his efforts to make sure that these translators were not left behind and not forgotten.

A note on the future: I am happy to support this bill for 1,000 visas today. However, it is reported that there are 5,000 translators backlogged. Now, we don't know, in that 5,000, some may have been murdered already, some may have given up, or some may have gone elsewhere. We don't know that we are going to need an additional number of visas, but we need to open our hearts in the same spirit of bipartisanship that if we fall short, we are going to have to come together as a country. Because we all know, not only is this the right thing to do morally, but for our troops in the field it is essential.

People have to know in other countries that if they step forward to assist the United States, the United States will honor its promises to them.

That is why this bill is so important, not only for what it does, but what it stands for, and why I urge its adoption.

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

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

In closing, this is an important piece of bipartisan legislation. The Afghans, who benefit by this legislation, put their lives on the line for the United States of America. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

I look forward in the coming Congress to doing oversight to look at the further backlog of Afghans who may be eligible for visas, and look through oversight how this program is being administered and ensure that we are able to fulfill the promises that we have made to Afghans who have helped us in the field.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5195, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENOUNCING USE OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS BY HAMAS AND OTHER TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 107

Whereas the term ''human shields'' refers to the use of civilians, prisoners of war, or other noncombatants whose mere presence is designed to protect combatants and objects from attack;

Whereas the use of human shields violates international humanitarian law (also referred to as the Law of War or Law of Armed Conflict);

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 50(1) to the Geneva Convention defines ''civilian'' as, ''[a]ny person who does not belong to one of the categories of persons referred to in Article 4(A) (1), (2), (3), and (6) of the Third Convention and in Article 43 of this Protocol. In the case of doubt whether a person is a civilian, that person shall be considered a civilian.'';

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 51(7) to the Geneva Convention states, ''[T]he presence or movement of the civilian population or individual civilians shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular in attempts to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield, favour or impede military operations. The Parties to the conflict shall not direct the movement of the civilian population or individual civilians in order to attempt to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield military operations.'';

Whereas since June 15, 2014, there have been over 2,000 rockets fired by Hamas and other terrorist organizations from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Hamas has been using civilian populations as human shields by placing their missile batteries in densely populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques;

Whereas Israel drops leaflets, makes announcements, places phone calls and sends text messages to the Palestinian people in Gaza warning them in advance that an attack is imminent, and goes to extraordinary lengths to target only terrorist actors;

Whereas Hamas has urged the residents of Gaza to ignore the Israeli warnings and to remain in their houses and has encouraged Palestinians to gather on the roofs of their homes to act as human shields;

Whereas on July 23, 2014, the 46-Member UN Human Rights Council passed a resolution to form a commission of inquiry over Israel's operations in Gaza without a single mention of the indiscriminate rocket attacks by Hamas or the use of human shields, with the United States being the lone dissenting vote;

Whereas public reports have cited the role of Iran and Syria in providing material support and training to Hamas and other terrorist groups carrying out rocket and mortar attacks from Gaza;

Whereas throughout the summer of 2006 conflict between the State of Israel and the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Hezbollah forces utilized human shields in violation of international humanitarian law;

Whereas Al-Qaeda, Al-Shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and other foreign terrorist organizations typically use innocent civilians as human shields;

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

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

Whereas, during the most recent rocket attacks from Gaza, Iron Dome has successfully

intercepted dozens of rockets that were launched against Israeli population centers; and

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the use of innocent civilians as human shields;

(2) calls on the international community to recognize and condemn Hamas' breaches of international law through the use of human shields;

(3) places responsibility for the rocket attacks against Israel on Hamas and other terrorist organizations, such as Islamic Jihad;

(4) supports the sovereign right of the Government of Israel to defend its territory and its citizens from Hamas' rocket attacks, kidnapping attempts and the use of tunnels and other means to carry out attacks against Israel;

(5) expresses condolences to the families of the innocent victims on both sides of the conflict;

(6) supports Palestinian civilians who reject Hamas and all forms of terrorism and violence, desiring to live in peace with their Israeli neighbors;

(7) condemns Hamas' repeated refusals to accept a cease-fire with Israel;

(8) supports efforts to permanently demilitarize the Gaza Strip, removing Hamas's means to target Israel, including its use of tunnels, rockets, and other means; and

(9) condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased commission of inquiry into Israel's Gaza operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the chairman and ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH of Florida for their good work on this legislation. I am pleased to have worked with Mr. ENGEL and the leadership to ensure that this legislation was scheduled for the floor today for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation places responsibility for the escalation and violence squarely where it belongs: with the Iranian-backed terrorist group Hamas. Hamas is deliberately targeting Israeli civilians through the use not only of rockets but longer and longer range missiles—2,500 of these so far—aimed at cities—Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, attempting to attack Israeli communities. Remember, these attacks are at civilian populations, they are not at military installations. And Hamas is perpetuating the kidnapping and murder, which started with three Israeli teenagers.

Again and again, we have seen these incursions through these tunnels—32 new tunnels found so far—3 miles into Israeli territory. One of the amazing things, when you go into the tunnels, you see not only how they are used for these attacks, but what they have in reserve in these tunnels: ropes, syringes, tranquilizers, handcuffs, explosives, walls and walls of explosives. These were attempts to inflict mass casualty attacks on the civilian population.

$100 million is approximately what was spent on these tunnels, at the expense, I might add, of the Palestinian people. That is 4,000 trucks of equipment coming in over the border from Israel with cement—which was presumed to be used, hopefully, for schools or hospitals—with cement, with aggregate, with steel, instead used for the construction of these tunnels tunneling under Israel.

Less than 10 years ago, Israel pulled out of Gaza. The Strip was going to flourish without Israel's control. That was what we were told. But it wasn't supposed to be this way. It wasn't supposed to be a situation where Hamas would take resources and plow it into terror day by day.

Today, the Gaza Strip is a terrorist sanctuary on Israel's borders with sanctuaries within this sanctuary. We now know 32 of these are tunnels.

Beyond targeting Israeli civilians with kidnapping and indiscriminate firing of rockets, Hamas shows a callous disregard for the lives of the Palestinians it ostensibly represents. That is the purpose of this initiative here today, to call attention to that fact.

Earlier this month, the Hamas spokesman Sami Abu Zuhri appeared on Al-Aqsa television and encouraged Gaza residents to act as human shields. That is the responsibility they ask as they are hidden down in these tunnels. As they are in these bunkers, they ask their civilian population to go and make of themselves human shields in front of rocket launchers.

The world can't let terrorists embed their forces among the civilian population, using them as human shields, without speaking out. This is a direct violation of international humanitarian law and the law of war, sacrificing the innocent in an effort to protect those engaged in terror from an Israeli response.

Hamas is engaging in a crime of enormous proportions, perpetrated by those who are deliberately hiding among civilians to protect themselves. According to the Geneva Convention, the presence of the civilian population, or individual civilians, shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular, in attempts to shield military objectives from attack, or to shield, favor, or impede military operations. That is the Geneva Convention.

A full court press to discredit Israel is on in the United Nations. My question is: Where are the defenders of international law in condemning Hamas' use of human shields? I saw the report. There is no mention in there of the rockets being fired against Israel.

Yes, this is a case where Israel is using missile defense to protect its civilians, and Hamas is using their civilians to protect their missiles. It is a case where we have to recognize Israel's right to defend its people by taking necessary and appropriate force to neutralize the threat posed by Hamas.

Think about the recent discovery that Israeli security sources unearthed, evidence that Hamas was preparing to dispatch 200 terrorists via ten tunnels toward six Israeli communities with a goal of killing and kidnapping scores and scores of Israelis on the Jewish New Year. If that was on our border with Canada, how would we react?

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, which takes a strong stand against Hamas' crimes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 107, condemning Hamas' use of human shields in Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, on our TV screens and computer monitors, in the pages of newspapers and magazines, we have seen the bloody and brutal results of war. We have heard the reports of so many lives lost. No matter where you come from or what you believe, if you don't grieve over every innocent killed, you simply don't have a heart.

What is missing from many of these stories, though, is why these blameless men, women, and children ended up in harm's way. When Israel acts to defend itself, it does everything it can do to warn civilians and minimize loss of life. Israel warns Palestinians ahead of time, going so far as to say specifically where an airstrike is going to occur.

What does Hamas do, on the other hand? It forces Palestinians to stay in their homes, to stay in the line of fire. All the while, Hamas leaders cower in their underground tunnels. Then they have the cynicism to point their cameras at the dead, show the world the outcome of their human shield strategy, and blame Israel. It is despicable and it is shameful.

This resolution sends a clear message. The Palestinian people of Gaza should not have to take this anymore from Hamas.

It also makes clear that we support taking away Hamas' ability to wage terror campaigns.

As Secretary Kerry said on Tuesday:

> Any process to resolve the crisis in Gaza in a lasting and meaningful way must lead to the disarmament of Hamas and all terrorist groups.

Now is the time for the United States to stand firm in our support of Israel. Hamas has Qatar and Turkey, shamefully, to support them, and the rest of

the world has turned a deaf ear to Israel's pleas for security.

The U.N. Human Rights Council, which, frankly, is a joke, even voted to investigate Israel for war crimes, with the United States casting the courageous lone dissenting vote. We know the Human Rights Council typically has a muddled view of Israeli-Palestinian issues. But given the constant barrage of Hamas rockets, launched from civilian population centers, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out, and falling on Israeli civilian population centers, the Council seems especially out of touch.

We ought to mention something that is very important. This war started because Hamas keeps attacking the Israeli civilian population through the years with its missiles—civilians. So for Hamas to now fret over civilian casualties, which is the fault of them in both Gaza and Israel, really just rings hollow.

□ 1445

If Hamas were so concerned about human casualties, why does it target Israeli civilian populations, as it has all these years?

As Israel's security is threatened and its reputation is smeared—frankly, the media hasn't been helpful or even-handed—this moral equivalency between a terrorist group and a democratic country trying to protect its citizens is sometimes sickening.

The United States is the only one true friend that Israel has. We must always stand up for Israel's security, and we must state plainly that Israel is not alone.

I want to thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN and Representative DEUTCH for their leadership on this issue. They have done very strong work in bringing to light Hamas' deplorable crimes against the Israeli and Palestinian people. I also want to thank Representative STEVE ISRAEL and Representative TOM COLE for sponsoring a similar resolution, which the House passed just a few weeks ago.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE, who has worked diligently and hard to bring consensus to our committee, so we can speak with one voice to let the Israeli people know that when it comes to the support of Israel, support is strong and bipartisan from this Congress, and that is the way it should be.

So only when the world rejects Hamas and its tactics and when Hamas can no longer rain terrorist rockets on Israel and send the Palestinian to their deaths will peace between Israelis and Palestinians be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend, the chairman of our committee, ED ROYCE of California, as well as the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL, for their continued efforts in support of human rights and Israel's right to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution condemning Hamas' use of human shields in violation of international humanitarian law is an extremely important and timely measure, given the current situation in Israel and Gaza.

I want to first thank my colleague from South Florida, TED DEUTCH, for joining me in introducing this legislation. It was at an official factfinding mission trip that we took to the Middle East earlier this month where Ted and I realized how important this measure was needed.

While we were there, Hamas had already begun to increase the frequency of indiscriminate rocket attacks against Israel. Prime Minister Netanyahu was compelled to respond, but made it clear from the very beginning that the objective was to restore peace and security to the people of Israel and that quiet would be met with quiet, but Hamas would not relent and only increased its attacks.

While Hamas was firing rockets at innocent Israeli civilians, Israel was taking every step imaginable to avoid Palestinian civilian casualties. Hamas' response was to intentionally place the Palestinians in harm's way.

It stores its rockets and weapons underneath the homes of Palestinians and even in at least three schools run by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and it uses Palestinian men, women, and children as human shields, in violation of international humanitarian law, by placing its missile batteries in densely-populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques.

Mr. Speaker, the contrast between Israel—a legitimate sovereign state—and Hamas—a terrorist organization—could not be any clearer. Israel values and goes to great lengths to protect human life, while Hamas has no respect for human life and goes to great lengths to sacrifice anyone, including the Palestinian people, in the name of its war against Israel.

Israel has accepted repeated cease-fire offers. Hamas has rejected them all. While Israel seeks to fight terrorism, Hamas is an internationally recognized terror organization that is being supported by countries like Qatar in its war against our true democratic ally, Israel, yet it is Israel that wrongfully faces international condemnation for exercising her right to protect her citizens and defend herself and gets singled out when the world should be condemning Hamas.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Human Rights Council, an institution that has been leading the anti-Israel charge for years now and has since lost any legitimacy that it might have had, passed a resolution to investigate what it calls war crimes and human rights violations by Israel, not Hamas.

There was not even a word about Hamas' attacks against innocent Israeli civilians, nor Hamas' use of Palestinians as human shields. Of the 47 members on the Human Rights Council, you would think that there would be many voices of reason—or some voices of reason—to speak out against this obvious anti-Israel bias, but the United States was the lone voice of dissent against this anti-Israel resolution.

Our so-called European allies lacked the courage of their convictions, and they couldn't even muster the resolve to vote for or against the resolution. Instead, they abstained. This is a disgrace, and it is a shame.

If the United Nations Human Rights Council will not act and use its voice, that is why it is so important for the U.S. House of Representatives to pass this resolution and not only stand up for the Palestinian people who have been made pawns in Hamas' mission to destroy Israel, to their detriment, but for Israel in the face of this biased anti-Israel agenda.

We must be the counterbalance, Mr. Speaker. We must send a message to the world that we will continue to stand alongside Israel and that we will condemn Hamas and its use of human shields. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to stand up for our ally, Israel, and to stand up for human rights and American ideals and principles.

I thank the chairman, Mr. ROYCE, and the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, as well as my South Florida colleague, Mr. DEUTCH, for their help.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee and co-author of this resolution.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and especially Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for her partnership in this effort to call the world's attention to Hamas' use of innocent civilians as human shields. I also thank Casey Kustin of my staff, Eddy Acevedo of Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN's staff, and the committee staff as well, for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and I were in Israel the night that the world learned the tragic fate of the three Israeli teens: Eyal, Gilad, and Naftali. We mourned with the families and tens of thousands of others at their joint funeral, and we were there just days later when 16-year-old Mohammed Abu Khdeir was brutally and tragically murdered.

In the wake of these heartbreaking deaths, violence escalated when Hamas began indiscriminately launching rockets at Israel, with the sole purpose of causing terror and death. Israel responded.

Every civilian death is tragic. We continue to mourn the loss of innocent lives on both sides of this conflict, but we cannot forget how this started, and we cannot forget who is responsible.

It is Hamas that has chosen to launch 2,600 rockets at civilians. It is Hamas that hides rockets and rocket launchers in UNRA schools, in mosques, and even in hospitals, using the Palestinian people as cover for their weapon stockpiles and their rocket launchers.

It is Hamas that chose to spend millions of dollars digging tunnels into Israel to launch terrorist attacks and fortifying underground bunkers for its terror commanders, instead of investing, so that the people of Gaza have a chance at a prosperous future.

It is Hamas that is responsible for the miserable condition of the Palestinians in Gaza, even before this military engagement started.

As former President Clinton said last week:

> Hamas was perfectly well aware of what would happen if they started raining rockets in Israel. They fired a thousand of them, and they have a strategy designed to force Israel to kill their own civilians, so that the rest of the world will condemn them.

Mr. Speaker, while Israel warns the residents of Gaza of incoming attacks via text messages, phone calls, and leaflets, Hamas' spokesmen go on television to urge people to stay in their homes to act as human shields. This is a direct violation of the Geneva Convention. Let me be clear: the use of civilians as shields to protect military objectives is a violation of international law.

It is time for responsible nations to condemn this abhorrent behavior and condemn the use of innocent civilians as human shields.

Passing House Concurrent Resolution 107 won't stop Hamas from putting the lives of its citizens at risk as human shields, but it will make clear that the U.S. House condemns the terrorists who wants to destroy and murder Israelis—the terrorists who violate international law by using human shields.

I ask my colleagues to please support this resolution.

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

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

It has been said many times, but I think we should say it again: Israel uses its missiles to protect its citizens, and Hamas uses its citizens to protect its missiles. That says it all. That is just a disgrace, and it is a fact.

The United States must back Israel in its quest for security. Any cease-fire that is put forth must contain the total disarming of Hamas and the total destruction of those death tunnels that Hamas has been building to try to kill Israeli civilians. That concrete was allowed to be trucked in, under the eyes of Israel, because they were told that the concrete would be used to build schools and infrastructure. Instead, the concrete was used to build tunnels to kill Israelis. This really cannot be tolerated at all.

I would also say again that the media reporting of what is really going on in Gaza has been less than stellar. There are atrocities in Syria, but that seems to be yesterday's story. So while every death in Gaza and in Israel is something over which we grieve, there are more deaths in Syria every single day in that bloody civil war than there have been in Gaza, yet you hear no mention of it on the news. All you do is have cameras focused on Gaza.

War is hell. Nobody wants war, but a terrorist organization like Hamas must be told that terrorism cannot prevail.

Israel's fight is not with the Palestinian people. It is with Hamas, a terrorist organization that denies Israel's very right to exist and that wants to kill as many Israelis and Jews around the world and destroy the State of Israel. That is why the United States and the European Union have designated Hamas as a terrorist organization.

We need to put that in perspective. A terrorist organization that uses its own people as human shields is not to ever be taken seriously, nor has it the right to lecture anybody about the sanctity of human life.

In closing, let me say again that Israel has the right to self-defense. Hamas' use of human shields demonstrates just how much they devalue human life. The Palestinian people deserve better than Hamas. The Israeli people deserve better.

I want to again thank my friend, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DEUTCH, for their hard work on this issue. I want to thank my friend, Chairman ROYCE, for his leadership on so many issues, but on this issue as well.

Democrats and Republicans agree that we stand by our ally, Israel, and we condemn the terrorist organization Hamas, which uses its own people as human shields.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO). He is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 107.

This resolution denounces the cowardly act of using civilians—women and children—as human shields by Hamas and any other terrorist organization, which is in violation of international humanitarian law.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, I was proud to have worked with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL. It is my hope that this resolution sends a very clear message to Hamas that their abhorrent practice of using civilians as human shields must stop.

Hamas has continued to fire rockets indiscriminately into Israel from residential areas within Gaza, as well as having continued to store munitions near schools and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of human does this kind of thing? It is a coward. It is a person who does not value human life.

Since June of 2014, over 2,000 rockets have been fired at Israel. In response to the repeated rocket attacks, the United States and Israel have worked together on missile defense projects, such as the Iron Dome. The Iron Dome is an effective missile defense system. It has proven its worth time after time, intercepting dozens of Hamas rockets bound for densely-populated areas within Israel.

This resolution must pass in order to assure our Israeli allies of our commitment to them, as well as to send a very clear message to Hamas that their use of human shields must stop.

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

I was in Haifa, Israel, in August of 2006 during the second Lebanon war, during the war between Hezbollah and Israel. While I was there, I was in Haifa. Rockets were raining down. For 30 days, rockets rained down on that city. Air sirens were blaring during the day. It looked like a ghost town. It was very debilitating, as you can imagine.

What amazed me was the targeting of the civilian areas of that town and the targeting of the hospitals—the deliberate targeting of civilians. That was the goal. At one point, we had to go into a bunker when rockets were fired close to where we were.

The one takeaway I had was that out of that came the Iron Dome. In a few short years, that system, the Iron Dome, which they were working on, went from the drawing board to deployment and battle, proving its mettle, and it proved its ability to shield Israelis in the south from the Hamas rocket threat more recently. Congress, I think, can be proud of our role here in backing the Iron Dome, which is recognized as part of this resolution.

There is another part of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I have to tell you that Israel has more than the right to defend itself; it has the duty to protect its citizens. I saw what happened in Haifa—over 600 people in that one trauma hospital I was in.

It is exercising that responsibility right now to protect its people because, time and again, day after day, these rockets continue to be fired from these rocket launchers in Hamas-held territory.

No country would stand for the Hamas terror organization's rockets and tunnels. Remember, these tunnels come 3 miles into the border, 3 miles under Israel—one of them right outside an Israeli kindergarten. That is Hamas.

Of course, Hamas' whole reason for being, for any of you who have read its charter, is to attack Israel and to attack Jews. This nihilistic terrorist organization works to kill the maximum number of Israeli innocents while using its own population as human shields. Yes, that is a double war crime.

Since the last conflict, Hamas has improved on all aspects of its operation, courtesy of Iran. In the same

way Iran supplied Hezbollah, Iran supplies Hamas, and this could not have been done without the longer-range missiles—the M–302s—that Iran has now transferred into the inventory of Hamas, so that Jerusalem and Tel Aviv can be targets.

Earlier this month, my committee held a hearing that exposed Iran as the primary backer of Hamas through weapons, through funding, through missiles. Imagine the increase in material support to Hamas from Iran if that government—if the Ayatollah regime—is granted further sanctions relief as part of nuclear negotiations.

I ask all Members to join me in condemning Hamas on its despicable use of human shields and to continue to stand with Israel to face down the many shared threats that we face.

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart as death and violence once again rips the Middle East. Innocent civilians find themselves again hostage in a war that none of them sought. The rockets continue to rain down in Israel and civilians in Gaza find it harder and harder to find refuge. And there is no end in sight despite the ongoing work of peacemakers.

The most pressing need at the moment is an immediate ceasefire that ends the rocket fire, allows humanitarian aid to reach those in need, and lays the foundation for efforts to address Israel's long term security needs. I am disappointed by the absence of any language in this resolution supporting international efforts to bring about an immediate ceasefire. Additionally, no one has come forward today to argue how this legislation brings us any closer to a peaceful resolution in the region or an end to the violence, terror, and fear being experienced in Israel and Gaza.

Over 1,000 Palestinians have been killed so far, many, but not all of them civilians. Over 50 Israelis, including 3 civilians and two Israeli-American soldiers, have been killed so far. The key concern for me is the qualifier—so far. A key question at this volatile moment is how to end the violence. This resolution is absolutely silent on that point.

I strongly believe that we need to work for an immediate ceasefire to prevent further death and destruction in both Israel and Gaza. I commend the U.S. for continuing to seek an immediate ceasefire which I fully support. Despite the gallant attempts of the Secretary of State and the U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon and others, an agreement remains elusive and the violence continues.

The resolution rightly condemns Hamas, a terrorist organization that has shown time and again its disregard for innocent human life. The only party that seems to benefit from further chaos and loss of life is Hamas, which continues to lob rockets at innocent Israelis. The barrage of rockets must stop. Hamas has no regard for the lives it puts in danger. Its despicable tactics have been thoroughly denounced by the international community including the U.N. Secretary General who recently noted that "the United Nations position is clear: We condemn strongly the rocket attacks. These must stop immediately. We condemn the use of civilians—schools, hospital and other civilian facilities—for military purposes. No country would accept rockets raining down on its territory—and all countries and parties have an international obligation to protect civilians."

The resolution recognizes, as President Obama has, that Israel has a right to defend itself from relentless rocket attacks. The current rocket count is well over 1,000 and growing every day. Israel does not need authorization from the U.S. House of Representatives to act to stop the rocket fire by Hamas.

I have been to Sderot. I talked with Israelis living in the shadows of the rockets, including one woman whose relative was killed by a rocket from Gaza in a previous conflict. And I remember her fervent desire to live at peace with her neighbors.

I would point out that the resolution rightly recognizes that innocent civilians on both sides have suffered. According to the U.N., nearly 10% of the population of Gaza are seeking shelter at U.N. facilities, some of which have been attacked. The U.S. has recently announced it would provide $47 million to help meet immediate humanitarian needs in Gaza amid deteriorating conditions.

However, I remain concerned that this resolution does not press for an immediate ceasefire by all parties or urge or express support for efforts by the U.S. and international community to push for that peace. That is the best way to support innocent civilians on both sides—ending the violence that threatens them. You can't force peace on those who don't want it, but we must make every effort to offer a path out of misery and suffering and fear.

As President Obama has said, "Israel has a right to defend itself against rocket and tunnel attacks from Hamas." He also stated, "I've also said, however, that we have serious concerns about the rising number of Palestinian civilian deaths and the loss of Israeli lives. And that is why it now has to be our focus and the focus of the international community to bring about a ceasefire that ends the fighting and that can stop the deaths of innocent civilians, both in Gaza and in Israel."

As a Congress, we should join with the State Department, the U.N. Security Council, and others in urging all parties to redouble efforts to protect civilians, to find a way to end the violence and ensure peace and security for all, and to then move to find a long-term resolution that meets Israel's security needs and the rights of civilians to live in peace. This cycle of violence cannot continue indefinitely.

Innocent Israeli and Palestinian civilians cannot afford another three weeks of rocket fire and further bloodshed. We must continue to push for a ceasefire and to help find a long term solution that will allow Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace, side by side. What is needed now is de-escalation of violence and escalation of diplomatic efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 107, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 2014, at page H6953.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

General Omar Bradley, the former administrator of what is now the Department of Veterans Affairs, once said of our work, "We are dealing with veterans, not procedures—with their problems, not ours."

We have come face-to-face with the problems our veterans routinely encounter, and they are considerable to say the least. As every American now knows, congressional oversight and whistleblower revelations have exposed widespread corruption and systemic delays in access and failures of accountability across our Nation's second largest bureaucracy.

Thousands of veterans across this country have been left to wait—some for years; some in pain; and, most disturbingly, some in caskets that are draped with American flags; some while chronic or fatal conditions worsened until little hope was left—for the health care they earned through their honorable service to our Nation. Meanwhile, poor-performing VA leaders and employees continued to receive large bonuses, subject to little accountability for their many inadequacies.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Veterans Affairs, as we know it today, is in crisis, and as a result, our veterans are suffering. The conference report we are considering this afternoon is the first step to alleviating their pain and for paving the

way for the failing VA health care system to experience much-needed structural and cultural reform.

To immediately improve access to care for veteran patients, the conference report would require the VA to authorize non-VA care to any eligible veteran who is unable to secure a timely appointment at a VA facility or who resides more than 40 miles from the nearest VA medical facility, with certain exceptions.

Eligible veterans would include those who are enrolled in the VA health care system as of August 1 of 2014 or who are newly-discharged combat veterans.

It would further require the VA to issue a veterans choice card to eligible veterans to facilitate care provided by non-VA providers and provide $10 billion for the newly-established veterans choice fund to cover the costs of access to non-VA care under this bill.

To lead the way for true reform in the long term, the conference report would require a comprehensive assessment of VA care by an expert independent entity or entities and would establish a congressional commission on care, which would be charged with setting the future course for access to and quality care throughout the entire VA health care system.

To improve the VA's internal capacity to provide timely and high-quality care to our veterans, this report would also provide the Department with $5 billion to hire physicians and other clinical staff and would provide for certain critical physical infrastructure improvements.

The conference report would also extend the VA's rural health care-focused project, ARCH—a pilot program—for an additional 2 years. It would extend the pilot program for an additional 3 years to provide rehabilitation, quality of life, and community integration services to veterans with traumatic brain injury.

It would authorize 27 medical facility leases across 18 States and Puerto Rico and make certain improvements to care provided to veterans who have experienced military sexual trauma and others.

To advance genuine accountability for incompetent or corrupt senior managers, the conference report would reduce funding for bonuses available to VA employees by $40 million each year through fiscal year 2024, and it would authorize the Secretary to fire or demote Senior Executive Service employees and title 38 SES equivalent employees for poor performance or misconduct. Poor-performing employees who are disciplined under this authority would be provided an expedited and limited appeal process, but would be prohibited from receiving their pay, bonuses, or benefits during the appeal process.

This provision will give the Secretary the tools he needs to expeditiously hold senior managers accountable for the types of willful misconduct and possibly criminal negligence we have seen during our investigations.

The conference report would also require public colleges to provide instate tuition to veterans and eligible dependents for the school to remain eligible to receive GI Bill education payments.

This provision closely mirrors the bill that I offered, H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, which passed the House earlier this year. The men and women who served this Nation did not just defend the citizens of their home States; they defended the entire United States of America.

The conference report would also include approximately $5 billion in offsets with additional incidental offsets expected to accrue over time as a result of increased third-party collections for nonservice-connected conditions and reductions in Medicare payments as a result of the increased utilization of the newly-created choice program.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is one that I am proud of, but more importantly, it is one that I believe our Nation's veterans can be proud of. It is not a blank check for a broken system, but it is an important first step down a long road toward true transformation.

However, our work is far from over. We all know that congressional oversight was crucial to bringing the failures at the VA to light, and it will increase in the days and weeks and months ahead after the passage of this bill.

The passage of this conference report will increase access to care and improve accountability within a desperately broken bureaucracy. However, the reform that is necessary to reforming the agency will require dedication for years to come, and I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in beginning that effort today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 3230, the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, Senator SANDERS, Senator BURR, and the other members of the conference committee for working so diligently on this legislation.

Even when it looked like an agreement would not be possible to achieve a compromise and bring it to the House floor today, at the end of the day, we all worked together to make sure our national commitment to veterans is there. This compromise agreement can serve as a model on how Congress should look at serious problems facing our country and how to address them.

It has been a long road getting here. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee, under Chairman MILLER's leadership, has held over a dozen oversight hearings in the past couple of months alone. We have heard from veterans, their families, VA employees, and veterans service organizations about what is and what isn't working within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The measure before us today isn't a long-term solution to all of the VA's problems, but it is an appropriate and well-crafted response to the immediate problems of veterans not being able to access quality health care in a timely fashion.

This bill also takes important steps to begin to address the systemic problems within the Department of Veterans Affairs that have led to this crisis: too few doctors, inadequate infrastructure, and a management culture that is asleep at the wheel. It holds those whom the Nation has entrusted with our veterans' lives and well-being responsible for the outcomes.

For the 12 years that I have been on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have fought to ensure that our veterans, especially those who are living in rural areas, have access to quality health care. I fought for the needs of veterans returning from the current conflicts, while not forgetting the sacrifices and the needs of veterans from previous conflicts.

One of the successes that you heard from Chairman MILLER earlier I am most proud of is the Project ARCH. The Access Received Closer to Home project expands the opportunity for rural veterans to receive health care without long drives to a VA facility many miles away. I am pleased to see that the conference report extends and expands this important program. It is critical for the thousands of veterans who live in districts like mine. Many veterans in my district would be forced to make a nearly 600-mile round trip drive to the nearest VA facility if it weren't for ARCH.

Another important aspect of this bill not only deals with Senior Executive Service, but also the title 38 employees, which covers about 80,000 within the VA. It sets metrics and outcomes and accountability for those employees.

This bill also will address the immediate problem of long waiting times for health care, while beginning to strengthen the VA, so we are not facing the same crisis next year or the year after.

But I would also like to remind my colleagues that this bill is only the first step. After 12 years on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am more convinced than ever that we must begin to talk about the innovative solutions that will truly modernize the Department and better meet the needs of current and future veterans.

Far too often, the good intentions underlying the laws that we passed are stymied by an organizational structure that has originated back in the seventies and eighties. Far too often, the good intentions of the Department of Veterans' Affairs employees meet the wall of bureaucratic indifference. Far too often, our veterans ask for help and there is no one there at the other end to answer for that help.

This is totally unacceptable, and it is why I believe we must begin the work of radically restructuring the Department of Veterans' Affairs. We must restructure it to better assist our veterans, to better live up to the promises we have made to them. We need to look at the fundamental business model, the processes, the organization, the technology, the data and information and the workforce capabilities.

Our work today is to pass this conference report and get it to the President's desk as quickly as possible so that we can fix the current crisis. The work for tomorrow is the work that I ask each and every one of my colleagues to continue working on: to make sure that the Department of Veterans Affairs evolves to a new, more veteran-centered Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is going to take a lot of work and a lot of oversight, as you heard the chairman mention earlier. Once again, I would encourage my colleagues to pass this bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the conference committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman JEFF MILLER for his continued leadership as we work to provide our veterans with the care and benefits that they have earned.

Keeping the promises that we have made to our veterans and their families is of utmost importance to me and all Americans. This piece of legislation is a major step in the process of restoring veteran trust in the VA.

This bill will expand access to non-VA care, making wait times shorter and increase convenience. Although this will ensure veterans who are currently on a waiting list will get the timely care they deserve, much more needs to be done.

I am especially pleased that an independent congressional committee on care will be formed to look at the VA from the ground up. For lasting change to take place, the corrupt culture shown by some in the VA must be purged. It must be replaced with an ethos that puts the veteran first.

By authorizing the Secretary of the VA to fire senior employees that are guilty of poor performance or misconduct, this bill ensures that newly confirmed Secretary McDonald will have more tools to hold individuals accountable for their actions. However, granting this authority will mean nothing if it isn't combined with the leadership required to always do the right things for our veterans. Through his words and actions, Secretary McDonald must make it clear from day one that individuals will be held accountable, whistleblowers will be protected, and anyone responsible for poor performance, negligence, or preventable deaths, even, will be held accountable.

It has been an honor to serve with the chairman during this conference committee.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the VA conference report.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I thank Mr. MICHAUD and Chairman MILLER for their leadership on this important bill.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been working with my colleagues to ensure that veterans have access to the highest quality care in a timely fashion. This legislation before us takes important steps towards that goal.

I am especially pleased that the compromise includes three of my bills, which ensure that: one, all victims of sexual assault in the military, including those in the National Guard, have access to the care they need; two, that spouses of those who have died in service to our country get education benefits; and, three, more residencies are going to be funded at VA hospitals in areas of the country that are underserved by doctors in private practice.

Our committee, I know, will continue to work in a bipartisan fashion with the new Secretary to ensure that all veterans have access to the benefits and care that they have so bravely earned.

Today, we are acting on behalf of a grateful Nation to provide our country's heroes the care they need and restore their trust in the VA. So I urge my colleagues to support this conference report to the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a veteran, a physician, and also a member of the conference committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand before this body in support of the conference report, the first major step in providing timely, high-quality health care to the veterans who so selflessly served this great Nation. As a physician, veteran, and member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it was an honor to have served on the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, a corrosive culture has been allowed to exist within the Veterans Affairs bureaucracy for far too long and to the detriment of our veterans. The most important thing this bill does is give the veterans who are experiencing long wait times or live more than 40 miles from the nearest VA facility a choice. These veterans will now be able to obtain a veterans choice card, which will allow them to seek care in the private sector. Only by forcing the VA to compete will we achieve the cultural change that is required in how they serve veterans.

I have met with many physicians in recent weeks, and the desire to help our veterans is stronger than ever. Hospitals and physicians, alike, are ready and willing to care for veterans, helping to address a crisis created by VA mismanagement.

Moving forward, this report creates a process by which we can make significant strides toward accountability, by giving the VA Secretary the ability to fire senior employees who fail to do their jobs and ensuring that there will be swift, harsh penalties for knowingly misreporting or falsifying information.

This agreement will also improve educational benefits for veterans and their dependents.

As the founder and cochair of the House Invisible Wounds Caucus along with my friend TIM WALZ, I am pleased this report includes a provision to extend an important pilot program intended to help veterans with traumatic brain injuries for 3 more years.

The negotiations were tough, but I know the final product will have a very positive impact on the lives of our veterans, and I would like to thank the House and Senate VA committee staffs for all their late nights and hard work they put into this toward this worthy goal.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the chairmen, MILLER and SANDERS, for their leadership throughout this process, along with Ranking Member MICHAUD and Senator BURR.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this report.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3230.

As a member of the conference committee, I pushed for negotiations on this bill to continue because veterans have waited too long for the care they deserve.

This bill reflects the comprehensive, meaningful reforms that passed the Senate and that I introduced as the companion bill in the House. This bill ensures that rural veterans who live too far from a veterans' medical facility and veterans who have waited too long for an appointment can see a provider closer to home.

For the tribal veterans in my district, this bill strengthens the relationship between the Veterans Administration and the Indian Health Services.

This bill also ensures that the Veterans Administration can quickly hire more doctors, nurses, and medical professionals, and this bill gives the Veterans Administration Secretary the authority to hold VA employees accountable.

Our veterans deserve world-class health care and a VA that puts veterans first. I believe this bill provides the foundation to do just that. Again, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill so it can be signed into law without delay.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.

BENISHEK), a former physician within the VA system.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to the Veterans Access to Care Act.

As a doctor who served at the VA hospital in Iron Mountain, Michigan, for 20 years, I have seen firsthand how Washington bureaucracy can keep doctors and nurses from taking care of veterans. On its most basic level, this is the sacred mission of the VA, and the VA has failed.

Today we take an important step toward reversing that failure. Most urgently, our bill will allow veterans suffering long waits for care the option to be seen by a local doctor at a private hospital. I believe every veteran should have a choice as to where they receive care, and this bill moves us closer to that goal.

But this triage measure is not the long-term solution. That is why our bill directs the VA to tap the best health care minds that we have in this country to go step by step through the system and write us a blueprint for a lean, smart, 21st century VA.

Our bill is not perfect, and the problems at the VA will not be solved overnight. However, this landmark effort is the best chance we have had in years to make fundamental changes to the way the VA operates.

Make no mistake, our true test comes next. We must continue to keep the pressure on the VA long after the headlines have faded and the worst employees have been fired, because our veterans will still be there and they will still deserve to be at the top of our priority list.

As the father of a veteran myself, I am committed to refusing to let this issue go. We will demand results, and we will demand swift and full implementation of this legislation. Anything short of that is not worthy of our veterans and is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

□ 1530

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 35 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the most senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I strongly believe that the VA provides the best care for our Nation's servicemembers returning from protecting the freedoms we most hold dear, and I am committed to VA continuing their critical mission of serving our veterans.

VA has served the special needs of our returning veterans for over 75 years and has expertise in their unique health care needs, including prosthetics, traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, and a host of other veteran-specific injuries. My focus continues to be on ensuring that the VA retains the unique responsibility for the health care our veterans receive, regardless of the provider.

The bill includes critical language that I discussed with Senator BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont to ensure the VA has the final authority over the care that the veterans receive, whether at the VA or at non-VA providers. We need to continue to work with our veteran stakeholders to ensure the VA has all the resources it needs to provide superior health care to our veterans.

I am looking forward to working with the new VA Secretary. And I want to thank the past Secretaries. I have worked with past Secretaries from Jesse Brown to the present one.

I know a lot of people will say that we have given the VA everything they need. But of course many of us don't have institutional memory.

I remember the first time the VA got the real budget they wanted in 2009 under President Barack Obama, when we had a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. So a lot of us talk the talk, walk the walk, but don't really roll the roll.

So we have got to make sure as we move forward that we don't just talk about providing service, but that we really provide service and we ensure that the veterans have the service that the first President, George Washington, promised the veterans.

And I do want to thank our chairperson, Mr. MILLER of Florida, for his leadership and the way he has conducted our meetings, and also our ranking member.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute and 35 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a United States veteran and another member of the conference committee.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Chairman MILLER for his dedicated work on behalf of our veterans.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran and chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I have spent the past year working side-by-side with the members of my subcommittee and with Chairman MILLER to investigate and uncover the largest scandal in the history of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I am proud that Republicans and Democrats were able to put aside their partisan differences to focus on supporting our Nation's warriors with choice, accountability, and greater transparency. These reforms will allow veterans to vote with their feet if they cannot get an appointment within a reasonable timeframe at a VA facility.

I am also proud that we were able to include much-needed reforms on the treatment of victims of sexual assault in the military. The scourge of sexual assault in the military and the corruption of covered-up waiting lists at VA hospitals are shameful acts, and we must work together to confront them head on.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I congratulate Mr. MILLER, the chairman of the committee, and Mr. MICHAUD, the ranking member, for working together to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a bipartisan agreement. And while I have some serious concerns about a number of provisions of which I will speak, I am supporting it because it assigns resources to help cut down the waiting times for veterans to get the care they need and that we owe them. That must be our number one goal.

I remain deeply outraged, as so many of us are, by what transpired in Phoenix and at other VA facilities, where our wounded warriors were made to wait weeks, months to get an appointment and receive treatment, including for serious postdeployment mental health issues. That is not acceptable. This is more than unacceptable, however. It is unconscionable.

I think there is wide agreement on both sides of the aisle that any VA personnel who facilitated this wrongdoing or undermined veterans' health care must be held accountable.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with provisions in this bill regarding the removal of senior executive personnel. While this bill does improve on the House version by adding a 21-day period for appeals, it still undermines civil service protections that had been in place for decades to ensure a merit service, not a politicized, patronage service.

There are already strict rules in place that facilitate the swift removal of SES officials who do not perform their jobs responsibly, as there should be.

Those protections strike the right balance between giving agencies the authority to remove personnel without trampling on the due process rights of SES employees, who need to do their job without fear of political reprisal or arbitrary removal.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses major challenges at the VA. It provides resources to ensure that our veterans can access health care at private facilities if they face a very long wait or live in rural areas far from VA doctors.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And it makes health care services more available and accessible to veterans through additional resources for medical and other VA personnel.

This, of course, is not a perfect bill. But then again, I don't think I have ever voted for a perfect bill. But this is a good bill that moves in the right direction.

Again, I congratulate Mr. MILLER and Mr. MICHAUD on their work on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), another member of our conference committee and an outstanding member of the full committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD, on behalf of the 54,000 veterans in my district and the 20 million around the country, thank you. And to every conferee that has served on this conference committee, thank you. This is a huge step forward today, and I am grateful to have been a part of this process. The need for this legislation and for our conference committee to have worked together was great, and it has been an incredible experience.

Let's not forget, in the past decade, nearly 1,000 veterans have died as a result of substandard treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and many more cases are under investigation. Mr. Speaker, 50,000 new patients have waited at least 90 days for their first appointment at VA hospitals. VA staff have admitted to falsifying medical appointment dates to fit within the agency's wait time performance goal of 14 days. All these facts have been simply appalling. All of us in Congress have constituents who have been directly impacted by this scandal.

The need for the legislation is so timely today. I just came from the World War II Memorial, and I thanked a veteran from the Chicagoland-Indiana area. I shook his hand, looked him in the eye, and thanked him for serving our Nation. He stood up out of his wheelchair, looked me in the eye, and said: ''Thank you for fighting for us.'' It just simply shows how important this is. This is an opportunity, as legislators, to take the first steps toward real change at the VA.

So today we stand together to help our Nation's heroes. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with nothing but the best. However, echoing the chairman's comments, simply providing a financial boost to an agency that has repeatedly demonstrated awful management practices will not solve the problem.

In the coming weeks and months, we must continue to stand together to ensure additional improvements are made to the VA. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen very much on behalf of the State that has one of the largest populations of veterans, including those in my congressional district. I would like to say thank you.

To Ranking Member MICHAUD and Chairman MILLER, thank you for allowing me to sit in on a hearing. Thank you to the conferees. Thank you for understanding that, when our soldiers put on the uniform, have any of us ever had them question why? And therefore, we should never question why are we giving the best service that we can give to our veterans.

I am grateful for the $5 billion that allows this temporary flexibility, that if you cannot get service, you are, in fact, able to go to civilian doctors.

The professionals that are going to be added with primary and specialty doctors are the TMI, housing, PTSD, sexual assault. All of these are making a difference.

In the name of the World War II veteran that I saw in Normandy, by the name of Curtis, a veteran in my district who had an appointment in 2013 and never heard back from the veterans hospital, in his name, I believe that this is the most important opportunity. We should vote for this and be able to provide our veterans with the promise we have made to them: You serve, and we will serve you.

God bless America.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report to H.R. 3230, ''Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.''

We must remember that freedom is not free and pause to recognize the valor and self-sacrifice of our nation's veterans.

We also need to keep our promises to the nation's more than 2 million troops and reservists and 23 million veterans.

I support the Conference Report for 6 principle reasons. The legislation before us:

1. Expands access to health care for veterans;
2. Addresses the shortage of health professionals in the VA;
3. Ensures access to care for rural veterans;
4. Provides funding to establish 27 new VA clinics;
5. Expands access to education for veterans and their families; and
6. Extends a community-based housing program for veterans.

Specifically, the conference report provides that the bulk of the funding in this agreement—$10 billion in emergency funding—be used to expand access to non-VA health care options for veterans who have been left waiting for more than 30 days for an appointment or live more than 40 miles from the nearest VA facility.

Additionally, the bill provides $5 billion to VA to hire more primary and specialty care physicians and other medical staff and includes incentives to attract more doctors, nurses and other medical personnel to the VA, and to increase medical education opportunities to attract doctors in the future.

Third, the bill extends the ARCH (Access Received Closer to Home) pilot program for two years. The ARCH program expands VA's ability to serve veterans who live far from VA facilities in Northern Maine; Farmville, Virginia; Pratt, Kansas; Flagstaff, Arizona; and Billings, Montana.

Fourth, the bill expands VA authority to provide counseling, care and other services to veterans and certain other non-veteran service members who have experienced military sexual trauma during active or inactive duty training (including members of the National Guard and Reserves). The legislation also requires the VA and DOD to conduct an annual assessment focused on the transition and continuum of care from DOD to VA for those who have experiences military sexual trauma.

Fifth, the conference report includes $1.5 billion to lease 27 new VA clinics, including a new research facility in my home city of Houston, Texas, bringing care closer to where veterans live and increasing access to specialty care services.

Sixth, the Conference Report permits veterans who are eligible for education benefits under the Post 9–11 New GI Bill to qualify for in-state tuition and it expands the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to include spouses of members of the Air Force who die in the line duty while serving in active duty.

Finally, the Conference Report gives the VA Secretary the authority to immediately fire or demote senior executives based on poor job performance or misconduct but includes an expedited appeals process for terminated employees to prevent political firings and protect whistleblowers from retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, my state of Texas and Houston appreciates the service and sacrifices of veterans and takes care of them.

The Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center, for example, located in Houston, Texas serves the 32,477 veterans and is the primary healthcare provider for almost 130,000 veterans in southeast Texas.

Veterans from around the country are referred to the DeBakey VA Medical Center for specialized diagnostic care, radiation therapy, surgery, and medical treatment including cardiovascular surgery, gastrointestinal endoscopy, nuclear medicine, ophthalmology, and treatment of spinal cord injury and diseases.

DeBakey VA Medical Center provides vital healthcare services to Veterans in the Houston area and through the nation.

I am proud to support the Conference Report since veterans from Houston and surrounding regions will benefit with the establishment of a new facility that will extend access to specialty care services.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to long wait times at VA facilities, many veterans face a number of other challenges, including homelessness, coping with PTSD, and finding suitable employment in the civilian job market.

To address these problems, earlier this year I was successful in passing amendments to this year's Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act and the Defense Appropriations Act providing additional funding and resources targeted to helping homeless veterans secure housing and treating veterans suffering from PTSD in underserved urban and rural areas.

I also introduced H.R. 4110, the ''Transitioning Heroes Act of 2014,'' which provides strong tax incentives for employers to hire, retain, and employ veterans in positions that take maximum advantage of their skills and experience.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in the military have fulfilled a commitment to this nation and to each other that we should imitate in our actions to work to provide for veterans now that their military service has ended.

That is why as Members of Congress we need to make sure our veterans receive the best medical care that modern medicine has to offer to them and their families.

That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report to H.R. 3230, "Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014."

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the full committee and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today I rise in support of the VA conference report on H.R. 3230. The Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 is a positive first step toward reforming the VA, which provides, among other things, relief to veterans who have waited excessively to receive the health care they have earned at a level of quality they deserve, Mr. Speaker.

This bill also includes real accountability provisions, allowing the VA Secretary to fire or demote Senior Executive Service employees for lack of performance and management negligence.

This reform package is focused around ensuring the veteran has timely access to quality care and includes language to authorize 27 major medical facility leases, including one in Pasco County, Florida, in my congressional district.

The veterans in my area will soon have the ability to seek treatments at a consolidated clinic, thanks to Chairman MILLER, as opposed to having to travel between the main clinic and four other satellite facilities.

Authorizing these leases will improve the timeliness for veterans to receive care in Pasco County and in 17 other States throughout the Nation, as well as Puerto Rico.

Passage of this bill is the beginning, not the end. Obviously much work needs to be done. However, immediate action needs to be taken to get veterans off waiting lists and ensure they receive care within the VA health system or in the private sector, if they so choose. The veteran should have the choice. We need to get this done for our veterans.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to thank Chairman MILLER for the gracious way that he has conducted the committee hearings, and I thank Ranking Member MICHAUD for his hard work.

Principally, I am very pleased that this conference report also includes 1,500 funded graduate medical school education slots at veterans facilities around this country. It was a good thing that we approved access to non-VA care for those servicemembers, those veterans who have been on waiting lists for far too long. But that would not be satisfactory to those areas of the country that are experiencing physician shortages. This is a huge, huge accomplishment for a Congress that is so partisan to approve these 1,500 funded GMEs.

I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this bill.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I want to take a moment to share a little about what this bill means for my Kansas veterans.

Since coming to Congress, I have heard dozens of stories from Kansas veterans about their troubles with the VA. They have shared about how they are required to travel hundreds of miles for simple medical tests or to renew their prescriptions, all the while, driving past dozens of local hospitals and other health care providers with the ability and desire to meet their needs locally. Many Kansas veterans drive halfway across the State or to Colorado, Nebraska, or even Texas to get their simplest health care needs met.

In fact, just yesterday, my office had to step in to help a 94-year-old World War II veteran. The nearest VA hospital was 240 miles away. He just had a recent serious surgery, and they said, you have to come into the hospital to renew your prescriptions.

□ 1545

Thankfully, I was able to contact the VA and ensure this veteran could get his care in his local community, but as I tell folks in Kansas, you shouldn't have to call your Congressman to get the care you deserve.

With this bill, hundreds of rural Kansas veterans will be able to use their new veteran choice card or Project ARCH, call their local doctor, and get their health care needs met. Just like Medicare or TRICARE, veterans should have the choice to schedule their own appointments, pick their own doctors in their own communities.

When our veterans come back from serving and defending our country and return to communities across the United States, most of them don't ask for much, but I want our veterans to know that I believe you deserve the best, not just the mediocre, scandal-plagued culture we have seen at the current VA.

This bill is just plain common sense. It is a big first step towards giving veterans real choice and real accountability. As this law is implemented, I remain committed to continuing to ask the hard questions and working to return the VA to its true mission, to serve our veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for bringing this Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act to us today.

In medically-underserved communities, where health care staffing shortages have caused delays in appointments, this conference agreement will help provide critical investments so that the VA can begin hiring the doctors it needs to serve our veterans.

It will help to reduce the backlog in VA construction and maintenance projects. It will help to ensure that veterans unable to get a medical appointment at a VA facility will be able to get the care they need from a non-VA provider.

This legislation can do a lot of good, but it is only a first step. The bill must be implemented, regulations issued, and scarce moneys allocated to ensure that veterans get the care that this legislation promises.

We must not lose sight of the rural, underserved areas in our Nation like in southern West Virginia, where veterans are elderly and travel is costly and burdensome. We must not lose sight of the need for medical facilities and health providers in those areas.

I urge the VA to remember rural veterans as it implements this bill, and I certainly aim to help to ensure that it does so. Again, I commend the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to us today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), someone who always has veterans first in his mind.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a necessary repair for our vets' damage that was caused by VA workers who were willing to allow veterans to die by denying them care, ostensibly to receive a bonus.

Leave no doubt that this is a patch and that the VA requires a complete overhaul. For example, 7 years ago, the VA hospital in Omaha was deemed to be in such poor condition it needed to be replaced ASAP. It was put on the official list, and in those 7 years since, the project has actually fallen down the list, as few projects have been completed.

The VA is just not able to manage major projects. The entire Nebraska delegation wrote then-Secretary Shinseki over a year ago to meet and discuss the lack of progress and possible alternatives, but he refused to meet with our delegation, even after repeated requests.

This is evidence of total dysfunction of this VA in Washington, D.C. My hope is that the new VA Secretary will be more accommodating to listen to the Nebraska delegation whose sole goal is simply to help our veterans receive the appropriate care in a building that meets at least today's standards.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to rise today in support of the Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 and to commend Representative MILLER and Representative MICHAUD for their leadership in getting this bill to us and this conference committee report to us today.

As the son of a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, I say it is long overdue that Congress took action to provide the quality of care that our veterans have earned. I am here today to fight for veterans in southern Arizona, of which I represent 85,000, and veterans all across this Nation.

I have been pushing for better access to health care for our veterans since I came to Congress a little over 2 years ago. This has become even more urgent given the tragedy, the disgraceful behavior that we have uncovered in Phoenix and potentially across veterans centers in our Nation. To play games with our veterans to get bonuses is despicable, and this bill, I hope, will move us in a direction of correcting those terrible actions.

One of the first bills I introduced was the veterans' access to health care bill to ensure that veterans could get health care they need in their communities, and this bill, I am glad to say, includes that provision. I commend the leader, the chairman, and the ranking member for their work, and I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for this important bill for our veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the conference committee report, asking all of our fellow members to support it, and I congratulate the chairman with whom I had a rather spirited conversation on this floor, as well as the ranking member on accomplishing the first step, I think, and it is the first step, but it is a significant step.

I am particularly proud that two of the provisions that I came to this floor to argue for—that being additional facilities, including an expansion of the facility in San Antonio, as well as additional support personnel, medical personnel, and health care personnel—are included in this bill.

This bill includes so much more: a graduate medical education component and, in addition, educational opportunities for spouses and families. This is an incredible first step.

I, again, want to underscore my thanks to the chairman, to the ranking member, to the members of the conference committee, and this is a great first step at putting us in the right direction towards finally treating our veterans with the respect that they not only deserve, but they have earned over the period of their service.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to state my support for this agreement, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, and thank both Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their leadership on bringing this issue to a resolution.

Last week, I offered a motion to instruct as a way to spur a bipartisan solution and to ensure that vets on the GI Bill could pay lower instate college tuition. I am happy that that provision has been included.

Enacting the measures offered in this plan will go a long way toward improving veterans health care though, as everyone noted, there is much more work to be done. The more than 200,000 veterans who live in San Diego County deserve access to the medical care and benefits America has promised them and they have earned.

It is my hope that our action today will give new hope to the many vets who felt despair and disappointment at the way they have been treated by the VA after all they have sacrificed. Today, we send a bipartisan message to them: America keeps its promises to our veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am ready to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 3230. This is a very important bill. It is a bill that we have worked long and hard over the last several months. It is one that took into consideration a lot of the concerns that Members from both sides and both bodies had, and we came together with this bill.

I do want to thank Chairman MILLER for his hard work and dedication to our veterans and their families. We would not be here today if it wasn't his determination in having strong oversight hearings over the last couple of months within our committee.

I also want to thank staffs on both sides, the majority and minority staff. I know they have put in thousands of hours for oversight hearings to work on this conference report to get us where we are today. We could not have done it without our dedicated staffs on both sides of the aisle going through this document and making sure that every Member's concerns were addressed in this document.

With that, I want to once again thank the chairman for your hard work on this effort and look forward to the vote on this. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say thank you to the ranking member of the full House committee, Mr. MICHAUD, for his tenacity in what he has done to move this conference report along.

I also want to say thank you to the ranking member, Mr. BURR, in the Senate and to Senator SANDERS because, as we continue to negotiate through, there never was a willingness to quit by either side.

I am grateful to the 24 other conference committee members who worked with us, with their input, their ideas, and their willingness to embrace this compromise. It was brought forth by diligent, focused effort and a willingness on all sides to put aside differences of opinion and ideology and focus not on our disagreements, but how best we can all help our veterans.

While not perfect, this is an example of all the good work we can accomplish when we work together, and remember, it is the veteran who is sacred, not the VA.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, there is no Federal agency more deserving of our attention than the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA has served generations of heroes who have sacrificed on behalf of our country and we have an obligation to take care of them when they come home.

Without a doubt, the American people expect and veterans deserve the best service possible and I firmly believe that it is a duty of all of us in Congress to ensure that no one betrays the sacred trust owed to our Veterans.

The failure and mismanagement of care for our veterans that has come to light through the IG's investigation over the past two months must never be repeated, and I trust that this bill will go far to help reverse the failures, and ensure better future treatment of veterans at the VA.

I think this conference report contains provisions that will help provide timely care to veterans, hold the management of the Department of Veterans Affairs accountable, uphold the integrity of the department, and improve education benefits for veterans and their dependants—representing a major step in the right direction in meeting those obligations.

Specific measures to do so include; providing $5 billion to the VA to hire additional physicians and other medical staff, authorizing a system for the VA to fire or demote management level employees for poor performance or misconduct, and increasing access to non-VA care for those veterans in dire need.

Yesterday, we were greeted with the good news of the Senate confirmation of the new VA Secretary, Robert McDonald. While the Senate acted swiftly on the confirmation of McDonald, I was disappointed to see that the Senate Appropriations Committee Chairwoman was unable to bring the FY 2015 MilCon/VA Appropriations bill to floor due to objections from the Senate Minority. If we truly wanted to get the ball rolling to make the VA better the Senate Minority should allow the bill to come to the floor.

Nevertheless, I also have full expectation that with the passage of this conference report it is going to be important that this Congress hold Secretary McDonald and his subordinates fully accountable moving forward.

Many in Congress are concerned about the cost of this bill. One way to help pay the cost of improved health care for veterans would be to improve third party collections.

Section 201 of the bill authorizes an independent assessment of a number of VA activities. Among other provisions, the assessment would report on ways to increase funds owed to the VA by third parties.

Over the past dozen years, the GAO and the VA/OIG have issued more than a dozen reports outlining the problems with third party reimbursement. I hope that the assessment team will not reinvent the wheel.

We already know that the VA has increased its billings for these services, but its collection rate has decreased or has remained stagnant. As a result, in FY13 alone, the VA failed to collect more than $3 billion in billings. Between FY07 and FY13, the VA left nearly $23 billion on the table.

The assessment should include specific directives for the improvement of the entire billings and collections process—from initial billing to denied claims to appeals of denied claims. The private sector seeks to maximize reimbursement. The VA should do no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on H.R. 3230.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 694;

Adopting House Resolution 694, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and adopting the conference report on H.R. 3230.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 676, AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 935, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2014, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 694) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing 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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—10

Clay
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Garrett
Gosar
Hanabusa
McKeon
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Sires

□ 1623

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. RICHMOND and LANGEVIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—196

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

NOT VOTING—9

Clay
Cleaver
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Hurt
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Sires

□ 1633

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 466, a recorded vote on H. Res. 694. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report to 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, 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 Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 5, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—420

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
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
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx

Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
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
Marchant
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)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
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
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—5

Crawford
Jones
Kingston
Sanford
Stockman

NOT VOTING—7

Clay
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Sires

□ 1640

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 3230

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 111

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 101(a)(1)(B)(i), insert before the period at the end the following: ", including any physician furnishing services under such program".

(2) In section 101(d)(3)(A), insert after "1395cc(a))" the following: "and participation agreements under section 1842(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(h))".

(3) In section 101(d)(3)(B)(i), strike "provider of service" and insert "provider of services".

(4) In section 101(d)(3)(B)(i), insert before the semicolon the following: "and any physician or other supplier who has entered into a participation agreement under section 1842(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(h))".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1645

AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules printed in the resolution is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

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

H. RES. 676

Resolved, That the Speaker is authorized to initiate or intervene in one or more civil actions on behalf of the House of Representatives in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction to seek any appropriate relief regarding the failure of the President, the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or employee of the executive branch, to act in a manner consistent with that official's duties under the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to implementation of any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, including any amendment made by such provision, or any other related provision of law, including a failure to implement any such provision.

SEC. 2. The Speaker shall notify the House of Representatives of a decision to initiate or intervene in any civil action pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 3. *(a) The Office* [The Office] of the General Counsel of the House of Representatives, at the direction of the Speaker, shall represent the House in any civil action initiated, or in which the House intervenes, pursuant to this resolution, and may employ the services of outside counsel and other experts for this purpose.

(b) The chair of the Committee on House Administration shall cause to be printed in the Congressional Record a statement setting forth the aggregate amounts expended by the Office of General Counsel on outside counsel and other experts pursuant to subsection (a) on a quarterly basis. Such statement shall be submitted for printing not more than 30 days after the expiration of each such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the consideration of H. Res. 676.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to discuss the unwarranted, ongoing shift of power in favor of the executive branch.

Under President Obama, the executive branch has increasingly gone beyond the constraints of the Constitution. In fact, in a number of instances, the President's actions have gone beyond his article II powers to enforce the law and have infringed upon the article I powers of Congress to write the law.

We are here today because, at the beginning of this Congress, every Member of this body took an oath of office in which we swore to ''support and defend the Constitution of the United States.'' At the beginning of each Presidential term, the President takes an oath to ''faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States and . . . to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.'' While these oaths are slightly different, the object of both oaths is the same. The President and Members of Congress have an obligation to follow and defend the Constitution.

The text of the Constitution that we have sworn to defend provides separate powers for each branch of the Federal Government. Article I puts the power to legislate—that is, to write the law—in the hands of Congress. Article II, on the other hand, requires that the President ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'' The difference is important. The Founders knew that giving one branch the power to both write and execute the law would be a direct threat to the liberties of the American people. They separated these powers between the branches in order to ensure that no one particular person, whether it be the President or a Member of Congress, could trample upon the rights of the people.

My fear is that our Nation is currently facing the exact threat that the Constitution is designed to avoid. Branches of government have always attempted to exert their influence on the other branches, but the President has gone too far. Rather than faithfully executing the law as the Constitution requires, I believe that the President has selectively enforced the law in some instances, ignored the law in other instances and, in a few cases, unilaterally attempted to change the law altogether.

These actions have tilted the power away from the legislature and toward the Executive. They have also undermined the rule of law, which provides the predictability necessary to govern a functioning and fair society. By and large, this country is founded upon the rule of law, and this tilts that balance. By circumventing Congress, the President's actions have marginalized the role that the American people play in creating the laws that govern them. Specifically, the President has waived work requirements for welfare recipients, unilaterally changed immigration laws, released the Gitmo Five without properly notifying Congress, which is the law, and ignored the statutory requirements of the Affordable Care Act.

We have chosen to bring this legislation forth today to sue the President over his selective implementation of the Affordable Care Act because it is the option most likely to clear the legal hurdles necessary to succeed and to restore the balance between the branches intended by the Founders. This administration has effectively rewritten the law without following the constitutional process.

When the executive branch goes beyond the constraints of the Constitution and infringes upon the powers of the legislative branch, it is important that the remaining branch of government—the judiciary—play its role in rebalancing this important separation of powers. After all, the constitutional limits on government power are meaningless unless judges engage with the Constitution and enforce those limits.

My friends in the minority do not seem to believe that the judiciary is up to its role in rebalancing the separation of powers. I disagree. Yesterday, at the Rules Committee, Members of the minority argued that this lawsuit is frivolous and a waste of time. They argued that if this litigation were to go forward that it would lead to countless lawsuits between the branches of government.

What my friends in the minority might fail to tell you—but I will today on the floor—is that they were for suing the President before they were against it. Eight years ago, in 2006, some Members of the minority, including the ranking member of the Rules Committee—the gentlewoman from New York—were plaintiffs in a lawsuit filed by congressional Democrats against then sitting President George W. Bush.

That is right. Eight years ago, my friends across the aisle filed a lawsuit against the President, brought by Members of one half of the Congress. The Democratic ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, who is also a plaintiff, argued that he was alarmed by the erosion of our constitutional form of government and by a President who shrugged about the law. After consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the Nation, he said he had determined that there was one group of people who was injured by the President's lack of respect for checks and balances—the House of Representatives.

I want to echo one line that he argued at the time regarding the separation of powers:

> If a President does not need one House of Congress to pass the law, what is next?

Perhaps this makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from The Huffington Post, on April 26, 2006, by the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan. It is entitled, ''Taking the President to Court,'' in which he made a compelling argument as to why Members of the House could, in fact, have standing to sue the President.

[From The Huffington Post, July 30, 2014]

TAKING THE PRESIDENT TO COURT

As some of you may be aware, according to the President and Congressional Republicans, a bill does not have to pass both the Senate and the House to become a law. Forget your sixth grade civics lesson, forget the book they give you when you visit Congress—''How Our Laws Are Made,'' and forget Schoolhouse Rock. These are checks and balances, Republican-style.

As the Washington Post reported last month, as the Republican budget bill struggled to make its way through Congress at the end of last year and beginning of this year (the bill cuts critical programs such as student loans and Medicaid funding), the House and Senate passed different versions of it. House Republicans did not want to make Republicans in marginal districts vote on the bill again, so they simply certified that the Senate bill was the same as the House bill and sent it to the President. The President, despite warnings that the bill did not represent the consensus of the House and Senate, simply shrugged and signed the bill anyway. Now, the Administration is implementing it as though it was the law of the land.

Several public interest groups have sought to stop some parts of the bill from being implemented, under the theory that the bill is unconstitutional. However, getting into the weeds a bit, they have lacked the ability to stop the entire bill. To seek this recourse, the person bringing the suit must have what is called ''standing,'' that is they must show they were injured or deprived of some right. Because the budget bill covers so many areas of the law, it is difficult for one person to show they were harmed by the entire bill. Thus, many of these groups have only sought to stop part of it.

After consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the nation, I determined that one group of people are injured by the entire bill: Members of the House. We were deprived of our right to vote on a bill that is now being treated as the law of the land.

So, I am going to court. With many of my Democratic Colleagues (list appended at the bottom of this diary), I plan to file suit tomorrow in federal district court in Detroit against the President, members of the Cabinet and other federal officers seeking to have a simple truth confirmed: a bill not passed by the House and Senate is not a law, even if the President signs it. As such, the Budget bill cannot be treated as the law of the land.

As many of you know, I have become increasingly alarmed at the erosion of our constitutional form of government. Whether through the Patriot Act, the Presidents Secret Domestic Spying program, or election irregularities and disenfranchisement, our fundamental freedoms are being taken away. Nothing to me is more stark than this, however. If a President does not need one House of Congress to pass a law, what's next?

The following is a list of co-plaintiffs on this lawsuit. I would note that I did not invite every Member of the House to join in the suit, and I am certain many, many more Members would have joined if asked. However, this was not possible for various arcane legal reasons.

The other plaintiffs include Rep. John Dingell, Ranking Member on the Energy and

Commerce Committee; Rep. Charles B. Rangel, Ranking Member on the Ways and Means Committee; Rep. George Miller, Ranking Member on the Education and Workforce Committee; Rep. James L. Oberstar, Ranking Member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Rep. Barney Frank, Ranking Member on the Financial Services Committee; Rep. Collin C. Peterson, Ranking Member on the Agriculture Committee; Rep. Bennie Thompson, Ranking Member on the Homeland Security Committee; Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, Ranking Member on the Rules Committee; Rep. Fortney ''Pete'' Stark, Ranking Member on the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee; Rep. Sherrod Brown, Representing Ohio's 13th District.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the litigation considered by this resolution is a lot different and is a lot stronger than litigation filed by my friends on the other side against a previous President. The majority of these lawsuits was brought by a small group of legislators or individual Members. Today, the House as an institution will vote to authorize the suit, which gives this case, I believe, a far better chance in court than previous attempts.

My friends in the minority at the Rules Committee yesterday claimed that this is all about politics, but the Republican members of this committee repeatedly insisted that we disagreed. The issue is not about partisan politics. It is not about Republicans and Democrats. This lawsuit is about the legislative branch's standing up for the laws that have been passed and signed into law by the legislative branch and signed by the Executive of this great Nation. Republicans are motivated to stand up for the Constitution, the separation of powers, and the rule of law.

Any person who believes in our system of government should be worried about the President's executive overreach. This President, as well as future Presidents—from either party—must not be allowed to ignore the Constitution and to circumvent Congress.

Both Republicans and Democrats have stood up for the legislative branch in the past. In fact, there have been 44 lawsuits filed in the last 75 years in which legislators sought standing in Federal court. Of the 41 filed by plaintiffs from a single party, nearly 70 percent were brought by Democrats, representing the body.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial by Kimberley Strassel, from The Wall Street Journal, dated July 17, 2014, that further explains why the Democrats were suing the President before they were against it, and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for Congress and to defend our Constitution against the executive branch.

[From The Potomac Watch, July 17, 2014]

THE BOEHNER-BASHERS' TRACK RECORD

(By Kimberley A. Strassel)

In the tiny House Rules Committee room in Congress on Wednesday, New York Democrat Louise Slaughter let roll her grievances against House Republicans' lawsuit against Barack Obama. It took a lot of coffee.

The suit, which sues the president for unilaterally changing a core provision of ObamaCare, is a ''political stunt,'' declared Ms. Slaughter. Republicans have ''timed'' it to ''peak . . . right as the midterm elections are happening,'' said the ranking Rules member. Having failed to stop ObamaCare, they have chosen to ''run to the judicial branch.'' And, she lectured, a ''lawsuit against the president brought by half of the Congress'' is ''certainly'' not the ''correct way to resolve'' a ''political dispute.'' As for the legal merits, well! Ms. Slaughter feted her witness, lawyer Walter Dellinger, praising his work on Raines v. Byrd , a 1997 case in which the Supreme Court found members of Congress do not have automatic standing to sue. The courts, she insisted, had no business settling such disputes. A lawsuit against the president, she declared, ''is preposterous.''

About the only thing Ms. Slaughter didn't do in five hours was offer House Speaker John Boehner her litigation notes. For it seems to have slipped Ms. Slaughter's mind—and the press's attention—that a mere eight years ago she was a plaintiff in a lawsuit filed by congressional Democrats against George W. Bush. The year was 2006, just as Democrats were, uh, peaking in their campaign to take back the House.

Democrats were sore that they'd lost a fight over a budget bill that made cuts to Medicaid and student loans. They dredged up a technical mistake—a tiny difference between the House and Senate version of the bill. Michigan Democrat John Conyers, ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, decided to (how did Ms. Slaughter put it?) file a lawsuit against the president brought by half of the Congress. He was joined as a plaintiff by nearly every other then-ranking Democratic member and titan in the House—Charles Rangel, John Dingell, George Miller, Collin Peterson, Bennie Thompson, Barney Frank, Pete Stark, James Oberstar and Ms. Slaughter herself.

In an April 2006 Huffington Post piece titled ''Taking the President to Court,'' Mr. Conyers explained that he was ''alarmed by the erosion of our constitutional form of government,'' and by a president who ''shrugged'' about ''the law.'' After ''consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the nation,'' he had determined that there was ''one group of people'' who were ''injured'' by Mr. Bush's lack of respect for ''checks and balances'': Congress. So he was ''going''—or as Ms. Slaughter might put it, ''running''—''to court.''

The plaintiffs—including Ms. Slaughter—meanwhile filed briefs explaining why Raines v. Byrd (her Dellinger special) should be no bar to granting them standing. They chided the defendants for omitting ''any mention'' of Coleman v. Miller, a 1939 case in which the Supreme Court did grant standing to members of a legislature to sue. By Wednesday, it was Ms. Slaughter who was omitting any mention that any such decision ever existed.

Then again, there was so much that escaped Democrats' minds at that hearing. Not one of those present, for instance, recalled that only two years ago, four of their House colleagues filed suit against Vice President *Joe Biden* (in his capacity as head of the Senate) challenging as unconstitutional the filibuster. Or that Democratic legislators also filed lawsuits claiming standing in 2011, and in 2007, and in 2006, and in 2002 and in 2001 and . . . It was left to Florida International University law professor Elizabeth Price Foley, another witness, to remind Democrats that in fact no fewer than 44 lawsuits in which legislators sought standing had been filed in federal court since Coleman v. Miller. Of the 41 filed by plaintiffs with unified political affiliation, nearly 70 percent were brought by Democrats. At least 20 of those came since 2000. The GOP might thank Ms. Slaughter for the idea.

Save one crucial difference. It was also left to Ms. Foley to explain that the reason most of these prior cases had failed is because most were, in fact—again, in Ms. Slaughter's words—''political stunts.'' The majority, including the Slaughter case, were brought by ad hoc groups of legislators, sore over a lost political battle, complaining to courts. The judiciary wasn't much impressed.

By contrast—and by far the more notable aspect of the five long hours of the hearing—is the care the Boehner team is putting into its own suit. While Democrats used Wednesday to score political points, Republicans used it to grill their expert witnesses on case law and constitutional questions. Mr. Boehner's decisions to have the House as a whole vote to authorize the suit, and to narrowly tailor it around a specific presidential transgression (and one that no private litigant would ever have standing to protest), are designed to make this a far different and better breed of a court case.

It's precisely because Democrats know how good a point Republicans have about Obama unilateralism that they are already working to dismiss the suit as ''political.'' And to do that, Ms. Slaughter must have us forget that up until, oh, two weeks ago, Democrats were all about asking the courts to vindicate Congress's prerogatives. How times change.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, through this lawsuit, the United States House of Representatives will take a critical and crucial step in reining in the President and in defending the Constitution so that it will endure for yet another generation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

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

Mr. Speaker, across the country, conservative thinkers and legal scholars are discrediting this lawsuit against the President. They are exposing it for what it is: a political stunt timed to peak in November as Americans are heading to the polls for the midterm elections.

For example, Harvard Law Professor and Former Assistant Attorney General under President George W. Bush Jack Goldsmith wrote: ''the lawsuit will almost certainly fail, and should fail for lack of congressional standing.''

Even Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, joined by Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas, wrote that the Framers of the Constitution emphatically rejected a ''system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.''

Conservative writer and former Justice Department official Andrew C. McCarthy wrote recently that this lawsuit is ''a classic case of assuming the pose of meaningful action while in reality doing nothing.''

Heavens to Betsy, how much more do we have to hear that this is not going to work?

A recent poll by CNN found that 57 percent of Americans oppose the lawsuit. Yes, the majority of the American

people recognize it for what it is: political theater. They recognize this lawsuit is not only a distraction from the real problems that plague our Nation, but that it is designed to appease radical Republicans clamoring for impeachment.

The Rules Committee, of which I am ranking member, was the only committee to consider this lawsuit. Under regular order, the House Administration Committee would have also held hearings and a markup because they are the ''money'' committee that handles the House's internal accounts, but they were not given the chance to do so.

Over the past 3 weeks, the Rules Committee heard testimony from constitutional scholars who debated the merits of the lawsuit and offered several amendments. The minority on our committee offered nearly a dozen amendments aimed at bringing some transparency and accountability to this process, and they were all voted down along party lines.

Democrats offered an amendment that would have required that this political stunt be funded from the Benghazi Select Committee's budget, another political stunt. After the 14 investigations of the Benghazi tragedy, they have allocated $3.3 million to continue to chase after a nonexistent scandal.

We offered an amendment that would have ensured that any law firms contracted for this lawsuit were not also lobbyists trying to influence us at the same time that they represented us in court, a clear conflict of interest.

We even offered an amendment that would have required disclosure of which programs and budgets in the Federal budget will be reduced to pay for the lawsuit. Would the funds come from the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the House Armed Services Committee? We don't know, because the majority has refused to tell us.

Before they vote today, Members of this House deserve to know exactly which legislative branch functions will be curtailed to pay for this folly. Otherwise, how can we cast an informed vote?

We focused our amendments on cost because of how important cost is. It is not, as has been stated here, an imaginary concern. Republicans have wasted hundreds of billions of dollars in this month alone passing over $700 billion, with a B, of unpaid-for tax extenders on this House floor. Republicans took $24 billion out of the economy when they shut down the government to deny health care to millions. And, according to CBS News, the majority has wasted over $79 million on the more than 50 votes for the House floor to dismantle, to undermine, and to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Where in the world does it stop?

When Republicans defended the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act and employed outside counsel in a similar lawsuit—with the fate that we believe this will have—they cost the American taxpayers $2.3 million. We learned later that their lawyers charged $520 an hour—an hour, and at that rate, they would have been paid $1 million a year for a 40-hour workweek.

So what will this lawsuit cost, Mr. Speaker? That is what we want to know. The minority requested this information. The majority replied: ''A lawsuit is a small price to pay.''

We could be spending money on our crumbling infrastructure, investing in our education system, making it easier for our children to go to college, even building some high-speed rail—we are about the only country left in the world that doesn't have any—or addressing climate change. We just had a terrible flood in my district and next door, where they have lost sewer systems, water systems. We could be doing so many other things than simply throwing this money away.

The idea of fiscal responsibility, of fiscal tightness, absolutely is decimated in just what I have said already at this time, the money wasted here, with nothing for it, when the needs are so great and the population cries out for relief. But instead of investing in our country, the majority insists on bringing a lawsuit that, if it is successful, will do the opposite of everything they have been trying to accomplish since 2010.

Yes, after years of rallying against the Affordable Care Act, not one of them would vote for it as it passed the House, voting to derail it, working against it—pay attention here—they are suing the President for not implementing it fast enough. And if that makes no sense to you, you are not alone. We don't understand it either.

Not only is this logic upside-down and inside out, it is directly against the feelings of members of their own party. A recent poll from the Commonwealth Fund found that 77 percent of people were pleased with their new coverage. Republicans themselves have a 74 percent satisfaction rate with the new plans that they have bought.

Now before us, we have a lawsuit that has been ridiculed and railed against by conservative thinkers and progressives alike. It is a deplorable waste of taxpayer funds and would go against everything the Republicans have been working for for 4 years. The Republicans that I worked with in this Congress when I first came here would not even think of this.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his leadership on this issue.

Without enforcement of the law, there cannot be accountability under a law, and political accountability is essential to a functioning democracy. We in the House of Representatives who face reelection every 2 years under the Constitution are perhaps reminded of that more often than others. And while there is at least one political branch willing to enforce the law, we will not fail to act through whatever means of which we can successfully avail ourselves.

When the President fails to perform his constitutional duty that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed, the Congress has appropriations and other powers over the President. But none of those powers can be exercised if a Senate controlled by the President's own political party refuses to exercise them. Nor would the exercise of those powers solve the problem at hand, because they would not actually require the President to faithfully execute the laws.

And, of course, the most powerful and always available means of solving the problem at hand is to vote out of office supporters of the President's abuses of power. In the meantime, however, the need to pursue the establishment of clear principles of political accountability is of the essence.

Earlier this year, I joined with Representative GOWDY to introduce H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE the Law Act, to put a procedure in place for Congress to initiate litigation against the executive branch for failure to faithfully execute the laws. But while that legislation passed the House with bipartisan support, the Senate has failed to even consider it, so today we consider a resolution to authorize litigation by the House to restore political accountability and enforce the rule of law.

Although the case law on standing may be murky, one thing is absolutely clear: the Supreme Court has never closed the door to the standing of the House as an institution.

As President Lincoln said: ''Let reverence for the laws be . . . enforced in courts of justice.''

It is the courts' duty, too, to uphold reverence for the law, and it is the specific duty of the courts to call fouls when the lines of constitutional authority under the separation of powers established by the Constitution have been breached.

A lawsuit by the House of Representatives would grant no additional powers to the judicial branch over legislation. Indeed, what a statute says or doesn't say would remain unaffected. But it would be the appropriate task of the Federal courts to determine whether or not, whatever a statute says, a President can ignore or alter it under the Constitution.

The stakes of inaction are high. The lawsuit will challenge the President's failure to enforce key provisions of the law that has come to bear his name in the popular mind and was largely drafted in the White House. What provisions of ObamaCare have been enforced have not proved popular, and

what provisions the President has refused to enforce have been delayed until after the next Federal elections.

How convenient for the President, yet how devastating to accountability in our Republic.

Imagine the future if this new unconstitutional power of the President is left to stand. Presidents today and in the future would be able to treat the entire United States Code as mere guidelines and pick and choose among its provisions which to enforce and which to ignore. The current President has even created entirely new categories of businesses to apply his unilaterally imposed exemptions.

In that future, if a bill the President signed into law was later considered to be bad policy and potentially harmful to the President's political party if enforced, accountability for signing that policy into law could be avoided by simply delaying enforcement until a more politically opportune time, if at all. No longer would Presidential candidates running for reelection have to stand on their records, because their records could be edited at will.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Sign one bill into law, enforce another version of it in practice. Rinse and repeat until the accumulation of power in the Presidency is complete.

We should all support this resolution today, as it aims to unite two-thirds of the Federal Government in delivering a simple message: Congress writes the laws and the President enforces them. Our own constitutionally required oath to support the Constitution of the United States requires no less.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the bill that is before us.

It is somewhat ironic that the Republicans want to sue the President for not enforcing a law that they want to repeal. How ironic. But it is, frankly, a demonstration of their frustration that they have been unable politically to attain the objective that they seek. They therefore repair to the wasting of time by this Congress and the wasting of the taxpayers' money on a hypocritical and partisan attack against the President, one that is meant to distract from the pressing issues of the day, like fixing our broken immigration system, raising the minimum wage, or restoring emergency unemployment insurance for those seeking jobs.

While the majority of Americans oppose this lawsuit gimmick, House Republicans continue to move ahead with it instead of acting on those policies and other critical legislation which the majority of the American public do support: Make It In America jobs bills, Export-Import Bank reauthorization, terrorism risk insurance, Voting Rights Amendment Act, continuing resolutions and appropriations bills. All of these the American people want to see us do.

But in polls, they show they don't want us to be doing this. They think it is frivolous. They think it is without merit. They think it should not be done.

All the bills that I referenced they think ought to be done. How sad it is that we come here and do things the American public thinks are a waste of time while not doing things Americans think are very important.

I tell my friend from Texas, and he is my friend, none other than Justice Antonin Scalia has made the point that the judiciary traditionally does not hear cases of political disagreement between the other two branches.

□ 1715

In fact, in United States v. Windsor, Justice Scalia said, a ''system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.'' Scalia felt that was not justified.

We believe this legislation is not justified. We further believe that the American people do not believe this legislation is justified. We do believe that the base of the Republican Party that tried to defeat President Obama in 2012, voted against him in 2008, and disagreed with him on the issues thinks this is what is available to them.

It is wrong. It is a waste of time. It is a waste of money. It is a distraction from the issues that are so important to our people. This lawsuit is nothing more than a partisan bill to rally the Republican base, and for some, it doesn't go far enough.

Under President Clinton, Republicans' playbook was shut down and then impeach. Under President Obama, Republicans said that if the Affordable Care Act were not repealed—not that they would sue him. They said they would shut down the government if they didn't get their way. They didn't get their way, and they shut down the government.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. They threatened to shut down the government, and they shut down the government. And the American people said, that is not what we want done.

Again, they come to this floor because they cannot achieve, through their political process, the ends they seek. They have voted over 50 times to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. They do not want it implemented. Now they want to sue the President because he is not implementing it fully, and now they are suing and refusing to say that impeachment is off the table.

In fact, their newly elected whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) declined the opportunity to rule out impeachment on four separate occasions last weekend.

My friends, instead of wasting time and money on the lawsuit and what might follow, Congress ought to do what our constituents sent us here to do: create jobs, grow the middle class, invest in an economy where all of our people can work hard, and make it in America.

Reject this waste of time. Vote ''no'' on this unjustified, impractical, losing proposition for the suit against the President of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a lot of revisionist history.

But I will answer the question. And the answer is that years back, we did impeach William Jefferson Clinton because he lied to an FBI agent. He lied to a Federal grand jury, and he violated a Federal law, which was a felony. Oh, by the way, that led to impeachment for a felony while in office, a sitting President.

In this instance, the President of the United States is not faithfully executing the laws of the country, and that is an entirely different process. So for the gentleman to suggest that this is going to lead to that is simply not true.

I will tell you that William Jefferson Clinton violated the Federal law as a felony, and we believe our President, now Barack Obama, is not faithfully executing the laws. And anybody could figure that out who serves as a Member of Congress.

I would now like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Natural Resources Committees.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleague from Maryland who just spoke that, in my humble opinion, HARRY REID shut down the government.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain for everybody watching at home across America what the separation of powers doctrine means. I know this is obvious for most Americans because we study it in school. But since our constitutional scholar President doesn't seem to get it, it apparently needs to be explained again.

Our Constitution says that we, the legislative branch—this branch—we write the laws. The President executes the laws. And the courts settle any dispute we may have. Got it? We write the laws. The President executes the laws. The court settles the disputes.

Our Constitution does not say that the President gets to write his own laws. Our Founders knew that was a bad idea. They had seen kings wield that kind of power, and they knew they didn't want that for the new Nation. They understood that too much power in the hands of any one person or any one group of people would inevitably lead to tyranny.

As Christian men of the day, they understood that since the Garden of Eden, man is fallen, and that fallen men, once they have a taste of power, they will always lust for more. They knew that ''Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.''

So in their understanding of fallen man, the remedy was a system of checks and balances, and clearly delineated, but separate, powers divided among three equal branches of government. We write the laws. The President executes them. It should be simple, right?

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President has failed us in two directions. He has failed to execute the laws we have written, and he has rewritten the laws on his own. I believe that is a breach of his oath of office to uphold the laws.

So we are gathered here, as the first branch, the legislative branch, the branch that is closest to the people, to seek the judicial branch's help in reining in the power of an out-of-control executive branch, plain and simple. We are here specifically to bring legal action against the President of the United States to stop him from unilaterally rewriting the so-called Affordable Care Act.

By the way, that is really a misnomer. There is nothing ''affordable'' about the Affordable Care Act, and the American people know it. But really, that is a discussion for another day.

From the individual mandate to the business mandate to the waivers for Big Labor to the HHS regulations that were struck down by the Supreme Court, to the decision just last week to exempt the U.S. territories—how many people is that, 4 million people?—exempt 4 million more people from the law known as ObamaCare with just the action of the President's pen, time and time and time again, we have seen this President rewrite the law.

But rewriting ObamaCare isn't only one of the ways this President has abused his power. Look at the mess on the southern border right now, a mess of the President's own making, thanks to his decision not to enforce the immigration law and his attempt to attempt to rewrite that law through a failed DACA regulation and so-called ''prosecutorial discretion.'' Last week, I sent the President 21 tweets which laid out the things that he could do to stop this mess at the border that are within the law, within his purview. And still, he continues to operate outside the law.

And it is not just the border and ObamaCare. It is DOMA and the NLRB and an out-of-control EPA trying to backdoor cap-and-trade legislation, a regulatory war on coal, and the waters of the United States—regulation after regulation, administrative action after action with no basis in real, actual bona fide law that this body has passed. This administration has chosen repeatedly to flout laws or to try to rewrite laws without going through the legislative process that our Founders set up for us.

The Constitution, they are laying all over the place. Get a copy. Look at it. Understand the separation of powers.

This Congress must use every power at our disposal to restore balance to our government and uphold the rule of law. We have voted repeatedly to use the power of the purse to cut off funding for unconstitutional activities within this administration. We have voted repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, to overturn bad regulations. We passed the ENFORCE Act, the REINS Act, and I have cosponsored numerous other efforts that repair our broken system of checks and balances in order to stop the overreaches of this administration. We must act today, and we must continue to act until this administration and this President relent and get it right.

I support this resolution to take this President to court.

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Let's take this President to court because I believe we need to take whatever steps are necessary and in our power to rein in this administration and hold them accountable to the United States Constitution and citizens of the United States of America.

The Founding Fathers gave us this recourse to restore the balance of power and uphold the rule of law. That is why this is so important for the legislative branch to reassert our authority, to make the law so he can enforce the law.

May God continue to bless this body. May God continue to bless the men and women that serve this country. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 676, which would authorize the Speaker to file suit against the President of the United States for failing to enforce the Affordable Care Act, which has been attacked more than 51 times unsuccessfully in the House.

Now, why do I oppose this seriously flawed measure? One, the fact that it addresses a nonexistent problem. Two, it violates constitutional requirements and fundamental separation of power principles. And three, it diverts Congress from focusing on truly critical matters that require prompt legislative responses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter received only today signed by eight constitutional law scholars explaining the reasons why a lawsuit filed pursuant to H. Res. 676 is likely to fail.

JULY 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, We write as law professors who specialize in constitutional law and federal courts to express our view that the members of the House of Representatives lack the ability to sue the President of the United States in federal court for his alleged failure to enforce a federal statute, even if an Act of Congress were to authorize such a suit and especially without such legislative authorization. Never in American history has such a suit been allowed. In fact, in many cases, the United States Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit have held that members of Congress lack standing to sue in federal court. An entire House of Congress is in no stronger a position to sue. Moreover, this is exactly the type of political dispute which courts have found to pose a non-justiciable political question and that should be resolved in the political process rather than by judges.

In Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811 (1997), members of Congress sued to challenge the constitutionality of the line-item veto. The Court dismissed the case for lack of standing and said that the members of Congress ''have alleged no injury to themselves as individuals, the institutional injury they allege is wholly abstract and widely dispersed, and their attempt to litigate this dispute at this time and in this form is contrary to historical experience . . . . We therefore hold that these individual members of Congress do not have a sufficient 'personal stake' in this dispute and have not alleged a sufficiently concrete injury to have established Article III standing.''

After Raines v. Byrd, it is clear that legislators have standing only if they allege either that they have been singled out for specially unfavorable treatment as opposed to other members of their bodies or that their votes have been denied or nullified. This is consistent with a large body of lower court precedent, primarily from the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, that requires a showing of nullification of a vote as a prerequisite for standing. The Court of Appeals has stated that a member of Congress has standing only if ''the alleged diminution in congressional influence . . . amount[s] to a disenfranchisement, a complete nullification or withdrawal of a voting opportunity.'' Goldwater v. Carter, 617 F.2d 697, 702 (D.C. Cir. 1979), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 444 U.S. 996 (1979); see also Harrington v. Bush, 553 F.2d 190, 213 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

It is just for this reason that the House of Representatives as a body, like its members individually, lacks standing to sue. The claim that the President has not fully enforced provisions of the Affordable Care Act, or other laws, does not amount to a ''disenfranchisement, a complete nullification, or withdrawal of a voting opportunity.'' Congress retains countless mechanisms to ensure enforcement of a law, ranging from use of its spending power to assigning the task to an independent agency.

On many occasions throughout American history, the Supreme Court has seen the need for the federal judiciary to stay out of disputes between the elected branches of government. That is exactly the lesson that the proposed lawsuit would ignore. Thus the suit likely would be dismissed both for want of standing and because it poses a non-justiciable political question. As Justice Scalia pointed out years ago, courts frequently fail

to review actions or inaction by the Executive when a decision involves ''a sensitive and inherently discretionary judgment call, . . . the sort of decision that has traditionally been nonreviewable, . . . [and decisions for which] review would have disruptive practical consequences.'' Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592, 608 (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting). The question presented here poses the very essence of what the Supreme Court in Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962), said is a political question because of ''the impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion; or the impossibility of a court's undertaking independent resolution without expressing lack of the respect due coordinate branches of government.'' The idea of a judge telling a President how to exercise his discretion in enforcing a law cuts at the heart of separation of powers and thus presents a question non-justiciable in the courts.

Under long-standing practice and precedents, disputes, such as this one between members of the House of Representatives and the President, must be worked out in the political process, not the courts.

Disclaimer: institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only.

ERWIN CHEMERINSKY,
Dean, University of California, Irvine School of Law;
JANET COOPER ALEXANDER,
Frederick I. Richman Professor of Law, Stanford Law School;
PETER EDELMAN,
Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center;
LAWRENCE LESSIG,
Roy L. Furman Professor of Law, Harvard Law School;
BURT NEUBORNE,
Inez Milholland Professor of Civil Liberties, New York University Law School;
KERMIT ROOSEVELT,
Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School;
SUZANNA SHERRY,
Herman O. Loewenstein Professor of Law, Vanderbilt University Law School;
CHARLES TIEFER,
Professor, University of Baltimore School of Law.

Mr. CONYERS. To begin with, H. Res. 676 seeks to solve a nonexistent problem because the President has, in fact, fully met his obligations to fully execute the laws.

Allowing flexibility in the implementation of a major new program, even where the statute mandates a specific deadline, is neither unusual nor a constitutional violation.

Indeed, in the case of the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate, the administration acted pursuant to statutory authorization granted to it by Congress.

Section 7805(a) of the Internal Revenue Code authorizes the Treasury Secretary to issue any rules necessary for the enforcement of the Code, including the provisions that enforce the employer mandate.

Exercising discretion in implementing a law is the reality of administering sometimes complex programs and is inherent in the President's duty to ''take care'' that he ''faithfully'' execute laws.

This has been especially true with respect to the Affordable Care Act. The President's decision to extend certain compliance dates to help phase-in the Act is not a novel tactic.

Yet, even though not a single court has ever concluded that reasonable delay in implementing a complex law constitutes a violation of the Take Care Clause, the Majority insists there is a constitutional crisis.

In addition, a suit initiated under H. Res. 676 would itself be unconstitutional and would violate separation of powers principles.

This is because such a lawsuit would essentially allow federal courts to second-guess decisions by the Executive Branch in how it chooses to implement a policy.

The federal judiciary, under the political question doctrine, avoids answering such questions precisely because a court is not appropriate forum to resolve issues of complex policy.

Additionally, it is highly unlikely that Congress could satisfy the standing requirements of Article III of the Constitution that must be met in order to enforce the Take Care Clause.

To meet those requirements, a plaintiff—under the Supreme Court's 1997 decision in Raines v. Byrd—must show, among other things, that it suffered a concrete and particularized injury.

Injury amounting only to an alleged violation of a right to have the Government act in accordance with law—which is what this resolution contemplates—is not judicially cognizable for Article III standing purposes.

This is in stark contrast to cases where Congress has sought to protect a fundamental power, like its subpoena authority.

In subpoena enforcement cases, courts have found standing for one House of Congress to sue because a specific legislative prerogative was at stake, constituting a sufficiently concrete injury to Congress to confer Article III standing.

Article III's standing requirements enforce the Constitution's separation-of-powers principles. Congress cannot simply legislate away these constitutional standing requirements.

Finally, H. Res. 676 is obviously just pure political theater that distracts the public from the fact that this Republican-controlled House has failed to address a whole host of critical issues.

These include immigration reform, extending unemployment insurance, enhancing environmental protections, ensuring worker safety, and helping those who are financially struggling.

Coincidentally, H. Res. 676 shares a number with H.R. 676, the ''Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act,'' which I introduced in February of 2013.

H.R. 676 would create a publicly-financed, privately-delivered health care system that would greatly improve and expand the already existing Medicare program.

My legislation would ensure that all Americans have access, guaranteed by law, to the highest quality and most cost effective health care services regardless of their employment, income or health care status.

Instead of discussing this and other critical matters, today we continue to waste precious resources on a patently unconstitutional measure that would authorize a lawsuit destined to fail.

We owe it to the American people to address real, not imaginary, challenges facing our Nation, including enhancing health care for all Americans.

I would also note that the litigation referred to by the gentleman from Texas that I was involved in eight years ago involved a situation where the House and Senate passed different versions of the same budget bill that was signed by the President. That was brought in our individual capacity as Members, not the House as a whole, and did not involve the use of additional taxpayer funds. The resolution before us today is of course an entirely different matter.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 676, a resolution to authorize the House of Representatives to initiate litigation against the President, or any executive branch employee, for failure to act in accordance with their duties. Specifically, this resolution deals with the President's failure to implement the employer mandate required by his own signature law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

While the scope of the litigation authorized is narrow, it is symbolic of a much larger problem—the President's continued refusal to faithfully execute the law, choosing, instead, to usurp Congress' exclusive constitutional right to legislate.

Simply because Congress chooses not to be the President's rubberstamp does not bestow upon him the power to circumvent the law. Conversely, when the President decides enforcement of a law might be politically perilous, he can't simply choose to ignore it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about party politics. This is about the proper role of government, as defined by our Founders. The Federal Government was intentionally designed with three branches, each with their own separate powers and the ability to serve as a check and balance on the other two. Yet, the President—as a former constitutional law professor—refuses to recognize his proper role, defying the law and unilaterally enacting policies, or ignoring the law, at will.

I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution as a Member of this institution, and I have taken that oath seriously every single day.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, I believe the President's actions undermine the very same oath that he has twice taken, so I urge my colleagues to join me in this step to uphold the law and protect the balance of power by supporting the resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in strong opposition to this resolution that would propose to have the House sue the President of the United States.

With only a few hours left before Congress adjourns for the August district work period, we have a full plate of responsibilities left unfinished. When I go back home to my district, I highly doubt that many constituents will be running up to me to thank me for Congress passing a resolution to sue the President of the United States.

I know what I will hear instead: Why hasn't the House passed comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken immigration system? Why hasn't Congress raised the minimum wage so people who work full time don't remain in poverty? Why haven't we renewed emergency unemployment insurance for more than 3½ million Americans, including nearly 300,000 veterans?

The only answer I will be able to give them is that Republican leadership in the House cares more about scoring political points against this President than they do about helping America's middle class families.

This is a question of priorities. The American people sent us here to respond to the pressing needs that face our Nation. It should be a given that we would use our time to focus on the most important issues. Instead, we waste time on suing the President of the United States while failing to address commonsense measures to ensure economic security for every American.

Not only does this resolution reflect a very different set of priorities from the majority of Americans, we are yet again wasting millions in taxpayer dollars, just like the $3 million wasted in defending the indefensible and unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act and billions of dollars wasted by shutting down the government to try to take away Americans' health care benefits.

It is unconscionable that when this do-nothing Republican Congress finally decided to do something, it is suing the President for doing his job when they refuse to do theirs. I wish I could say that this was politics at its worst, but I have heard too many in the Republican majority raise the specter of impeachment not to know better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this time- and taxpayer money-wasting resolution and urge Republicans in the majority to join Democrats and address the serious challenges facing our Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I also want to thank the whole House for its work to address the American peoples' concerns about jobs and our economy. All told, we have sent the Senate now more than 40 jobs bills, almost all of them in a bipartisan way.

From the first day of this Congress, I have said our focus would be on jobs, and it has been, but also on that first day, you may recall that I addressed the House about the importance of our oath of office. I noted that it is the same oath we all take, that it makes no mention of party, it makes no mention of faction or agenda. The oath only refers to the Constitution and our obligation to defend it.

Mr. Speaker, I said that with moments like this in mind. I said that knowing there would be times when we would have to do things we didn't come here to do, we didn't plan to do, and things that require us to consider interests greater than our own interests.

I have to think this is why, on several occasions, members of the minority party have taken a similar step. In 2011, some of them filed litigation against the Vice President. They took similar steps in 2006, 2002, 2001, and so forth.

Because this isn't about Republicans and Democrats—it is about defending the Constitution that we swore an oath to uphold and acting decisively when it may be compromised.

No Member of this body needs to be reminded of what the Constitution states about the President's obligation to faithfully execute the laws of our Nation. No Member needs to be reminded of the bonds of trust that have been frayed, of the damage that has already been done to our economy and to our people.

Are you willing to let any President choose what laws to execute and what laws to change? Are you willing to let anyone tear apart what our Founders have built? Think not only about the specifics of the oath you took, but think about how you took it: as one body, standing together.

That is all I am asking you to do today, to act as one institution defending the Constitution on behalf of the people that we serve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, Republicans today are choosing lawsuits over legislating. They are choosing to sue the President rather than pursuing legislation to support American families.

There is no shortage of legislation awaiting action: immigration reform, a bipartisan Senate bill held up by the Speaker who has just spoken; unemployment insurance, a bipartisan Senate bill has never gotten a vote in this House held up by this Speaker; the employment nondiscrimination bill, the Senate bill not brought up here and held up by the Speaker; paycheck fairness, not brought up; a minimum wage bill, not brought up; Ex-Im, caught in controversy within the Republican conference; a highway bill, another patch, the inability of House Republicans to face up to the need for a long-term highway bill; and a voting rights reform bill sponsored by a senior Republican, held up by the Speaker of this House and the conference of the Republicans.

The Republicans in this House are suing the President because they conjure up that the President did not adopt what Republicans argue is the correct implementation of a law they have tried 50 times to destroy. It is the House Republicans who should be sued, if that were possible, for their abdication of their responsibilities to the people of this Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my favorite piece of art in this Capitol is a picture in the rotunda of our Founding Fathers gathered together to sign the Declaration of Independence, a document that they knew, when they signed it, they were signing their own death warrant if they were caught and tried for treason. They felt that strongly that they wanted to escape the bonds of a monarch and pursue freedom.

Our forefathers fought a Revolution against the greatest military power on Earth to escape the bonds of a monarchy. At the end of that bloody Revolution, the last thing they wanted was another king. They wanted freedom.

To protect that precious freedom, they designed a government of, by, and for the people based on a separation of powers. The legislative branch makes the laws; the executive branch enforces laws.

President Obama has decided that he is not bound by the separation of powers. He has bragged that if Congress will not accept his priorities, he has a pen and a phone, and he will make the laws himself.

He may have a pen, but the people have the Constitution left us by our forefathers. Our forefathers recognized that one man who can both make the laws and enforce the laws is a king, not a President. Thomas Jefferson once said that freedom does not disappear all at once, but is eroded imperceptibly day by day.

The prosperity of our great country sprang from our freedom. Our form of government set forth in the Constitution by our forefathers has protected that very fragile freedom for 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle worry about the price of a lawsuit to protect our freedom. Our forefathers paid dearly for that freedom. Many gave all they had, even their lives.

Our freedom is in peril, my friends. We cannot stand by and watch the President shred our Constitution. I stand in support of H. Res. 676.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. The constitutional question raised by this

measure is whether the House has standing to sue the President over what is, in essence, a policy difference. ''Standing'' is a constitutionally-defined status and requires that the plaintiff, among other things, demonstrate a legally recognizable injury. In the case of a suit between branches of government, the House would also have to show that there is no other remedy.

On both of these counts, this lawsuit fails. The House cannot speak for the Senate, which doesn't agree with its position, and therefore cannot represent the legislative branch. Even if it could, neither body has suffered a recognizable injury merely because some Members of the Congress do not like how the President has interpreted a law passed by a different Congress.

Moreover, this Congress has a remedy if it doesn't like the way that the President has implemented the Affordable Care Act: it can change the law. That would be a far better approach, one more consistent with our separation of powers than this expensive and ill-conceived lawsuit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to reject this effort.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker does not have a good record when it comes to wasting taxpayer dollars on frivolous lawsuits. When the Justice Department concluded that the Defense of Marriage Act could not be defended in court, the House wasted $2.3 million trying to defend the indefensible and lost in the Supreme Court.

Now, the Speaker wants to waste more of the taxpayers' money on a meritless lawsuit against the President for not ''taking care that the law be faithfully executed.''

What did the President do? In implementing the Affordable Care Act, which the Republican-led House has voted to repeal 50 times, he postponed implementation of one provision by a year, a provision the Republicans and the House opposed.

Now, they want to waste money to go to court to say the President had no power to postpone this provision for a year, although no one opposed President Bush when he postponed implementation of a provision of the Medicare drug act for a year.

It is well-settled that it is within the discretion of Presidents in implementing a law to postpone implementation of part of it in order to get it done right, but this leads to another absurdity of the case. Let's assume the Republicans get the House to go into court and somehow overcome the standing question—which they will not. What is the remedy they will seek?

By the time it got to court, the provision in question will have already been implemented, so the Republicans want to waste $5 million or $6 million in taxpayers' money to go into court and say, Judge, please order the President to implement what he has already implemented. Totally ridiculous.

So what have we got? We have a Congress that has passed no highway bill, no minimum wage bill, no unemployment extension bill, no pay equity for women bill, no action on campaign finance reform, no action to reduce the burdens of student loans, no action to make sure that women continue to have access to contraceptive services despite the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision, no action on all the emergencies that face the American people, but we are going to waste money and time on a meritless lawsuit that will go nowhere, but will simply serve the single function of diverting attention from all the real problems the House Republicans want to continue to ignore.

This is not a proper use of the taxpayers' money. More wasted money for political purposes. For shame.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman very much, and I rise to oppose H. Res. 676, which is seeking an unconstitutional right to sue the President for doing his duty and following the law.

The underbelly of this resolution would, in essence, put fire in the hearts and minds of Americans when we find out that this legislation is to undermine the President and any of his officers and employees from doing their jobs.

□ 1745

This is a failed attempt to impeach the President. I am willing to say that word because the President has been following the law. The law passed, and it gives him discretion to interpret the Affordable Care Act to make it best work for the American people. As has been stated, if you want to change the law, go to the floor of the House. But in actuality, this resolution smacks against the Constitution which says there are three equal branches of government. Therefore, the Executive has the right to perform his duties.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution for it is, in fact, a veiled attempt for impeachment, and it undermines the law that allows the President to do his job. It is a historical fact that President Bush pushed this Nation into a war that had little to do with apprehending terrorists. We did not seek an impeachment of President Bush because as an Executive, he had his authority. President Obama has the authority.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to, in essence, provide the opportunity for us to do valid things for the American people—improve the minimum wage, paycheck fairness—and stop undermining the authority as indicated in the Constitution that gives equal authority to the three branches of government.

We can pass laws. We have the ability to pass laws, and citizens have the right to go into court on their independent standing. The courts have often said that the Congress has no standing. The House of Representatives has no independent standing, as evidenced by many cases that we have already taken to court and determined that Congress has no standing.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

That dictates on how you gain standing, and I would say the constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete, and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

Let me be very clear. We in Congress can make no argument that the President has injured us. We can make no independent argument of that, and so I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution and do not accept a veiled attempt at impeachment when our President is doing his duty and following the law under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H. Res. 676, providing 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.

We could be doing some very important legislation to help the American people from Texas to the tip of Maine, like Comprehensive Immigration Reform, the Appropriations Border Supplemental, comprehensive tax reform, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, or the Voting Rights Act, yet my Republican colleagues insist on wasting valuable time.

The Congressional Black Caucus did a Special Order earlier this week entitled: the GOP's March Towards Impeachment, and that is where we appear to be headed.

But first let me make a distinction between impeachment and a lawsuit initiated by the House, qua House of Representatives, via H. Res. 676.

Article II, Section 4 of the United States Constitution states:

The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

In any impeachment inquiry, the Members of this branch of government must confront

some preliminary questions to determine whether an impeachment is appropriate in a given situation.

The first of these questions is whether the individual whose conduct is under scrutiny falls within the category of President, Vice President, or ''civil Officers of the United States'' such that he is vulnerable to impeachment.

A preliminary question is whether the conduct involved constitutes ''treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors.''

Now Mr. Speaker, whether we get to this point where we are actually considering impeachment of the President is a question that only the GOP majority can answer. It appears that we are heading in that direction—even in the face of doubt from numerous experts as to whether the effort will succeed or not.

Indeed, it is a matter of historical fact that President Bush pushed this nation into a war that had little to do with apprehending the terrorists of September 11, 2001; and weapons of mass destruction, ''WMD's'' have yet to be found.

House Democrats refused to impeach President Bush.

Let me state that again: House Democrats refused to impeach President George W. Bush.

Now I wish to turn to the resolution which the GOP Majority intends to put before this body in a last-ditch effort to stir their base before November.

Former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger testified before the Rules Committee two weeks ago and had this to say about the potential lawsuit:

> The House of Representatives lacks authority to bring such a suit. Because neither the Speaker nor even the House of Representatives has a legal concrete, particular and personal stake in the outcome of the proposed lawsuits, federal courts would have no authority to entertain such actions.
>
> Passage of the proposed resolution does nothing to change that. If federal judges were to undertake to entertain suits brought by the legislature against the President or other federal officers for failing to administer statutes as the House desires, the result would be an unprecedented aggrandizement of the political power of the judiciary.
>
> Such a radical liberalization of the role of unelected judges in matters previously entrusted to the elected branches of government should be rejected.

My colleagues on the other side argue that lawsuits by Congress to force the administration to enforce federal laws will prevent the President from exceeding his constitutional authority,

But the Supreme Court has constantly held that the exercise of executive discretion being taken by President Obama is within the President's powers under the Constitution.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in Article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

The constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely to be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

To satisfy the constitutional standing requirements in Article III, the Supreme Court imposes three requirements.

The plaintiff must first allege a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual or imminent, concrete, and particularized.

Second, the injury must be ''fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct, and'' third, the injury must be ''likely to be redressed by the requested relief.''

PRUDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the constitutional questions posed by the doctrine of standing, federal courts also follow a well-developed set of prudential principles that are relevant to a standing inquiry.

Similar to the constitutional requirements, these limits are ''founded in concern about the proper—and properly limited—role of the courts in a democratic society,'' but are judicially created.

Unlike their constitutional counterparts, prudential standing requirements ''can be modified or abrogated by Congress.''

If separation-of-powers principles require anything, it is that each branch must respect its constitutional role.

When a court issues a decision interpreting the Constitution or a federal law, the other branches must abide by the decision.

The executive branch's ability to fulfill its obligation to comply with judicial decisions should not be hampered by a civil action by Congress pursuant to this bill as my amendment to H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE ACT made clear.

And Mr. Speaker, a basic respect for separation of powers should inform any discussion of a lawsuit from both a constitutional standpoint and a purely pragmatic one.

In our constitutional democracy, taking care that the laws are executed faithfully is a multifaceted notion.

And it is a well-settled principle that our Constitution imposes restrictions on Congress' legislative authority, so that the faithful execution of the laws may present occasions where the President declines to enforce a congressionally enacted law, or delays such enforcement, because he must enforce the Constitution—which is the law of the land.

This resolution, like the bill we considered in the Judiciary Committee on which I serve and before this body, the H.R. 4138, The ENFORCE Act, has problems with standing, separation of powers, and allows broad powers of discretion incompatible with notions of due process.

The legislation would permit one House of Congress to file a lawsuit seeking declaratory and other relief to compel the President to faithfully execute the law.

These are critical problems. First, Congress is unlikely to be able to satisfy the requirements of Article III standing, which the Supreme Court has held that the party bringing suit have been personally injured by the challenged conduct.

In the wide array of circumstances incident and related to the Affordable Care Act in which the resolution would authorize a House of Congress to sue the president, that House would not have suffered any personal injury sufficient to satisfy Article III's standing requirement in the absence of a complete nullification of any legislator's votes.

Second, the resolution violates separation of powers principles by inappropriately having courts address political questions that are left to the other branches to be decided.

And Mr. Speaker, I thought the Supreme Court had put this notion to rest as far back as Baker v. Carr, a case that hails from 1962. Baker stands for the proposition that courts are not equipped to adjudicate political questions—and that it is impossible to decide such questions without intruding on the ability of agencies to do their job.

Third, the resolution makes one House of Congress a general enforcement body able to direct the entire field of administrative action by bringing cases whenever such House deems a President's action to constitute a policy, of non-enforcement.

This bill attempts to use the notion of separation of powers to justify an unprecedented effort to ensure that the laws are enforced by the President—and I say one of the least creative ideas I have seen in some time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to deliberate before we are at a bridge too far.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time and money. We are sent to Congress to make progress on behalf of the people of this Nation, yet House Republicans spend all of their time and energy fighting this President. Why?

The Republicans need to jump off the bandwagon of political attacks and come together to jump-start the economy. While Americans were unemployed, they did nothing to put them back to work. When people were losing their homes, they did little to protect them from foreclosure. While hunger and poverty are on the rise in this country, they have hardly mentioned the disappearing middle class.

From his first day in office, Republicans in the House, in this House, have never supported this President. Every olive branch he has extended was broken.

But today, Mr. Speaker, they have reached a low, a very low point. This resolution to sue the President just goes a little too far. It is a shame and a disgrace that we are here debating the suing of the President. The American people deserve better. We can do better. We can do much better.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to have the raw courage—nothing but courage—to oppose this insulting and offensive resolution. It has no place on this floor. Let us get back to the work that we were elected to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to speak within the time yielded to those Members.

The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. With the gentlewoman having 5½ minutes left, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee on the Constitution and Civil Justice.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I find it interesting that this is all about President Obama engaging in an executive overreach. Look at the statistics. During President Obama's first term and comparing him to prior Presidents, President Bush issued 173 executive orders, President Clinton 200, President Reagan 213, and President Obama only 147. And during this part of President Obama's second term, he has thus far issued only 36 executive orders, while President Bush, during his second term, issued 116; Clinton, 164; and Reagan, 168. So I ask you, based on the statistics, is that overreach? No, it is underreach. It is underreach.

MITCH MCCONNELL said upon President Obama's inauguration the job was to see that this man wasn't reelected. Now the job seems to be to see that the attack on the President can be such that the Republicans take the Senate and hopefully set the stage for 2016 of the Presidency. This unquestionably is impeachment lite. It is an attempt to put the President in a situation in a lawsuit that, if successful, which I find hard to believe, would be the foundation for impeachment.

This President has done nothing that is impeachable, nothing that merits this type of action, nothing that merits this type of disrespect. He should be respected as our President and supported, and we should work to create jobs, pass an infrastructure bill, pass a minimum wage bill, and extend unemployment insurance.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

There are plenty of places in the Affordable Care Act where it is full of drafting errors and stuff that, quite frankly, just wasn't quite ready for prime time, but, Mr. Speaker, there is no ambiguity over this issue.

When the President delayed the institution of the employer mandate on July 2, 2013, it couldn't have been clearer. Let me give you an example. The effective date for the individual mandate as written in law, and this is for the individual mandate:

> The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

Pretty clear. ''Shall apply.'' Seems straightforward.

The effective date for the employer mandate, section 1514 of the law, effective date:

> The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

It really does seem straightforward. There is no ambiguity there. I would just ask the question: Is there a list of laws that must be followed and those that may or may not be followed depending upon whatever the will of the President is that day?

I would remind my colleagues the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> The best way to end a bad law is to enforce it strictly.

We should do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we in this body are called upon to represent the wishes of the American people. The last national election, President Obama was reelected by the American people by an overwhelming majority. What we find today are the people who opposed his reelection, the people who for years now have been wishing upon him failure, are attempting to do with this lawsuit what they could not do at the polling places.

Rather than address the problems of the American people, repair our crumbling infrastructure, getting affordability for our young people to attend colleges and universities and other postsecondary education, here we are trying to find a way to discover some peg upon which to hang an impeachment resolution. That is what this is all about.

I would hope that we would hurry up and return dignity to this body and stop these charades that are inflaming the American people in a way that they are undeserving of.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the gentlewoman that I have no additional speakers except myself to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to bring to a close this sorry spectacle of legislative malpractice. It really saddens me to think that we have arrived at this point in this legislative year when we are about to go home for 5 weeks of legislative work in the district when we should be here on the floor taking care of the very many issues that people have talked about all day.

But most importantly, this lawsuit goes against everything that the majority has been working for for the last 4 years. They have tried over 50 times, spending $79 million, to repeal the Affordable Care Act. And no one, frankly, listening to this is now going to believe that there is this great change of heart and they are so broken up that it wasn't implemented in time and by the book that you are going to try to sue the President of the United States. I don't think even to kids watching Sesame Street that would make any sense. In fact, the strongest arguments about it really come from the majority's own party. It is sadly a partisan political election year stunt, and it has no place in this House.

As I said earlier today, when I first came here, the bipartisanship was so wonderful and strong that the New York delegation, all of us, stood together on issue after issue. I miss that terribly and long for it to come back.

In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to vote against this disgraceful resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, our system of government is in a bad place when one branch of government is compelled to sue another branch of government for failing to play its proper constitutional role. We shouldn't be in that situation, but we are. The President should have fulfilled his oath to faithfully execute the laws as written by Congress and signed by this President. Unfortunately, this lawsuit is necessary because the President has not implemented the law as passed and chose to pick and choose how he would have the law affect the American citizens.

This resolution will help guarantee that the legislation passed by Congress and signed by the President is faithfully executed according to the rule of law and not according to the whim of one person, that being the President of the United States. Also, no President should be allowed to pick and choose which laws matter and which ones do not.

It is unfortunate that some Members of Congress believe this body should be irrelevant. It is unfortunate that they believe any President should be able to enforce the law or not enforce the law as that President chooses.

The American people elect their Member of Congress. They live under the laws that are written. They make their plans and follow through based upon what the laws are, and they live under these rules of law, and they need to be able to count on them. When Members of Congress believe the laws that we pass no longer matter, they are also saying that the beliefs of the American people do not matter.

□ 1800

When we allow the President to singlehandedly determine what the law is, the Constitution, our separation of powers, and the American people become irrelevant. That is why the President's system of unilateral governance cannot stand. It must be stopped. Even if it takes a lawsuit to do so, that is what we think the Federal judiciary is there to do: to resolve differences based upon the law. If the President's goal was to goad the House into defending the Constitution and the role of the

government, he certainly had succeeded when he said: Why not just sue me?

Our Constitution must be defended and the role of the American people in the lawmaking process must be understood and guaranteed. This resolution is an important step in doing that.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I submit an exchange of letters between Chairman of the Committee on House Administration, CANDICE MILLER, and myself regarding the Committee on House Administration's jurisdictional interests in this resolution as well as Chairman MILLER'S desire to waive House Administration's consideration of H. Res. 676. These letters were also included in House Report 113-561, which was filed on July 28, 2014.

JULY 24, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS;
Chairman, The Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: On July 24, 2014, the Committee on Rules ordered reported H. Res. 676, a resolution providing 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. As you know, the Committee on House Administration was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the allowance and expenses of administrative officers of the House.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Committee on House Administration. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on House Administration does not waive its jurisdiction over H. Res. 676.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration.

JULY 24, 2014.

Hon. CANDICE S. MILLER
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you for your letter regarding H. Res. 676, resolution providing 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, which the Committee on Rules ordered reported on July 24, 2014.

I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in this legislation and appreciate your cooperation in moving the bill to the House floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on the bill will not prejudice the Committee on House Administration with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record when the House considers the legislation.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today on the House Floor, the Republican leadership is taking a dangerous and unprecedented action by bringing up H. Res 676, a bill to move forward with a lawsuit against President Barack Obama.

Beyond a doubt, the move to sue the President is yet another example of the failed leadership of the Republican Party. If the Republicans had acted on critical issues to move our country forward instead of wasting time and taxpayer money by taking over 50 senseless votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act or shutting down the Federal government, the President would not have needed to use Executive authority in the first place.

With fewer than 150 bills enacted into law to date, the 113th Congress is on course to be the least productive in our nation's history. Undeniably, this Republican led Congress is the worst, and least productive, in our nation's history.

Instead of spending time passing partisan bills that attack working Americans, weaken environmental protections and retreat on education and job training opportunities, this Congress should be working to create jobs and strengthen the middle class, not wasting taxpayer dollars on yet another political stunt.

Congress should instead be focusing on the issues that matter: creating jobs, fixing our broken immigration system, restoring unemployment insurance for 3 million Americans, and raising the minimum wage to help workers and their families to have access to opportunities. Along with my Democratic colleagues, I strongly urge House Republicans to work with Democrats to help create jobs and opportunities for the American people, not engage in political tricks.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the unprecedented Republican plan to sue the President of the United States.

At a time when Congress should be focusing on strengthening the middle class and expanding opportunities for all Americans, our Republican colleagues in the House accuse the President of unconstitutionally abusing his executive power by delaying the requirement in the Affordable Care Act that larger companies provide health insurance to their employees.

At a time when student debt exceeds credit card debt in our country, when mothers are the primary breadwinner yet receive unequal pay, and when job creation is stagnating, our Republican colleagues have proposed a baseless, shameful lawsuit that further erodes the public's confidence in the United States Congress and a functioning American democracy.

The lawsuit is fundamentally flawed in several ways:

First, Republicans argue that the President acted outside of his authority with respect to implementing the ACA.

Claims that the President is ignoring the law are unmerited. Records show that the President is using the same flexibility that presidents of both parties have long utilized to phase in new programs and policies and ensure that statutes are implemented in workable, sensible ways, minimizing disruption to individuals, families and businesses.

Everything we do in Congress bears the mark of humanity. No law is perfect and occasionally, presidents must make reasonable, short-term accommodations to reality.

Second, the courts are not the appropriate place to work out political disagreements between one half of one House of Congress and the Administration.

The Affordable Care Act was passed by the House and the Senate and signed into law by the President. I understand that many House Republicans hate the law; they've made that abundantly clear in the more than 50 times they have voted to repeal it.

After unsuccessfully attempting to repeal the law through regular order, House Republicans, grasping at straws, have opted to give away the mighty powers of the legislative branch to the judicial branch. If Congress starts relying on judges to check executive power, instead of the tools the Constitution grants us, this body will transfer enormous authority to the judicial branch.

And to add insult to injury, the entire cost of this political misadventure will be paid for by the taxpayers.

Repeated attempts to maintain regular order regarding cost transparency have been rebuffed.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER of the Rules Committee sent a letter to Chairman SESSIONS, asking for a cost estimate of the lawsuit. No useful information has been provided.

Ranking Member BRADY of the House Administration Committee sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER asking for regular order and transparency with the use of taxpayer money. No useful information has been provided.

Amendment after amendment was offered by the Minority Members of the Rules Committee to provide transparency to the expenditures which would come out of legislative branch funds. All were voted down on party lines.

This lawsuit is further proof of House Republicans' contempt and disregard for the priorities of the American people—an effort to pander to the most extreme, rightwing voters at taxpayer expense and our nation's well-being.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 676. This legislation, which authorizes a lawsuit that the Republican Party plans to bring against President Obama, is a waste of time and a waste of money.

Congress has two days before the August recess and instead of bringing up unemployment insurance, the Bring Jobs Home Act, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, the Paycheck Fairness Act, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, universal pre-K legislation reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act, reauthorization of the Export Import Bank reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, legislation addressing global climate change, legislation to fund the federal government after September 30th of this year, gun control, comprehensive immigration reform, or any number of other issues that have stalled in the House since the Republicans took control in 2010, this is what the Republican majority has chosen to pass.

The proposed lawsuit has dubious legal standing and no evident merit at all. Every administration has used the executive authority delegated to it by the Constitution and by the Congress, in the implementation and execution of our nation's laws. In fact, Supreme

Court Justice Antonin Scalia said "The framers of the Constitution emphatically rejected a system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress's liking."

I hope that the American people will see this action for what it is—a stunt—an attempt to placate a radical wing of the Republican Party. The majority should be embarrassed to use Congressional time for this rather than for real, pressing issues.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 3.5 million Americans who have lost their unemployment benefits over the past seven months and the one million Dreamers whose aspirations continue to be tragically denied and in strong opposition to the Majority's endless parade of political stunts, now best highlighted by the present legislation, H. Res. 676, a resolution giving one chamber of Congress the authority to sue the President.

As the American people's elected representatives, we have a duty to debate and vote on pressing legislation, such as long-term unemployment insurance and comprehensive immigration reform.

Instead, the Majority is wasting the American people's time and precious tax dollars on this political stunt that will inevitably fail. Any first-year law student would be able to tell the Majority that our chamber would lack standing before any court under the U.S. Constitution because there's simply no injury.

Just nine days ago, Judge William Griesbach agreed, dismissing a suit brought before the Eastern District Court of Wisconsin by Senator RON JOHNSON against the U.S. Office of Personnel Management over its implementation of the Affordable Care Act because the Senator lacked standing.

To quote Judge Griesbach, "Under our constitutional design, in the absence of a concrete injury to a party that can be redressed by the courts, disputes between the executive and legislative branches over the exercise of their respective powers are to be resolved through the political process, not by decisions issued by federal judges."

One of our nation's most noted jurists, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia agrees. He wrote last year in his opinion in United States v. Windsor, regarding the dangers of resolving a political question before a court, that the framers of the Constitution unequivocally rejected a "system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress's liking."

Our Constitution provides the Executive wide discretion in the implementation of federal law. In 2006, then-President George W. Bush extended the deadline and waived penalties for certain seniors who failed to sign up in time for the new Medicare prescription drug program.

At that time, or in the following year when control of this chamber changed hands, neither Democrats nor Republicans contemplated suing President Bush over his use of executive discretion.

If the Majority is dissatisfied with current federal law, it should use its authority granted under Article I to amend it.

Otherwise, the Majority should do what every elected official under our present government has done since 1788—go before the American people and openly debate the merits of their agenda—which today includes the unashamed denial of millions of Americans essential unemployment benefits or the million young persons raise in our country the opportunity to become Americans.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—201

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

NOT VOTING—6

DesJarlais
Foster
Hanabusa
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Sires

□ 1828

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 468 had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 935.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 935

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 ''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.''.

SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

''(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

''(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

''(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

''(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

''(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

''(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

''(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

''(ii) Treatment works effluent.

''(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013.

The reason we are back here on the floor for this bill today is pure politics. In the last Congress, this bill then was H.R. 872. It was introduced on a bipartisan basis, with overwhelming bipartisan support, and it passed on the suspension calendar with two-thirds of this body in support of it. In this Congress, H.R. 935—the exact same bill—was again introduced on a bipartisan basis, with bipartisan support, and it was voice-voted out of the Transportation and Agriculture Committees.

However, earlier this week, partisanship reared its ugly head, and Members who were on record as voting in support of this legislation or in having agreed to it by voice vote were urged to change their votes from ''yes'' to ''no'' in order for it not to be agreed on by two-thirds of this body. This is partisanship at its ugliest. The principles and policy of this legislation have not changed over the last few years. Instead, the politics of it did.

I introduced H.R. 935 to clarify congressional intent regarding how the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters should be regulated. It is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act—also know as FIFRA—and not the Clean Water Act, which has long been the Federal regulatory statute that governs the sale and use of pesticides in the United States. In fact, FIFRA regulated pesticide use long before the enactment of the Clean Water Act. However, more recently, as the result of a number of lawsuits, the Clean Water Act has been added as a new and redundant layer of Federal regulation over the use of pesticides.

I will not repeat the history I gave in Monday's debate of how the EPA came to impose this unnecessary second layer of Federal regulation, but I think it is important for everyone to realize that this regulatory burden is impacting not just farmers, but cities, counties, and homeowners.

Federal and State agencies are expending vital funds to initiate and maintain Clean Water Act permitting programs governing pesticide applications, and a wide range of public and private pesticide users are now facing increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting process. This is adding another layer to an already big and growing pile of unfunded regulatory mandates being imposed on the regulated community. Despite what some would have you believe, all of this expense comes with no additional environmental protection.

The cost of complying with the NPDES permit regulations and the fears of potential liability are forcing mosquito control and other pest control programs to reduce operations and redirect resources to comply with the regulatory requirements. This may be having an adverse effect on public health. In many States, routine preventative programs have been reduced due to the NPDES requirements. This most likely impacted and increased the record-breaking outbreaks of the West Nile virus around the Nation in 2012. H.R. 935 will enable communities to resume conducting routine preventative mosquito and other pest control programs in the future.

H.R. 935 exempts from the NPDES permitting process a discharge to waters involving the application of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, where the pesticide is used for its intended purpose and the use is in compliance with pesticide label requirements. This is appropriate because pesticide registration and enforcement programs under FIFRA take into account environmental and human health risks just like the Clean Water Act does.

H.R. 935 was drafted very narrowly with technical assistance from the United States EPA to return pesticide regulation to where it was before the court got involved. It leaves FIFRA as the appropriate and adequate regulating statute. Well over 150 organizations, representing a wide variety of public and private entities and thousands of stakeholders, have signed a letter supporting a legislative resolution of this issue.

I will insert the letter in the RECORD. Just to name a few of these organizations, they include the American Mosquito Control Association, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, the National Water Resources Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, Farm Family Alliance, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, CropLife America, and Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

In addition, I will submit for the RECORD a letter from the National Alliance of Forest Owners, who expressed support for H.R. 935. NAFO represents private forest owners and managers of over 80 million acres of private forestland in 47 States, supporting 2.4 million jobs.

Finally, I will submit for the RECORD a letter of support, plus a rebuttal paper, prepared by the American Mosquito Control Association, which rebuts the inaccuracies of several statements made by several Members on the House floor Monday evening.

JULY 28, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations ask for your vote in support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, today. The bill will be on the floor of the House of Representatives on suspension this evening.

Pesticide users must now comply with the added requirement that certain pesticide applications—already stringently regulated under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)—obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or delegated states. The legislation would clarify that federal law does not require water permits for FIFRA-compliant pesticide applications.

The new water permit for pesticides provides virtually no environmental benefit because all pesticide applications are already stringently regulated through FIFRA, including applications to and near water. Compliance requirements under the permit impose significant resource and liability burdens on thousands of small businesses, farms, municipalities, counties, and the state and federal agencies legally responsible for protecting public health. Most notably, the permit potentially exposes all pesticide users to citizen law suits under the CWA.

In the 112th Congress, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act—then, H.R. 872—passed the House of Representatives on suspension.

Now, in the 113th Congress, the Act has been reintroduced as H.R. 935. Strong bipartisan support was again demonstrated by the bill's recent passage out of both the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the House Committee on Agriculture.

Pesticides play a critical role in protecting crops from destructive pests, controlling mosquitoes and other disease-carrying pests, and managing invasive weeds that choke our waterways and shipping lanes, impede power generation, and damage our forests and recreation areas. We believe that the water permit for pesticides jeopardizes these protections and the economy as regulators and businesses expend time and resources on implementation and compliance all for no additional environmental benefits. We urge you to vote in support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act.

Sincerely,

Agribusiness Council of Indiana, Agricultural Alliance of North Carolina, Agricultural Council of Arkansas, Agricultural Retailers Association, Alabama Agribusiness Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, Alabama Farmers Federation, American Mosquito Control Association, American Soybean Association, Aquatic Plant Management Society, Arkansas Forestry Association, Biopesticide Industry Alliance, California Association of Winegrape Growers, Cape Cod Cranberry Growers Association, The Cranberry Institute, CropLife America, Council of Producers & Distributors of Agrotechnology, Edison Electric Institute, Family Farm Alliance, Far West Agribusiness Association.

Florida Farm Bureau Federation, Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Golf Course Superintendents Association of America, Hawaii Cattlemen's Council, Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho Potato Commission, Idaho Water Users Association, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Fertilizer & Chemical Association, Kansas Agribusiness Retailers Association, Louisiana Cotton and Grain Association, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Maine Potato Board, Michigan Agribusiness Association, Minnesota Agricultural Aircraft Association, Minnesota Pesticide Information & Education, Minor Crops Farmer Alliance, Missouri Agribusiness Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

Montana Agricultural Business Association, National Agricultural Aviation Association, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Pest Management Association, National Potato Council, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Water Resources Association, Nebraska Agri-Business Association, North Carolina Agricultural Consultants Association, North Carolina Cotton Producers Association, North Central Weed Science Society, North Dakota Agricultural Association, Northeast Agribusiness and Feed Alliance.

Northeastern Weed Science Society, Northern Plains Potato Growers Association, Ohio Professional Applicators for Responsible Regulation, Oregon Potato Commission, Oregonians for Food & Shelter, Pesticide Policy Coalition, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Professional Landcare Network, RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment), South Dakota Agri-Business Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Crop Production Association, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Southern Weed Science Society, Texas Ag Industries Association, Texas Vegetation Management Association, United Fresh Produce Association, U.S. Apple Association, USA Rice Federation.

Virginia Agribusiness Council, Virginia Forestry Association, Washington Friends of Farm & Forests, Washington State Potato Commission, Weed Science Society of America, Western Growers Association, Western Plant Health Association, Western Society of Weed Science, Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine, Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, Wisconsin State Cranberry Growers Association.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FOREST OWNERS,
July 30, 2014.

Hon. BOB GIBBS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GIBBS: On behalf of the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), I write to express NAFO's support for your bill, H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. NAFO represents private forest owners and managers committed to promoting economic and environmental benefits of privately-owned working forests. NAFO membership encompasses more than 80 million acres of private forestland in 47 states, support 2.4 million U.S. jobs. NAFO seeks to sustain the ecological, economic and social values of forests and to assure an abundance of healthy and productive forest resources.

In many parts of the country, wetland areas form an integral part of working forests. Congress has recognized in section 404 of the Clean Water Act that forest management maintains the wetlands function and has provided a permit exemption for normal silviculture activities. Judicious use of herbicides once or twice over 30 years helps ensure a healthy and vigorous forest stand is regenerated after a harvest.

Herbicide use must now comply with the added requirement that certain pesticides obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or delegated states. This NPDES permit for herbicides provides virtually no additional environmental benefit because applications are already stringently regulated by EPA under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). The permit must be renewed every five years and exposes all pesticide users to citizen law suits under the CWA.

Your legislation would clarify that federal law does not require water permits for FIFRA-compliant herbicide applications. We believe this clarification will provide certainty to forest managers and others who rely on these products. We appreciate your leadership to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

DANIEL SAKURA,
Vice President for Government Affairs.

AMCA,
July 30, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, I am writing on behalf of the American Mosquito Control Association (AMCA) to request your support for H.R. 935, which is of vital importance to the public health mission of the nation's mosquito control agencies.

Threats to the public from existing and new and emerging mosquito-borne diseases persist and have amplified. West Nile virus (WNv) is now endemic throughout the United States and annually causes local epidemics and fatalities. Eastern equine encephalitis (EEE) continues as a significant health risk, especially to children. Now, a new mosquito-borne virus, chikungunya virus (CHK), has emerged in the Western Hemisphere, causing hundreds of thousands of human cases in the Caribbean and Central America. Recently, locally transmitted cases of CHK have occurred in Florida, and this disease now threatens numerous other states as well.

Effective, local mosquito control programs are the best line of defense against these mosquito-borne diseases. Yet these programs face challenges, not the least of which is the financial burden caused by the imposition of permit requirements under the Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). This NPDES permit requirement mandates that mosquito control agencies' limited financial resources be shifted away from actual mosquito surveillance and control activities to administrative and compliance monitoring activities.

Mosquito control products are already very well regulated under FIFRA. NPDES compliance by public health agencies does not, in fact, add any additional environmental benefit, but does add unnecessary costs. The impact of those added costs will be felt by people at most risk to mosquito-borne diseases.

The solution is the elimination of this duplicative regulatory burden by supporting and passing H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. This legislation clarifies that no additional federal NPDES permits are required when pesticide applicators are using those products in accordance with the federal mandates established by the US Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Pesticide Programs that are already specified on the product label.

We respectfully request your support of H.R. 935.

Sincerely,

STEVE MULLIGAN,
AMCA President.

AMCA,
July 30, 2014.

On the House floor this week, Representative DeFazio said that his local mosquito control district applied for their permit online and has been able to operate just fine before and after the NPDES permits went into effect. It is our understanding that Rep. DEFAZIO does not live in a mosquito control district.

However, he has contacted the 4 Rivers Vector Control District in Bend, Oregon to

spray his vacation home. 4 Rivers VCD told him the permit would be a financial burden on their operation and they we were already regulated under FIFRA.

Rep. DEFAZIO's staff has called the North Morrow Vector Control and the Baker Valley Vector Control managers in Oregon who explained the negative impacts the permit was having on their districts. The managers of those districts have met with Rep. DeFazio's staff repeatedly in Washington D.C. over the past several years regarding the burden NPDES is having on mosquito control and provided written information (AMCA briefing papers) during those meetings.

It is our understanding that many Oregon Mosquito and Vector Control Districts have similarly written him about NPDES impacts on their districts at various times when there has been a push for legislation.

Rep DEFAZIO stated on the floor that anyone with a computer can easily get a NPDES permit online, with no fee, and no waiting period. This is not an accurate statement in the State of Oregon and most other states in the country.

Instead, operators seeking to register under the Oregon permit must take the following steps so that uninterrupted coverage continues:

Write a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan.

Obtain a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) application form through the mail or in person from a DEQ regional office, or download the application from the DEQ website.

Submit the application and maps of the treatment area, by mail, no less than 45 days before a planned pesticide application. There is no online application system.

Pay the permit fee is $903, and you must continue to pay an annual fee.

Failure to pay applicable fees may result in denial of an application or termination of coverage under this permit.

Submit an Annual Report. This cannot be submitted online, and there is no acknowledgement from the state that your Annual Report has been received.

The free, online permit only applies to the EPA's pesticide general permit that covers discharges in areas where EPA is the NPDES permitting authority. This only includes four states (Idaho, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New Mexico), Washington, D.C., all U.S. territories except the Virgin Islands, most Indian Country lands, and federal facilities in four additional states (Colorado, Delaware, Vermont, and Washington).

NPDES permits do not reduce the amount of pesticides being used, or bring about additional water monitoring. Integrated Mosquito Management strategies used by mosquito control programs for over a century, new technology, safer products, and our dedication to a healthy environment is what reduces adverse effects to Waters of the U.S.

The California NPDES permit is the strictest in the nation requiring post-treatment water testing, but after the initial samples showed that mosquito control did not adversely affect water quality, that provision of the California permit has been eliminated.

Our pesticides are vigorously tested by the Environmental Protection Agency to be used over, near, and in water without causing adverse affects to the environment. When used according to the label, the EPA has built in a significant margin of safety.

Pesticides are detected in many of our nation's waters, but the technology used today can detect pesticides at miniscule amounts; this does not mean that pesticides are present at levels toxic to people, aquatic plants or animals.

Why would environmental groups want pesticide applicators regulated under the CWA? Because it leaves municipal mosquito control programs vulnerable to lawsuits where fines may exceed $35,000/day. Under FIFRA they would need to demonstrate that the pesticides caused harm or were misapplied; because our pesticides are specific to mosquitoes and used in low doses by qualified applicators that would be extremely difficult. However, under the CWA, all they have to prove is a paperwork violation.

Communities without established Mosquito Control Districts are being deprived of the economic and health benefits of mosquito control. Historically, a local contractor could be hired to provide spraying services with the understanding that if he/she follows the FIFRA label he/she will be in compliance with the law.

Now, these local applicators must apply for a NPDES permit, create a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan, publish a Notice of Intent to apply pesticides, and wait for approval from the State or EPA. In most states the permits are not free. The steep fines under the Clean Water Act and the cumbersome administrative process have caused local applicators to discontinue mosquito control services.

Mr. GIBBS. This is a good bill that reduces burdensome regulations without rolling back any environmental safeguards.

Don't just ask the environmental community about what it takes to comply with the current duplicative Clean Water Act regulation of pesticides. Ask your farmers and your mosquito control agencies in your cities and your counties. Then look at your States' Web sites to see what it takes to apply for the NPDES permit for pesticide applications. We did that. It costs over $200 in my State of Ohio, and in Oregon, it is over $900. That does not count the time of an applicant to complete the process or the time of a regulator to evaluate the application—all to regulate again something that is already adequately regulated under FIFRA.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 935.

In the 112th Congress, the Republican leadership moved similar legislation under the guise that, unless Congress acted, the process for applying a pesticide would be so burdensome that it would grind to a halt an array of agricultural and public health-related activities.

Now, some may say that this may be a bit of hyperbole to describe the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's pesticide general permit. However, if you were to compare the concern expressed before the Agency's draft permit went into effect with the almost nonexistent level of concern expressed after almost 3 years of implementation, you would likely question why we are here this evening debating this bill.

Contrary to the rhetoric, the EPA and the States have successfully drafted and implemented a new pesticide general permit, a PGP, for the last 2½ years that adopted several commonsense precautionary measures to limit the contamination of local waters by pesticides. They do so in a way that allows pesticide applicators to meet their vital public health, agricultural, and forestry-related activities in a cost-effective manner.

This sky has not fallen. Farmers and forestry operators have had two successful growing seasons, and public health officials successfully addressed multiple threats of mosquito-borne illness while, at the same time, complying with the sensible requirements of both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA.

I say ''sensible'' because, as we should clearly understand, the intended focus of the Clean Water Act and FIFRA are very different. FIFRA is intended to address the safety and effectiveness of pesticides on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse effects on human health and the environment through uniform labels indicating approved uses and restrictions. Very sensible. However, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of the Nation's waters, with a primary focus on the protection of local water quality—two very distinct purposes.

It is simply incorrect to say that applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide in accordance with its labeling requirements is a surrogate for protecting local water quality. As any farmer knows, complying with FIFRA is as simple as applying a pesticide in accordance with its label. Farmers do not need to look to the localized impact of the pesticide on local water quality.

So why are groups, ranging from the American Farm Bureau Federation to CropLife America, so adamantly opposed to this regulation?

Let's explore that.

One plausible answer is that these groups do not want to come out of the regulatory shadows that have allowed unknown individuals to discharge unknown pesticides, in unknown quantities, with unknown mixtures, and at unknown locations.

I wonder how the American public would react to the fact that, for decades, pesticide sprayers could apply massive amounts of potentially harmful materials almost completely below the radar.

In fact, prior to the issuance of the pesticide general permit, the only hard evidence on pesticide usage in this country came from a voluntary sampling of the types and amounts of pesticides that were purchased from the commercial dealers of pesticides. No comprehensive information was available or required on the quantities, types, or locations of pesticides applied in this country.

Based on that practice, I guess we should not be surprised that, for decades, pesticides have been detected in the majority of our Nation's surface and groundwater, which leads me to

question how eliminating any reporting requirement on the use of pesticides is protective of human health and the environment. All this would do is make it harder to locate the sources of pesticide contamination in our Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams, and it would make the accountability for these discharges even more difficult. If this legislation were to pass, we would require more disclosure of those who manufacture pesticides than those who actually release these dangerous chemicals into the real world.

During the debate this past Monday, several speakers questioned the environmental and public health benefits of the Clean Water Act for the application of pesticides. However, many of these benefits are so obvious that it is not surprising they may have otherwise gone overlooked.

First, it is the Clean Water Act, not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to minimize pesticide discharges through the use of pesticide management measures, such as integrated pest management. I find it very difficult to argue that using an appropriate amount of pesticides for certain applications would be a problem.

Second, it is the Clean Water Act, not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to monitor for and report any adverse incidents that result from spraying.

□ 1845

I would think that monitoring for large fish or wildlife kills would actually be a mutually agreed-upon benefit.

Also, it is the Clean Water Act and not FIFRA that requires pesticide applicators to keep records on where and how many pesticides are being applied throughout the Nation. Again, if data is showing that a local water body is contaminated by pesticides, I would think the public would want to quickly identify the likely sources of pesticide that is causing the impairment.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I am unaware that, despite repeated requests to both EPA and the States, of any specific example where the current Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing their services.

So despite claims to the contrary, the Clean Water Act has not significantly increased the compliance costs to States or individual pesticide sprayers, nor has it been used as a tool by outside groups or the EPA to ban the use of pesticides.

So let me summarize just a few points.

One, the Clean Water Act does provide a valuable service in ensuring that an appropriate amount of pesticides are being applied at the appropriate times and that pesticides are not having an adverse impact on human health or the environment.

Number two, to the best of my knowledge, the pesticide general permit has imposed no impediment on the ability of pesticide applicators to provide their valuable service to both agricultural and public health communities. In fact, most pesticide applications are automatically covered by the pesticide general permit, either by no action or by filing of an electronic notice of intent.

Three, Federal and State data make clear that application of pesticides in compliance with FIFRA alone, as was the case for many years, was insufficient to protect water bodies throughout the Nation from being contaminated by pesticides. So, if we care about water quality, more needed to be done.

I can see no legitimate reason why we would want to allow any user of potentially harmful chemicals to return to the regulatory shadows that existed prior to the issuance of Clean Water Act pesticide general permits. It has caused no known regulatory, administrative, or significant financial burden, and it has been implemented seamlessly across country. As was stated during the debate on Monday, this legislation is seeking to address a pretend problem that simply does not exist.

I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 935, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Well, as a farmer, I take a little bit of offense to some of the remarks that we are applying pesticides in the shadows.

Pesticides cost money and, as farmers, we do not control what we get for our products, our commodities. We are raising corn and soybeans. We are at the mercy of the commodities market, so we have to do everything we can do on the cost side. And we certainly aren't going to waste a valuable input cost: pesticide, herbicide, and insecticide. So that is just an erroneous statement. That is just not true. Farmers of today are professionals, high capital cost operations, and it just makes no sense that we would waste those inputs.

On the issue about finding pesticide residues in water bodies, there is an issue that we call legacy issue, meaning that there was pesticides used many years ago that didn't break down in the environment, weren't biodegradable, and there is essentially a bank of residue left, and you get those legacy issues. The pesticides we are using today are much safer. The industry, the technology has improved drastically, and a lot of these pesticides, if not all, are more biodegradable.

Also, keep in mind, under FIFRA, the EPA approves the label. That is the approval of the process and the application and the amount that can be used. In most States, if not all States, most of these pesticides are being applied, have to be applied by certified applicators, and they are licensed. So they are filling out some paperwork and have to do due diligence.

This bill really does add a lot of duplication, because we went to a couple of States, and if you are applying a pesticide near a water body or a wetland—and that is open for definition how close that may be—you have to go online and apply for the permit. In some States, you have to apply for, you have to submit a management plan. You have to list where you are going to be applying the pesticide, the location.

So, basically, let's take this down to a homeowner level. A homeowner maybe wants to spray their yard for dandelions. If they are maybe reasonably close to a water body, or maybe not—that is open for discussion—they have to go online and, like I said, in Oregon, they have got to apply for a permit and submit a management plan and pay over a $900 fee. In my State of Ohio, it is over $200.

I think that is a little bizarre, as long as they are applying it to the label under EPA approval.

So let's also talk about mosquito control districts. We had a huge outbreak of West Nile virus in 2012. That was a big mosquito year. I guess last year wasn't as much. This year, the debate is going to be out on that.

But we were hearing evidence that, because of the permitting requirements, that some of our mosquito control districts—and the American Mosquito Control Association actually surveyed their members. Some of them were actually kind of holding back and doing the preventative programs.

I know of one large metropolitan area in the southern part of this country that had to declare an emergency. And the irony of this, when they declare an emergency, they don't have to get any permits. It was so bad, they had to do aerial spraying, so that was putting the environment even at more risk. When you go from land application up to aerial, you can imagine the possible results that could happen of contamination—and with no permit requirement.

So we do have evidence, there was some talk on Monday night in this debate that the one gentleman on the other side of the aisle was talking about: My mosquito control district, there is no issue—no issue, no problem.

Well, we talked to his mosquito control district and it is a problem, and they have been talking to them for the last several years that this is a problem.

I would also contend, I did some research, checked around with some of our local spraying outfits, the grain elevators that do spraying. They don't know about this new rule yet because the EPA, in a lot of States, hasn't notified, they haven't implemented it. I think maybe because they know there is legislation hanging out there. So a lot of our entities don't know about it yet. Some of the larger, obviously, mosquito control districts and larger operations might know.

But the reason, when you talk about it has been nearly 3 years, which is more like 2 years, and there hasn't been a problem as we might think

there should be a problem is because a lot of them aren't doing the NPDES permits because they are not aware of that fact yet.

So at some point, if we don't fix this, the hammer is going to come down and you are going to hear about it from farmers, mosquito control districts, and individual homeowners.

So I just want to make that clear that this bill is duplicative, and they are under a lot of regulation, and the EPA approves the label. If you are not applying a pesticide under the label requirements, then you have got a problem.

But we don't need to open this up to farmers and landowners and mosquito control districts to lawsuits and other problems. So what this is really boiling down to today is, now I am starting to see this is a revenue stream into the EPA for these outrageous costs of the NPDES programs.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, which will relieve farmers, foresters, and other pesticide applicators from a potentially costly regulatory burden that would do little, if anything, to protect the environment. The legislation simply makes clear congressional intent by amending both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA, to prohibit permits for pesticide application when pesticides are applied consistent with FIFRA.

This legislation is necessary following a 2006 decision by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that overturned an EPA rule which specifically exempted permitting of certain pesticide applications under the Clean Water Act. The Court's decision preempts FIFRA by the Clean Water Act for the first time in the history of either statute.

Clean Water Act permitting requirements place a significant burden and responsibilities on the States and the EPA. These National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits do not reduce the amount of pesticides being used or bring about additional water monitoring.

I know many of my colleagues share my concern about the regulations coming from the EPA, and frankly, the last thing we need to do, we need the EPA to do, or the lawyers or the judges who don't understand agriculture, is to have them tell farmers how to farm or add another meaningless paperwork exercise to their workload. The courts are not the place to make agriculture policy, and this legislation takes a step to address that.

Additionally, this bill is identical to legislation passed by the House last Congress with broad and strong bipartisan support. So I urge my colleagues to show that same support today.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

This legislation was the product of collaborative work done by two House committees, along with technical assistance from the Obama administration's Environmental Protection Agency. This is the way legislation should be handled, and I am proud of our efforts in the House.

To refresh our memories, this problem stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. This decision invalidated a 2006 EPA regulation exempting pesticides regulations that are in compliance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act from having to also comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

I want to be clear, our pesticides are vigorously tested by the EPA to be used over, near, and in water without causing adverse effects to the environment. When used according to the label, the EPA has built in a significant margin of safety. Communities without established mosquito control districts are being deprived of the economic and health benefits of mosquito control.

Historically, a local contractor could be hired to provide spraying services with the understanding that, if they followed the FIFRA label, they would be in compliance with the law. Now these local applicators must apply for an NPDES permit, create a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan, publish a notice of intent to apply pesticides, and wait for approval from the State or EPA. In most States, the permits are not free. The steep fines under the Clean Water Act and the cumbersome administrative process have caused local applicators to discontinue mosquito control services.

The effort to have these same products today doubly regulated through the Clean Water Act permitting process is unnecessary, costly, and, ultimately, undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of regulatory compliance costs for a variety of public agencies and doubles their legal jeopardy. Think about that—doubles their legal jeopardy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for debate purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and I certainly appreciate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Waterways for his leadership.

I rise today in support of H.R. 935.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing we need in agriculture right now is more regulation. Pesticides are and have been an integral part of insuring that our Nation continues to produce the world's most abundant, safe, and affordable food supply. As it stands today, pesticides already go through a minimum of 125 safety tests before being registered for use. On top of that, they are subject to strict labeling and usage requirements, as the Agriculture Committee chairman alluded to in his remarks.

Passage of H.R. 935 will clarify congressional intent that Clean Water Act permits are not required for lawful pesticide applications and protect pesticide users from abusive lawsuits.

□ 1900

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 935, which prevents wasteful and duplicative regulations that could ultimately expand the EPA's reach further into every part of our country.

Federal law already requires the EPA to ensure that pesticides cause "no unreasonable adverse effect" to humans or the environment. Labels attached to pesticides that are related to its use are crafted to minimize such impacts. The label, in effect, is the law today. When a person does not follow the label, regardless of additional permits, they are violating the law.

Yet activists believe requiring water permits, even when a user abides by the pesticide label, will somehow strengthen our water quality. States continue to spend more and more money and man hours implementing and enforcing a water permit process that most regulators do not believe does anything to further protect the water quality. That is why H.R. 935 is so important.

This bill removes a pointless paperwork exercise and burden through NPDES permits that do nothing but create additional hurdles between consumers and the benefits of products like pesticides provide.

Registration and labeling of a pesticide already does as much as any additional NPDES permit would require. In fact, EPA's own analysis suggests that the NPDES permits program for pesticides is the single greatest expansion in the program's history, covering over 5.5 million pesticide applications per year by 365,000 applicators.

If H.R. 935 is not implemented, the effects of the EPA's overregulation would be felt across the State of Georgia. For example, county officials will

have one more hurdle to overcome when trying to control the mosquito population and the outbreak of West Nile virus. These counties are forced to address an additional bureaucratic hurdle before they are able to address a serious health threat to our citizens, a hurdle that provides no additional benefits.

With this unprecedented expansion, all stakeholders are affected, including State agencies, cities, counties, municipalities, research scientists, forest managers—and every American will pay for this. Last Congress, we passed this same legislation, 292–130, and I ask Congress to, again, do the same thing.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up a couple of points here.

For the record, 45 States actually manage their own pesticide programs. So it is not the responsibility of the Federal Government or the EPA.

In fact, contrary to what we have heard here tonight, Mr. Speaker, small applicators are already covered. They don't need to do anything. They are covered already under the permitting process.

And then just to be clear, in fact, in the management of those 45 States—a State like Idaho, for example, currently has 122 active permits, and there has been no charge for that permit. It is free from the Federal Government. And that is true for actually a number of States.

Now, we have heard about the dramatic effect that the regulations would have. But, in fact, for almost 3 years now, there has been no drama. The process has worked well. And confusing the FIFRA process and the purposes of the Clean Water Act, I think in some ways, is what brings us here today. As I said earlier, they are very distinct. And, in fact, just because we need to cover applying pesticides and controlling the way that those are applied and the application doesn't absolve us of a responsibility also to make certain that our water bodies are clean.

There is another myth, actually, that has been put forward here that we have heard. And that is that maintaining the Clean Water Act would subject pesticide applicators to litigation and increase citizen suits. In fact, this is false. If a pesticide applicator abides by the terms of the Clean Water Act, the pesticide general permit—which applies in accordance with the FIFRA label and minimizes the use of the pesticide and conducts routine monitoring of acute impacts—they are, by the terms of the Clean Water Act, immune from lawsuits by any party.

Another myth that we have just heard here is that the permitting process, Mr. Speaker, the FIFRA requirements and the Clean Water Act, are duplicative. As I have said earlier, FIFRA addresses the safety and effectiveness on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse impacts on human health and the environment through uniform labeling requirements. In contrast, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of local water bodies, with direct considerations on the potential impact of additional pollutants to specific waters. So measuring the human health and environment with uniform labeling and protecting the waters are two separate purposes.

Another myth that we have heard here is that most of the pesticides that are contained in the existing studies are legacy pesticides that are no longer used domestically. There is no evidence of pesticide contamination by currently used pesticides. This is absolutely false.

Although the U.S. Geological Survey did publish a report in 2006 that documented how pesticides were detected in every stream tested by the USGS, including pesticides such as DDT and chlordane that were previously banned as recently as 2014, the USGS has published several research studies showing how more recently developed pesticides and insecticides are being detected as widespread in streams in high corn and soybean regions of the United States.

So we have heard a lot of mythology here, but it is important for Congress to deal in reality. So I just wanted to clear those things for the record.

And I would inquire of the gentleman if he has additional requests for time because I am prepared to close.

Mr. LUCAS. I do, indeed, have one further request, and then I will yield back to my friend from Ohio, who will close.

Ms. EDWARDS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

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

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation. This evening, we are, once again, considering H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. Many of you will remember that the House voted in support of this legislation 3 years ago. That bill, H.R. 872, passed the House floor on suspension with a vote of 292–130.

This same language was included in the 2012 farm bill that was reported out of the Agricultural Committee, as well as the 2013 farm bill, which the House sent to the farm bill conference. It was included in the committee-reported text of the fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations bill. Unfortunately, due to the opposition from a couple of our friends in the Senate, we have been unable to get this bill to the President's desk, which we know, once done, will guarantee his signature.

As many of you may recall, this language was drafted at our request for technical assistance by the EPA general counsel. The problem we asked the EPA to help resolve stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit. This decision nullified a 2006 EPA regulation that exempted certain pesticides from having to comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland, gave a very nice speech. And she mentioned several times the potential problem of contaminating creeks, the potential problems of this pesticide causing all of these problems that we haven't seen. We don't have the facts on that, and to regulate something that is already regulated—and I must caution everybody how these drugs and how these pesticides come out. They go through extensive testing. Millions of dollars are spent by these industries. And the intent by those pressing to have federally registered pesticides regulated through the Clean Water Act is unnecessary, it is costly, and it ultimately undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of compliance costs for a variety of public agencies, adding to their legal jeopardy and threatening pesticide applicators, including mosquito control districts, with fines set at $37,500 per day per violation. All I can say is, welcome to going out of business if you are in the private sector.

Across the country, several mosquito control districts may have to cease operations due to these costs. If this occurs, it would expose large portions of the population to mosquitoes carrying a number of dangerous and exotic diseases, such as West Nile virus. Hospitalization and rehab costs ranging from the tens of thousands into the millions of dollars, lost productivity, a decrease in tourism, and negative impacts on horses and livestock production are but a few of the costs that will further strain public health resources.

Being a veterinarian for the last 30 years, I have seen effects of mosquito-borne diseases. In addition, the West Nile virus causes deaths, from alligators to humans. Also, diseases such as Eastern encephalitis are transmittable to people, along with dengue fever, which is moving its way up from the Caribbean through the peninsula of Florida, and it will, no doubt, get up further to the mainland of the United States of America, in addition to the heartworm disease in our pets.

This unnecessary mandate applies not only to local and State interests but also to Federal agency lands located in States directly regulated by the EPA. For example, Federal agencies, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, authorize the use of some of their lands for many purposes, including recreation and agriculture. These uses often require pesticide applications to prevent mosquito-borne transmitted diseases and for other purposes.

Although the local mosquito control district may be the entity actually applying the pesticide, the Army Corps District is required to obtain the permit and sign off on related reports, thereby pointlessly driving up costs to

the Federal Government. We have agencies suing government agencies.

Further, experience has shown that the Corps is unwilling to assume permit responsibility for activities that it is not actually performing. This is a regulatory burden that Congress never intended, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from 144 environmental organizations, community-based organizations around the country that oppose H. Res. 935.

BEYOND PESTICIDES, BEYOND TOXICS, CATA—THE FARMWORKER SUPPORT COMMITTEE, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, EARTHJUSTICE, ENDANGERED SPECIES COALITION, FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, GREENPEACE, LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVERKEEPER, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NORTHWEST CENTER FOR ALTERNATIVES TO PESTICIDES, NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES, NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE CENTER, PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK, SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER, SIERRA CLUB, SURFRIDER FOUNDATION, WATERKEEPER ALLIANCE, WATERKEEPERS CAROLINA,

July 25, 2014.

Re Oppose H.R. 935 (''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013'')

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters nationwide, we urge you to oppose H.R. 935 (''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013''), which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting water supplies from direct applications of pesticides.

Nearly 150 human health, fishing, environmental, and other organizations have opposed efforts like H.R. 935 that would undermine Clean Water Act permitting for direct pesticide applications to waterways. We attach a list of these groups for your reference, as well as a one-page fact sheet with more information on the issue.

Regulating pesticide discharges to waterways under the Clean Water Act is critical. Despite current regulation under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, pesticides continue to impair our waterways in significant quantities and have caused real harm to public health and ecosystems. H.R. 935 would render ineffective the Clean Water Act pesticide general permit that took effect in 2011 (''pesticide general permit''). This permit is necessary to protect our waterways, public health, and fish and wildlife.

There have been mischaracterizations of the existing permit that we must correct:

The pesticide general permit has no significant effect on farming practices. The permit in no way affects land applications of pesticides for the purpose of controlling pests. Irrigation return flows and agricultural stormwater runoff will not require permits, even when they contain pesticides. Existing agricultural exemptions in the Clean Water Act remain.

The pesticide general permit allows for spraying to combat vector-borne diseases such as the West Nile virus. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, the permit ''provides that pesticide applications are covered automatically under the permit and may be performed immediately for any declared emergency pest situations.''

The pesticide general permit—which has been in place for more than two and a half years now—simply lays out commonsense practices for applying pesticides directly to waters that currently fall under the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act. Efforts to block this permit are highly controversial, as evidenced by the attached list of groups opposed.

Please protect the health of your state's citizens and all Americans by opposing H.R. 935.

Sincerely,

Marty Hayden, Vice President, Policy & Legislation, Earthjustice; Scott Slesinger, Legislative Director, Natural Resources Defense Council; Sara Chieffo, Legislative Director, League of Conservation Voters; Dalal Aboulhosn, Senior Washington Representative, Sierra Club; Jeannie Economos, Pesticide Safety & Environmental Health Project Coordinator, Farmworker Association of Florida; Nelson Carrasquillo, Executive Director, CATA—The Farmworker Support Committee; Mary Beth Beetham, Director of Legislative Affairs, Defenders of Wildlife; Jay Feldman, Executive Director, Beyond Pesticides; Brett Hartl, Endangered Species Policy Director, Center for Biological Diversity; Nina Bell, Executive Director, Northwest Environmental Advocates; Rick Hind, Legislative Director, Greenpeace.

Pete Nichols, National Director, Waterkeeper Alliance; Heather Ward, Executive Director, Waterkeepers, Carolina; Mark Riskedahl, Executive Director, Northwest Environmental Defense Center; Tara Thornton, Program Director, Endangered Species Coalition; Marylee Orr, Executive Director, Louisiana Environmental Action Network; Paul Orr, Riverkeeper, Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper; Jason Flanders, Program Director, San Francisco Baykeeper; Kristin S. Schafer, Policy Director, Pesticide Action Network; Lisa Arkin, Executive Director, Beyond Toxics; Gus Gates, Oregon Policy Manager, Surfrider Foundation; Kim Leval, Executive Director, Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.

WHO OPPOSES EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE CLEAN WATER ACT PERMITTING FOR DIRECT PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS?

The below organizations have signed letters opposing legislation that guts Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticides:

Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Altamaha Riverkeeper and Altamaha Coastkeeper, Atchafalaya Basinkeeper, Apalachicola Riverkeeper, Assateague Coastkeeper/Assateague Coastal Trust, American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, Audubon California, Better Urban Green Strategies, Beyond Pesticides, Big Black Foot Riverkeeper, Biscayne Bay Waterkeeper, Black Warrior Riverkeeper, Blackwater Nottoway Riverkeeper Program, Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper, Butte Environmental Council, Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Californians for Pesticide Reform, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Cape Fear River Watch, Cascobay Baykeeper, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc., Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Environmental Health, Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment, Charleston Waterkeeper, Choctawhatchee Riverkeeper, Clean Water Action, Clean Water Network, Coast Action Group, Colorado Riverkeeper, Cook Inletkeeper, Inc., Defenders of Wildlife, Detroit Riverkeeper, Dolphin Swimming and Boating Club, The Earth Cause Organization, Earthjustice, Emerald Coastkeeper, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environment California, Environmental Protection Information Center, Environmental Advocates, Flint Riverkeeper, Food & Water Watch, Forestland Dwellers, French Broad Riverkeeper, Friends of the Earth, Friends of Five Creeks, Friends of Gualala River, Friends of the Petaluma River, Galveston Baykeeper, Geos Institute, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Grand Riverkeeper, Grand Traverse Baykeeper, Gunpowder Riverkeeper, Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc., Haw Riverkeeper/Haw River Assembly, Housatonic River Initiative, Hurricane Creekkepper/Friends of Hurricane Creek, Hudson Riverkeeper, Humboldt Baykeeper, Idaho Conservation League, Indian Riverkeeper, Inland Empire Waterkeeper, Kansas Riverkeeper, Klamath Forest Alliance, Klamath Riverkeeper, Lake George Waterkeeper, Lake Pend Oreille Waterkeeper, Lawyers for Clean Water, League of Conservation Voters, Long Island Soundkeeper, Louisiana Bayoukeeper, Louisiana Environmental Action Network, Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper, Lower Neuse Riverkeeper, Lower Susquehanna Riverkeeper, Madrone Audubon Society, Milwaukee Riverkeeper, Mothers of Marin Against The Spray, Narragansett Baykeeper, National Audubon Society, National Environmental Law Center, Natural Resources Defense Council, Neuse Riverkeeper Foundation, New York/New Jersey Baykeeper, Northcoast Environmental Center, Northern California River Watch, Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Northwest Center for Alternatives for Pesticides, Ogeechee Riverkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, Oregon Wild, Oregon Toxics Alliance, Ouachita Riverkeeper, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Pamlico-Tar Riverkeeper, Patuxent Riverkeeper, Peconic Baykeeper, Pesticide Action Network, Pesticide-Free Sacramento, Pesticide-Free Zone, Pesticide Watch, Planning and Conservation League, Potomac Riverkeeper, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Puget Soundkeeper Alliance, Quad Cities Riverkeeper, Raritan Riverkeeper, Riverkeeper, Rogue Riverkeeper, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee, Russian Riverkeeper, Sacramento Audubon Society, Inc., Safe Alternatives for Our Forest Environment, Safety Without Added Toxins, Saint John's Organic Farm, Saint Louis Confluence Riverkeeper, San Diego Coastkeeper, San Francisco Baykeeper, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, San Francisco Tomorrow, Santa Monica Baykeeper, Santee Riverkeeper, Satilla Riverkeeper, Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition, Savannah Riverkeeper, Shenandoah Riverkeeper, Sierra Club, Silver Valley Waterkeeper, Spokane Riverkeeper, St. Johns Riverkeeper, Stop the Spray East Bay, Tennessee Riverkeeper, The Bay Institute, Toxics Action Center, Tualatin Riverkeepers, Upper Neuse Riverkeeper, Upper Watauga Riverkeeper, Waterkeeper Alliance, West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Western Nebraska Resources Council, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Yadkin Riverkeeper.

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

Again, I think it is important for us to deal in facts and not in mythology. And a couple of the facts are these:

In 2008, States reported to the EPA—that is, State reporting agencies—that 16,819 miles of rivers and streams, 1,766 square miles of bays and estuaries, and

260,342 acres of lakes are impaired or threatened by pesticides. So it is simply not the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is no identified pesticide contamination in our water bodies. It is simply not true.

I just want to note also for the record, Mr. Speaker, that, again, there has been no evidence at all that, again, despite the repeated request of the EPA and State-run permit programs, that there are specific examples where the application of the Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing their services. So if there was a problem and a burden, then identify it. And there simply has been no identification of such a problem.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to review our recent history. Just on Monday of this past week, the House of Representatives actually defeated the bill that we are considering tonight, H.R. 935, under suspension of the rules. So having gone through that defeat, tonight we have debated the merits again of that same piece of legislation under a rule that does not allow any amendments to improve the bill to be offered, debated, or voted on. Tomorrow, the House will, once again, vote on passage of H.R. 935, the bill that failed under a suspension of the rules on Monday.

This legislation will undermine one of our Nation's most successful environmental laws, the Clean Water Act, in limiting the potential contamination of our Nation's waters by pesticides.

Contrary to some of the rhetoric—some of which we have heard tonight, Mr. Speaker—the Environmental Protection Agency has successfully drafted and implemented a new pesticide general permit for the last 2½ years.

□ 1915

That regulation has several commonsense precautionary measures that limit contamination of local waters by pesticides—we have heard from the States even since 2008 that pesticide contamination in thousands of miles of streams, rivers, and estuaries are in fact contaminated by pesticide—while it would allow pesticide applicators to meet their vital public health, agricultural, and forestry-related activities in a cost-effective manner.

Now, last Congress, Mr. Speaker, the House narrowly approved a similar bill, H.R. 872, under suspension of the rules by a vote of 292–130, under the guise of regulatory uncertainty under a yet-unseen Clean Water Act permit program.

However, since that time, the EPA has issued a reasonable and protective Clean Water Act permit program that preserves vital farming, forestry, and mosquito control activities at the same time as protecting our Nation's waters. So a year passed, and we have implemented a program that is underway now.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Water Act is a key to those of us who value clean drinking water and fishable, swimmable waters or who represent States that depend on tourism, like my home State of Maryland, since we have the fourth longest coastline in the continental United States, the Chesapeake Bay—which is the largest estuary in the United States—and several of its tributaries, including the Anacostia, Patuxent, Potomac, and Severn Rivers that flow through the Fourth Congressional District.

The shoreline of the Chesapeake and its tidal tributaries stretch for over 2,000 miles, and thousands of streams, rivers, and acres of wetlands provide the freshwater that flows into the bay.

Thanks to the Clean Water Act, over the past 40-plus years, billions of pounds of pollution have been kept out of our rivers, and the number of waters that meet clean water goals nationwide has doubled, with direct benefits for drinking water, public health, recreation and wildlife.

The act represents a huge step forward by requiring States to set clean water standards to protect uses such as swimming, fishing, and drinking and for the regulation of pollution discharges.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly want to return to a laissez-faire policy that provided no accountability to who was using what pesticides, where they were using those pesticides, and in what amounts and resulted in thousands of miles of streams and lakes being contaminated by pesticides.

I would urge my colleagues to take the commonsense approach that the EPA has taken and to, on both sides of the aisle, vote ''no'' on H.R. 935 and to once again vote down legislation that is looking to solve a problem, Mr. Speaker, that simply does not exist.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, how much time does my side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not deregulate pesticides as has been suggested by some speakers. Pesticides have been regulated under FIFRA for decades, and this bill does not change that.

This bill makes it clear that if you are a mosquito control agency, a farmer, or a citizen that is applying a pesticide and you are complying with FIFRA, you do not need an NPDES permit.

Now, there are a couple facts that came out here tonight that the other side said that, without this bill, it is not necessary because you don't have to get a permit to go out and apply pesticides. Well, if you are applying near a water body or a wetland, you do have to get an NPDES permit from the court decision.

This was not an EPA decision. This was a court decision that looked at it in a narrow vision, and it was a very ill-advised court decision, and I would say when you look at proposed rules out there about waters in the United States, it is up to debate what is near or close to a water body, so that is a fact that we would have that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a personal experience. Several years ago, my soybean crop—it was a Friday, late Friday afternoon, working with my certified pesticide applicator, we discovered that my soybean crop had just been attacked by spider mites, an insect, and we had to make application, insecticide application, to take care of it.

That application was made on a Friday night. If I had to apply for an NPDES permit, fill out the form, put in the management plan, submit it to the State, it comes back—I don't know if we would have got it until Tuesday. I would have lost—the damage to my soybean crop would have been substantial.

So the issue out here that there is no cost happening, there will when this thing gets fully implemented because, in practice, this court decision has not been fully implemented in practice across the country, but that will be coming if we fail to enact H.R. 935.

This bill removes the needless and duplicative regulation that threatens public health and imposes an expensive burden on public and private entities trying to safely approve pesticides.

This is a bipartisan bill. It has passed out of this House last Congress by a two-thirds majority. We had partisan antics going on Monday night. We had people switch their votes under pressure for partisan reasons, and that is not good government.

This bill will help protect the environment and human safety when you especially look at West Nile virus and all the other mosquito diseases we are finding that are coming about.

We have to allow our certified pesticide applicators, our mosquito control districts to do their job, and if the private sector wants to go in here and have to do all this extra permitting—we are not talking—when you hear about general permit, you think, oh, I just get a permit for the season, and I am good to go.

That is not what the general permit means. What it means is you have to go every time you do an application, if it is near or close to a wetland or water body, apply for a permit, put in that permit where the location is going to be, probably the date.

Well, say it is raining that day or it is too windy. Do you have to reapply for your permit? That is kind of up in the air still, so there are a whole bunch of issues out there, plus the costs, the time to do it, the bureaucracy, the red tape, and the costs.

Mr. Speaker, I think the one that is really bizarre is if you are a homeowner and you want to apply a pesticide to your yard and if you are near a water body or a wetland, whatever,

you have to apply for a permit because of this court decision.

This will bog down the NPDES permit process, and it will delay and add costs, and it puts farmers in jeopardy to get their crops to maintain and get the yields we need to produce the wholesome food supply in this country that our agricultural community produces and our mosquito control districts that protect many of our citizens from West Nile virus and other mosquito-borne diseases.

So this is critical that these bills pass because we are getting close to the time when we are going to see very much damage being done. We saw a little bit of it in 2012, in at least one large metropolitan area, when they had to spray for mosquitoes aerially when they declared an emergency when it got so far out of hand because they didn't do the preventative measures.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to pass this bill, send it to the Senate, and hopefully, the Senate takes it up and passes it to protect the environment and health and human safety of the citizens of this country.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 935 is postponed.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ARKANSAS POLICE OFFICER AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ACADEMY INSTRUCTOR MARK WILLIAMS

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to honor the life of longtime Arkansas police officer and Law Enforcement Training Academy instructor, Mark Williams.

Born and raised in El Dorado, Mark began his law enforcement career in his hometown with the El Dorado Police Department in 1977, serving as a patrolman, detective, and sergeant.

Mark also served as a supervisor in the Hope Police Department's Patrol Division before joining the faculty of the Arkansas Law Enforcement Training Academy in 1994, where he trained new police officers until his retirement in 2013.

Mark's commitment to Arkansas didn't end there. He was also a gifted musician, who served as an Artist in Education, playing his guitar to entertain and educate children across south Arkansas.

I extend my deepest condolences to Mark's wife, children, and grandchildren on their loss. May they find comfort in knowing that Mark's legacy lives on with the thousands of Arkansas police officers he trained over nearly two decades at the academy and in the countless children and Arkansans he inspired with his music.

HONORING THE 138th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 138th anniversary of the founding of the Revenue Cutter School of Instruction, the predecessor of today's Coast Guard Academy, on July 31, 1876.

On that day, the Academy's first training exercise was held aboard the two-masted topsail schooner Dobbin, with a class of nine cadets. The class boarded the Dobbin in Baltimore, Maryland, for a 2-year training mission led by Captain John Henriques. Training aboard the ship emphasized seamanship and navigation, as it still does each summer when cadets still sail onboard the Coast Guard Barque Eagle.

Today, the Coast Guard Academy, located in New London, Connecticut, since 1910, is the home to a corps of nearly 1,000 cadets, 200 of whom graduate each year.

The Coast Guard Academy produces almost half of the service's corps of commissioned officers and has graduated distinguished leaders such as Thad Allen, Bob Papp, and the present commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Paul Zukunft, who lead our Coast Guard and serve the Nation. Today, it is led by the first woman officer to lead a United States military academy, Admiral Sandra Stosz.

As a cochair of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus and the representative of Connecticut's Second District, home to the Coast Guard Academy, I am honored to recognize its distinguished beginnings and the longstanding traditions of leadership and excellence which continue to serve our country.

MEDICARE'S 49TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise today to celebrate the 49th anniversary of the Medicare bill. The impact of Medicare on the lives of millions of Americans over the past 49 years has been extraordinary. As a result of this program, Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have lived longer, more productive, and healthier lives.

I am very fortunate and honored to be able to say that I was one of the few Members still here who cast a vote for Medicare in 1965. Earlier that year, I joined with the gentleman from California, Cecil King, and I introduced, as my very first piece of legislation, a bill that would have provided health care under Social Security and an increase of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I said at that time:

> Our senior citizens have far too long been neglected in this, the most prosperous society on Earth. Many of them, after leading productive lives prior to their twilight years, have been so overburdened with medical costs that they have been denied the rewards that should come with retirement.

I am proud to say that in my nearly five decades since the enactment of Medicare, the program has accomplished its mission of providing retirement security for America's seniors and care for those suffering from disabilities and debilitating diseases; yet Medicare continues to face threats from some of the same opponents that have opposed its enactment back in 1965.

They continue to seek to cut Medicare's guaranteed benefits and push seniors into private plans, which value profits over health outcomes.

□ 1930

Today we present another path forward, one in which Medicare's benefits are protected by expanding health care security and insurance coverage to more Americans, not fewer.

Since 2003, I have introduced H.R. 676, the Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act, which would create a national publicly funded, privately delivered single-payer health care system. Studies have shown that enacting H.R. 676 would save nearly a half trillion dollars by slashing the administrative waste associated with the private health care system.

Another $100 billion would be saved by using the purchasing power of the Federal Government to reduce pharmaceutical prices to the levels that exist in other industrialized nations.

Lastly, by slowing the growth of health care costs, H.R. 676 would save $5 trillion over the next decade, thereby ensuring that the guarantee of affordable public health insurance will be there to be enjoyed by future generations.

And so for all of these reasons, H.R. 676 is one of my most important pieces of legislation in my way of thinking,

and I am proud that it now has 60 cosponsors. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for being the 60th sponsor. But I would be remiss if I did not reiterate my strong support for President Obama's landmark health care legislation, the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act's results speak for themselves. As of this month, the percentage of uninsured Americans is now the lowest on record. The Affordable Care Act has protected as many as 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions from being denied health care coverage or being charged higher premiums. It has provided free preventive health care services such as mammograms, birth control, and immunizations to the 100 million Americans who are on private insurance or Medicare. Around 60 million Americans have gained expanded mental health benefits. And since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, almost 8 million seniors have saved nearly $10 billion on prescription drugs as the health care law closes Medicare's doughnut hole.

But, as with any complex law, implementation can be difficult and there will be unforeseen issues. Those issues have been seized by some opponents against expanding health care who hope to eliminate health insurance for those who cannot afford it. This is unacceptable.

While we must continue to defend the Affordable Care Act, we must also work to ensure that any future changes to the Affordable Care Act take us in the direction of the universal health care enjoyed by virtually all of the citizens of other industrialized countries.

I hope Members of Congress and the American public will join me to fight for a day when, in the wealthiest country on Earth, no one has to suffer and die unnecessarily because their health care system prioritizes corporate profits over their health.

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

STUCK IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you being down with me here tonight. It took me awhile to get my materials over here because the topic I have tonight is the topic of what this House has been doing to make a difference in the life of families across this country. That is the good news. I have to confess, I am here with good news/bad news tonight.

This is the stack of bills that this House has passed, again, to make a difference in the lives of families, to makes a difference in small businesses, to grow the economy, to create jobs, the bills this House has passed collaboratively that sit collecting dust in the United States Senate. That is the bad news part of tonight.

It is fair enough if folks think this process is broken. It is fair enough if folks think there is too much partisanship in Washington, but what we have here are the successes. What we have here are not the hypothetical ''if only'' bills. What we have here are the bills that have actually left this House and sit in the United States Senate. It is 356 bills, Mr. Speaker, 356 bills that have left this House that sit collecting dust in the Senate. We did a hashtag, Mr. Speaker: #StuckInTheSenate. We all remember, ''I am just a bill sitting on Capitol Hill,'' that Saturday morning cartoon. This is not a dictatorship. We had that conversation a little bit earlier this afternoon. It is not a dictatorship. It is a collaborative effort, and the House has collaborated to pass over 356 bills that have gone to the Senate to do nothing.

Now, again, it is good news/bad news day. Let me start with something that is good news, because if folks don't believe there is opportunity for success, I could imagine how folks would give up, not just folks here in this Chamber, but folks across the country, families across the country.

This, Mr. Speaker, you may remember it, H.R. 803, the Workplace Innovation and Opportunity Act. This passed the House. It passed the Senate. It was signed by the President. This has become law. This was a bill to consolidate a variety of workplace training programs. We talk so much about a trained workforce, how it is we get Americans who may be transitioning in their life, are transitioning home from Iraq or Afghanistan, transitioning from an industry that is in decline to an industry that is growing, how do we get those folks trained.

I credit Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX with this. She is one of my colleagues here in the House. I serve with her on the Rules Committee, but she also serves on the Education and the Workforce Committee. She has been working to try to consolidate programs, take money from programs that were not effective and move the money to programs that were effective. Imagine that. Imagine that. Here she is, a conservative Republican, and what she was trying to do was take money from places that weren't working and put it into places where it would make a difference for moms and dads and kids. And she did it. She did it.

Now, what we passed out of the House was strong, Mr. Speaker. We went out and we found every single program that was failing in America and we brought them together and put them into a single pot and sent it over to the Senate. The Senate said: No, we don't think all of those programs are failing. We don't want to move that big of a package. We want to do something smaller. They ended up consolidating about half of what we consolidated in the House.

But guess what. When you elect ROB WOODALL dictator, then I get to have it my way every day. Until then, this is a collaborative effort here: the House, the Senate, and the President.

So we worked with the Senate, and we worked out our differences. We found that package of consolidation that we could all live with, and we sent it to the President and we got a signature. That is what the American people expect. That is what my constituents expect. They expect us to work together to get things done, not sacrificing principle, not compromising on values, but finding consensus because we all agree that American workers need help. We all agree that moms and dads in transition need to find a better way to feed their families.

We can spend tax dollars better. We found a way to do that here. I call it common sense, Mr. Speaker. It is not supposed to take a rocket scientist to sort some of these issues out. It is supposed to be common sense.

Did I mention #StuckInTheSenate, Mr. Speaker? If I didn't, I want to mention it right now because here is one that really gets me.

We were just talking about hiring more moms and dads. It is called the Hire More Heroes Act. Do you remember it, Mr. Speaker? We passed it out of this House with over 400 votes. Now, young high school students, middle school students, they might not know how many Members there are in the House. There are 435 Members in this House, and more than 400 of them said we should pass the Hire More Heroes bill, but it is stuck in the Senate. Over 400 folks voted ''yes,'' only one voted ''no,'' so I don't want to hear about bipartisanship in the House. I don't want to hear about Republican this and Democratic that.

Mr. Speaker, 400-plus folks said let's pass this bill. I will tell you what it does. The Hire More Heroes Act says one of the highest rates of unemployment we have in this country are men and women in uniform coming home from overseas. It says that we have small employers in this country, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, most of the employment in this country is not driven by the big guys. It is driven by small employers. We heard from small employers in this country who said: I want to hire those veterans, but I am worried about that 50-employee threshold that throws me into this brand-new round of ObamaCare regulations.

Guess what this House did, Mr. Speaker. More than 400 out of 435 got together and they said, if you are a small business owner in America and you want to put unemployed veterans to work but you don't because you are worried about some Federal Government regulation dealing with ObamaCare, we will waive that regulation for you. Hire all of the veterans you want to, and be not afraid of Federal Government regulation.

Think about that. Think about that. It is what I think about. It is why I ran

for Congress. It is why my friends on the other side of the aisle ran for Congress. We came to make a difference—to make a difference. Who among us doesn't want to see unemployed veterans get a job? Who among us doesn't want to see small businesses succeed? We came together, more than 400 of us, to pass the Hire More Heroes Act, but it is stuck in the Senate.

Why? Why? Over 400 of us, almost every Democrat—we lost one—but every Republican, almost every one of us voted ''yes'' to make a difference for small businesses, get them the labor that they need and make a difference for veterans looking for a job.

That was a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and still is, and it is stuck in the Senate. It is not stuck because we can't come to agreement on it, Mr. Speaker. It is not stuck because Republicans are intransigent. It is stuck because the Senate can't get these bills moving.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking folks to just come together and do what I want them to do. What I am talking about are things that we are celebrating in this institution. I am not talking about things that squeaked through by the skin of their teeth. I am not talking about Republican proposals that we jammed through with the might of the majority. I am talking about commonsense proposals that make a difference in people's lives.

I will give you another one. How about H.R. 4414, Mr. Speaker? It is the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014. That doesn't sound very exciting, does it? And you know what, it is not very exciting for about 99 percent of Americans. But for Americans who have to work overseas and who have seen their health insurance policies canceled, quadrupled in price, folks who have struggled to find coverage, what this says is, if you don't live in America but you are working for an American company, really, you can sort out your insurance needs on your own over there. If you don't live in America, you don't have to comply with all these needs because—guess what—if you are doing business in London, the health care system is different in England.

□ 1945

If you are doing business in Paris, the health care system is different in France. If you are doing business in Moscow, the health care system is different in Russia. The rules we passed here won't work in those places. It is commonsense.

Had we not jammed that bill through Congress, that Affordable Care Act, maybe we would have gotten to that, but I don't know. It is a small group of people.

We passed a solution—let's look—269–150. I dare say those folks who voted ''no'' wouldn't say they opposed the policy, they would say they just thought it was a symbol of undermining ObamaCare in some way, they didn't want to undermine the President. I say nonsense about undermining the President. I want to make a difference in the lives of families.

Ninety-two days, Mr. Speaker, 92 days this bill has been sitting in the Senate.

Now, that is a minor piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that could make a big impact, but for a small number of people. What about things that make a big impact for a large number of people? What about those things?

The REINS Act, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 367, the REINS Act says—and it is a crazy bill, I will confess—it says before you pass a regulation, you need to consider the economic impact of that regulation. Now, while that is commonsense back home in Atlanta, it may seem crazy here in Washington, D.C.

Before you pass a regulation, weigh the pros and the cons to see if it is a good idea or not, weigh those pros and the cons. It is a REINS Act because we are just out of control here with regulation and we need to have a thoughtful conversation about it.

H.R. 1105, the Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act. Trying to find ways for our small businesses to get access to the capital they need in what have been incredibly tight credit markets.

H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, we are passing bills—they are all here, they are all sitting on HARRY REID's desk over in the Senate—passing bills in an effort to make a difference in people's lives. If it didn't matter, we wouldn't be interested in doing it. I don't have a bill in this stack that is about making a political statement. I don't have a bill in this stack that is about trying to be one up on the other guy, trying to embarrass somebody, trying to call somebody out. What I have in this stack—did I mention there are 356 bills in this stack?—what I have in this stack are bills that could make a difference to a struggling economy today—today. I say today. These bills passed a week ago, a month ago, a year ago or more. They could make a difference. They are #StuckInTheSenate—356 bills.

I have got the great honor tonight, Mr. Speaker—I am not alone in this endeavor, haven't been alone in passing 356 bills. It has been a team sport from day one, team sport from day one—Republicans, Democrats, folks from the North, folks from the South, folks representing families from across the country.

Tonight, I have got Mr. ROTHFUS here, an 18-month Member of this institution, who came, I wager, not to make a point, but to make a difference, and has been doing that every day he has been in this Chamber.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for organizing this very informative Special Order tonight.

You are right: I came here to make a difference. I came here to be part of a team that wants to relight America, relight the job market, relight opportunity, relight the American Dream, because people are hungry for it. They see this town that is out of control, they look at this town, and if they visit this town, they marvel at the growth that is happening in Washington, D.C.

I challenge everybody who visits Washington to count the construction cranes they see and the explosive growth and the high-end shops that open here and the concentration of wealth and power in this town. It is a scandal to the rest of the country. I see these construction cranes here on Pennsylvania Avenue. I would like to see those construction cranes back in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

But this is a very important discussion we are having about the actions that this House is taking to relight the American economy and how it gets snuffed out in the Senate.

As we have reviewed this evening, Mr. Speaker, the House has continued to pass legislation that would move our country ahead, grow our economy, add more jobs, and increase wages and prosperity. Then there is the brick wall across the other side of the Capitol.

Nowhere is the Senate's inaction more evident than in the budgeting and appropriations process we have here in Washington, D.C. The Senate and House have together managed to pass all 12 appropriations bills and complete the appropriations process on time by September 30 only four times since 1977. It is shocking.

This House, Mr. Speaker, has been working to correct this problem. I want to recognize the hard work of the House Appropriations Committee and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

This year, the Appropriations Committee has already passed 11 out of the 12 appropriations bills out of committee. Seven of those bills have already passed the House here, most of them with strong bipartisan majorities.

How many bills, how many appropriations bills has the Senate passed? Zero. They have yet to pass a single one.

The Senate's failure to do its work is disappointing, but it is not surprising. That is why I introduced the Congressional Pay for Performance Act earlier this year.

The bill is simple. The House and Senate must each pass a budget and all annual appropriations bills by August 1 or have their pay withheld until the job is done. It applies that fundamental lesson that we learn in our first job: if you don't do your work, you don't get paid until you do. That is the lesson that millions of young Americans learned working their first job this summer. It is the lesson I learned on my first paper route. I didn't get paid if I didn't deliver the newspaper. It is past time for Members of Congress to live by that lesson.

Beyond the Senate's failure to execute their constitutionally prescribed job of appropriations, the House has passed, as you noted, more than 350 bills, including many jobs bills, that Senator REID allows to collect dust in the Senate. Over 98 percent of these bills have passed with bipartisan support, both Republicans and Democrats.

As of this morning, Mr. Speaker, 195 of these bills passed without opposition. House Democrats introduced 60 of these bills that now gather dust in the Senate. Again and again, the Senate refuses to act.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTHFUS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I may have misunderstood what you said, because what my constituents believe is that it is partisanship that has shut this down. That it is Republicans fighting with Democrats and Democrats fighting with Republicans.

We are talking about over 350 bills that are sitting in the Senate that have passed this House, that we have come together on this House, you are saying 60 of those were introduced by Democrats?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Sixty of those bills, Mr. Speaker—you look at the stack of paper that the gentleman from Georgia has with him here today—Mr. Speaker, 60 of those bills were introduced by Democrats, and yet they gather dust in the Democrat-controlled Senate.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we passed dozens of energy-related bills designed to increase production, reduce prices, add family sustaining jobs, and promote American energy independence. Bills like the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, the Northern Route Approval Act, which is going to get the Keystone XL pipeline going, passed in May of 2013, 241–175. It has been sitting over in the Senate for 434 days.

We have passed dozens of regulatory reform bills to promote job growth and keep an out-of-touch and out-of-control Washington, D.C., bureaucracy in check. Those like the REINS Act that the gentleman from Florida mentioned. A very simple bill. If a regulatory agency puts out a regulation on the economy that is going to cost more than $50 million to implement, suppressing job growth, bring it back here for an up-or-down vote. Let's restore the constitutional responsibility for both the Senate and the House, who have that responsibility for making the law. Let us take accountability for that. If there is a regulation that merits approval, we are going to vote for it. It is called being accountable. But you can't fire these bureaucrats who come up with these regulations that have a negative impact on our economy.

We have also passed the Achieving Less Excess in Regulation and Requiring Transparency Act, known as the ALERRT Act. It is an effort to improve thoughtful consideration of the consequences of regulation.

I offered an amendment to the ALERRT Act. The amendment requires the capital bureaucrats to acknowledge whether their regulations will have a negative impact on jobs or wages in a particular industry.

Any such regulation will be subject to additional review to ensure that the benefits justify the costs to families and communities. The principle is simple: if Washington bureaucrats are going to implement rules that take wages or jobs away from hardworking Americans, they should take responsibility for and justify their decisions. It is important that regulators think through the impacts, costs, and burdens that red tape imposes on families and communities, and it is time for the Senate to come to the support of those individuals and those communities and take up the ALERRT Act.

We have passed several tax-related bills to help individuals keep more of their hard-earned money and to help small businesses add jobs and increase wages, like the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act and the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.

We have also heard stories of people whose hours have been cut because of the 30-hour work week in the President's health care law. But the House has acted. That is why we passed the Save American Workers Act to restore the traditional 40-hour work week and help those who want the opportunity to work more hours and see their wages go up.

The Senate has to act. Time and again, Mr. Speaker, the House has acted but the Senate has not.

I really thank the gentleman from Georgia for shining a light on what is going on at this Capitol, the production that is coming out of this side of the Capitol and then hits the wall on the other side. It is time for the Senate to act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would stay just 1 more minute. I see you are down here with three lovely young women from the next generation of Americans. When they grow up, they are going to be the leaders of this country.

You mentioned energy in your presentation. I have got to be honest with you, I didn't come to deal with those big issues that are sometimes amorphous. I came to deal with the issues that make a difference in families' lives today, tomorrow, and in the next generation.

We talk about energy, we talk about streamlining production, we talk about the Keystone pipeline, but I live in Georgia. We are not drilling any wells in Georgia. I can't tell much of a difference at the price of the pump. I don't have that many families who say: This is going to make a difference in my pocketbook, this is going to make a difference for a job right here in Atlanta, Georgia. But you come from a different part of the country.

Can you see the difference that these bills make, not from a Republican/Democrat partisan perspective, but from a real world difference, real dollars in families' pockets back home?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Georgia notes that western Pennsylvania has a growing energy industry. We are seeing a tremendous number of jobs coming in, family sustaining jobs.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, when somebody gets a job in that field and they start to get that paycheck—and every American who gets a paycheck sees this—there is some stuff that is taken out. There is a FICA charge, a Medicare tax charge, and Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we are paying for Social Security, that is how we are paying for Medicare. When people pay their income taxes, it is how we pay for the defense of our country. This is a dangerous world, Mr. Speaker.

We need to have an economy that is generating the kind of jobs where people can get back to work and get those salaries and wages so that when they pay taxes, they are paying for Social Security, Medicare, and veterans benefits. We have got a boom like you have never seen before, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Georgia has all these bills there that show the work that this House is doing, all to help this economy get growing again.

If you want to be paying for Social Security, if you want to be paying for Medicare, if you want to be paying for veterans benefits, we have got to grow this economy at 4 percent, at 5 percent, yes, at 6 percent. So many people, Mr. Speaker, have said, that is not going to happen, we can't get there. It happened. It happened in the 1980s, it happened in the 1990s. We can do this. We are a blessed land, Mr. Speaker, and in western Pennsylvania we see that.

□ 2000

We are having a big debate right now with respect to the President's greenhouse gas emissions, and there is testimony being taken across the country, including in Pittsburgh. We have to use our resources.

Under his plan, in 2008, when the President was running for his seat, he promises, ''Electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket.''

No single person should have the authority to impose a policy on a country that would cause electricity rates to necessarily skyrocket. That is why the REINS Act is so important. That is why Senator REID has to move the REINS Act to the floor of the Senate, to have this Congress have a voice. Our Constitution has an executive branch, a legislative branch, and a judicial branch. The legislative branch is where those policy decisions should be made.

Mr. WOODALL. I am looking at the Northern Route Approval Act poster you have got behind you, and I am

looking at the ''days in the Senate'' column. It says it has been 434 days that that bill has been in the Senate.

You are a new Member in this body. I have only had a voting card for 3 years. I know it is a collaborative process, but as I look at that 434 days in the Senate, does it mean that we have sent over a proposal to expand energy production to make those family-providing jobs that you mention and the Senate didn't like our idea, and so they sent us back a different proposal, and we have dropped the ball? Is that a possibility?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is asking questions about what is happening on the Senate side. They are simply not acting.

It was 241–175. I think the last time I counted, there are some 234 Republicans in this House. It was 241, so there are Democrats voting for this bill.

There is almost universal support for Keystone XL. The President could allow it to go forward. Thousands of jobs are in the waiting—thousands of jobs where people would be paying Social Security tax and Medicare tax and increasing the supply of North American energy being able to be refined in this country, which means American jobs refining that.

So what is happening over there in the Senate? It is not coming up. We get phone calls all the time from our constituents, and it is important that constituents call their Members of Congress, who are their employees. We are the employees of the American people. The Senators are the employees of the American people because they pay our paychecks.

Their hard-earned tax dollars are what fund the paychecks for Senators and the paychecks for the Members of this House. We are the employees of the American people.

So we welcome phone calls from our bosses, our employers out there. They need to be calling their employees in the Senate and saying: Why aren't you approving the Keystone XL pipeline? We need those jobs. Why aren't you approving the REINS Act?

We don't think one person should make the decision that would turn off the lights in this country, turn off the lights at power plants, turn off the lights in coal mines, turn off the lights in factories because the prices are going too high.

When the President said that electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket, if you are opening up a plant and you are looking at that, that is a cost. If the income doesn't exceed the cost, that factory isn't going to get built.

So there are folks across the country—entrepreneurs—who want to get things going. They want to hire people, but then they look at the cost, and they say: no, we are going to put our money elsewhere.

We need people investing in this country because that is what is going to cause this country to boom again, and look at some of the tax bills we passed out of this House, which wait in the Senate—where is the Keystone XL pipeline? Where is the Northern Route Approval Act right now?

I can't answer the question that the gentleman from Georgia asks, but I think maybe the Senators could answer that question if their bosses—the people who pay their salaries—would call them.

Mr. WOODALL. The gentleman said it so well. This isn't about one person. This isn't about one Chamber. This isn't about one part of the government. We are all in this together. Families in western Pennsylvania and families in north Georgia are in this together. We will rise or fall as a Nation together.

I go back to what you said when you first took the well. There are so many awful stories about Washington, D.C., and the way that we work together. Some of them are true, and many of them are just lore, but I believe you said—and my staff handed it to me after you said it—that about 254 of the 356 bills that are stuck in the Senate passed this House either unanimously or with more than two-thirds of the Members voting in favor of them.

I don't know everything about western Pennsylvania, but I know you don't get elected to Congress there because you are interested in propounding wild views that make no difference to people. You get elected there because you care about people and you want to do the things that matter. You know who the boss is, and it is those folks back home.

When I think that about this stack of bills, it would be so easy for people to dismiss it as: well, those are those crazy Republican ideas, and this is just some sort of political stunt.

How many times have we heard that it is a political stunt? Why are those guys talking about those bills? It is because of what you said. Sixty of these bills introduced by Democrats passed this Chamber, and 254 of these bills stuck in the Senate passed with two-thirds of us coming together—or more—to send them over to the Senate.

We have an obligation to work together. The answer to the question is that, after 434 days, the Senate hasn't said no. The Senate hasn't said: we have a better idea, so we will send this back to you. The Senate didn't say: you are focused on the wrong pathway; let's look at a different route approval.

The Senate did nothing.

Mr. ROTHFUS. You raise a good point because the way the process is supposed to work, one side of our Capitol—the House—will pass the bill or maybe the Senate will pass a bill, and then there might be a slightly different bill passed out of the other Chamber, and then the two sides would come together in a conference, and there would be some negotiating. There is some compromise going on.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had a job of negotiating contracts. Your client would tell you when you go into that negotiating room: whatever you do, make sure you get A and B into that contract.

So you know what your marching orders are, but you understand the other side has come in, and they have been told by their client: make sure you get C and D in that contract, whatever you do.

The art is that the two of you get together and you negotiate. You go back and forth. Are you going to get 100 percent? You never do. That is negotiating. That is life, but here, we passed these bills. We are waiting to negotiate. They are not even acting.

I go back to the appropriations process, which is fundamentally broken. Since 1977, you have only four times that the House and the Senate got this job done by September 30. That is a scandal.

Everybody in this country knows that April 15 is an important date. You have got to pay your taxes that day. You can't call the IRS and say: Hey, can I get a continuing resolution on that? Can I have 3 weeks?

The gentleman from Georgia pointed out that I have two of my young children with me. We know that the Tuesday before Labor Day, school starts. Am I supposed to able to call the principal and say: hey, we're not ready? Can I have a continuing resolution on that summer, so we can have 3 more weeks to get ready?

It shouldn't happen. The spending bills will be passed, whether it is through a continuing resolution that will extend it until December or January or February or March. Why can't it get done by September 30? It is an act of the will.

If the other side of the Congress—the Senate—hasn't passed any, where can you even begin to have that negotiation between the two different ideas and what is in those bills? We would love to negotiate with Senator REID.

We would love to negotiate. In fact, it has worked. I think you pointed out the SKILLS Act which, again, the House passed some 16 months ago. It took a while for the Senate to get going. It finally did. We passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act last summer. We finally got it to the Senate and got together. It got done.

We passed a temporary patch for the highway trust fund that we sent over to the Senate. The Senate had some other ideas, so they are making some changes, but this is the process that is supposed to work. One House moves; the other House moves. They are not even moving, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. I think about those seven appropriations bills you talked about. I want to remember the numbers. We have gotten 12 out of committee. We passed seven on the floor of the House. We have sent those over to the Senate.

Again, I don't know if the Senate is going to take our ideas or reject our

ideas or come up with their own ideas, but they have done none of those things. They haven't taken our ideas, they haven't rejected our ideas, and they promulgated absolutely no ideas of their own.

I don't enjoy being down here. This is not #kickthesenate. This is #StuckInTheSenate. It is not that there is not a way forward. You have described the way forward. It is not all my way. It is not all your way. It is not all anyone's way. It is a negotiated pathway forward.

When I ran for Congress, that is what I expected. When my constituents sent me here, that is what they expected.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It isn't my way or the highway, but if you have one part of this Congress—the Senate—not even acting, what is the communication there? It is no way.

We invite the Senate to act. We invite the Senate to come and start to talk about the Keystone XL pipeline and the thousands of jobs that are waiting, talk about the REINS Act, talk about the ALERRT Act to require the bureaucrats in this wealthy and powerful Capitol to take a look at the regulations that they are putting out and making an assessment whether those regulations are going to hurt wages or jobs.

I talk to people who are capped at 29½ hours. They can't get above 30 hours, Mr. Speaker, so we passed legislation that, again, sits in the Senate. We need to boom this economy again. That is how you pay for the critical programs that we have.

We have to use the God-given resources we have in this country—yes, prudently, smartly, and in a responsible way. There are ways to do that.

We have made tremendous progress in this country over the last 50 years. I am from Pittsburgh, and they talk about, back in the day, that you had to bring two shirts to work because, by noon, your shirt would be dirty.

We are making tremendous progress with the environment. I have another bill that I am trying to get this House to move, so we can send it over to the Senate to help that progress continue, called the SENSE Act, H.R. 3138. Again, I hope to get this House to move it, but we have to get the Senate to act.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for focusing on those commonsense points.

Again, when I open up the newspaper, what I hear is it is about partisan nonsense and it is about election-year politics. When we are talking about over 350 bills and we are talking about 60 of those bills being introduced by Democrats, but passed with Democrat and Republican support here in the House, when we are talking about 250 of those bills being passed with more than a two-thirds vote—many of those unanimously—what it tells me is we are not in the business of trying to make a point.

We are in the business of trying to make a difference, and if we had a willing partner in the Senate, we could absolutely make that difference.

I yield to my friend from Indiana, a former secretary of State, which has you in the executive side of things. You actually had to be responsible for getting things done. I guess that is my frustration with the Senate.

I just need somebody to stand up and be a partner and take responsibility for moving a few of these things forward, trying to make a difference in people's lives.

□ 2015

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for organizing this here tonight.

I think the gentleman is exactly right. We need leadership. Leaders are supposed to lead. When you look at what the gentleman rightly put here on the House floor in terms of the stack of work that sits in HARRY REID's—the Senate majority leader's—in-box, you realize what leadership isn't, and that is a real problem.

If my constituents, Mr. Speaker, saw that pile in my in-box, I don't know how much longer I would last. I wonder what the citizens and voters and taxpayers of Nevada think at this point.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, I rise today to discuss with my colleagues the importance of improving education in our country.

This House has done excellent work in that regard. We understand here in the House—and parents, teachers, and school administrators are all too aware—that the current state of our education system threatens the American Dream for the current and future generations of students.

I know that we want to help create a better world and the possibility of a better life for our young students. Leaving the world in better shape than we found it is as much a part of our American exceptionalism as is the freedom we enjoy that allows us to pursue the American Dream.

To our credit, frankly, when American citizens see what is not being done in the Senate, they can look to the House for some great things that have been accomplished in terms of righting what is wrong on education.

Right now, sadly, we are not faring well on the international education stage. Our children are not reading at grade level, while math and science performance by U.S. students trails far beyond that of our counterparts in other developed countries. We are not competing to win in a 21st century world.

The comical irony of that—if it weren't just so plain sad—would be that the American education system is failing the students that its most passionate advocates claim to want to help. Sure, you can argue that somehow while we aren't universally successful, our best and brightest rival any in the world, and our leading institutions will continue to provide the high-quality instruction that will keep us afloat, but I would say to the gentleman of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, that the America I know, the America that I believe in—the America that my constituents and that, I think, Americans across the country believe in—doesn't include a two-tiered system. We want everyone to have an equal opportunity. We want everyone to only be limited by the capacity of their dreams.

At the subcommittee level, in what we call K–12 education and in a more broad sense on the Education and the Workforce Committee and then on the floor of the House, we have done some things to right that ship, as I explained.

One of those bills that passed the House was H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act. This was a bipartisan bill. It passed on 5–9-14, just this year. The vote tally, Mr. Speaker, was 360–45. It has been in the Senate for 82 days. 360–45 is a huge bipartisan victory. It is one of the biggest bipartisan victories we have had on the floor of the House.

This is a charter school bill. It is school choice. I believe charter schools—like a majority of the people on the floor of this House believe—play a critical role in creating educational options for all children. Charter schools encompass two key principles American families want from our Nation's education system: choice and flexibility.

These innovative institutions will empower parents to play a more active role in their children's educations, open doors for teachers to pioneer fresh teaching methods, encourage State and local innovation, and help students escape poor-performing schools.

Why do we want to continue to shackle students to poor-performing schools and give them no choice and take away that equal opportunity for them to be successful? This bill, Mr. Speaker, did it. This bill now sits in HARRY REID's in-box.

Across the Nation, charter schools are leading the way in innovation and in improving education outcomes. In my home State of Indiana, for example, the Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School in Indianapolis—which serves a predominantly low-income and minority student body—expects every student, no matter his or her background or circumstances, to have a college acceptance letter upon graduation.

No matter his or her background or circumstances, one has to have a college acceptance letter upon graduation. The school's rigorous curriculum and laser focus on preparing students for higher education has helped 100 percent of its students to date gain acceptance into college. This bill sits, awaiting action in the Senate. It is not leadership.

Mr. WOODALL. I would just like to ask my friend because, in serving on the committee, you have an insight that most of us don't have.

I am looking at those numbers, at 360 Members of this House voting ''yes.''

That is more than you need to pass a constitutional amendment, for Pete's sakes.

Mr. ROKITA. That is right.

Mr. WOODALL. That is about as close to unanimous as we generally get. I am looking, and it hasn't been at the Senate for 1 week or 2 weeks. It has been there for almost 3 months so far.

What have they said? Have they said, We have got a better idea, and they have sent back an alternative to the committee? What have you heard?

Mr. ROKITA. I would love at this point—I think we all would—to hear them say: We have a better idea, we are going to take it up, and we will show you.

I would take that as progress, sir. This is what we have heard: silence.

Mr. WOODALL. These are not partisan issues. Education is not a partisan issue. Children are not partisan issues. We have votes with 360 Members of this body. Again, this is the hyperpartisan House—so the news tells me—and two bills right there in front of you are making a difference in people's lives. They could make that difference today, and yet the Senate does nothing.

I have been preaching the ''Stuck in the Senate'' hashtag message, I will say to my friend, because I still believe. I told folks when we started this hour tonight that this is a good news/bad news hour. The good news is I am sitting on top of a stack of 356 bills that this House has passed in a bipartisan way, and the bad news is that they are stuck in the Senate.

I believe that perhaps you and I, as young Congressmen, can't move the Senate, but I believe the American people still can move the Senate.

Mr. ROKITA. I think the gentleman is exactly right, if the American people show the Senate that the American people care as we know they do. This is still the home of the free. This is still an open republic, and it is still we, the people, who are in charge. We can make the change happen if we show the ''leaders'' of this country that we care.

Mr. WOODALL. It is a ''we'' question. I thank my friend. There are folks who get wrapped up in the partisan issues of the day, and there are those folks who have committed themselves to finding willing partners wherever those partners may be.

What I have seen of you in our 3 years of working together is that you came here to do things that mattered, and whoever you have to partner with and however late you have to work and however early you have to get up—whatever you have to do—if this job is worth doing, it is because it is making a difference in people's lives, and I am grateful to you for that.

It may be a Midwestern values night. I have got the gentleman from Indiana, and I have been joined by a gentleman from Illinois, who has also been a true champion, Mr. Speaker. You didn't have the great pleasure of coming in with this big freshman class of 2010, but what was so neat about it to me was that, in showing up to freshman orientation, I met these two guys for the very first time, and I met my new Democratic colleagues for the very first time.

Truthfully, when we talked about why we came here, I couldn't tell the difference between the two because the American people sent a crowd of folks here to do the things that mattered, and we have partnered to do those.

The gentleman from Illinois is one of those great partners, and I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HULTGREN. Thank you so much. I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for hosting this hour.

It is so important to talk about what really matters to people—our constituents, hardworking families—who are just trying to make it through, to get by, and to have hope for a bright future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, troubled over a recent email I received from a constituent of mine. Jessica from Lake in the Hills in Illinois wrote me with concern about her current economic condition.

She is a single mother with two teenagers, but like many Americans, she recently lost her job amidst the slow economic recovery. Of course, she is greatly concerned about providing for her children, now that her main source of income has dried up.

As Gallup recently confirmed, many Americans like Jessica are having to spend more on items they have to buy and less on items they choose to buy. This mandatory spending is squeezing out everything else in their budgets.

The rising costs of basic necessities, like groceries, gas, and utilities for middle class families like Jessica's, smothers them as the cost of day-to-day living goes up and up. At the end of the month, there is little left over for them to choose to buy something for their homes, for their families, or for themselves.

This is heartbreaking and frustrating because the House has passed legislation to lower energy prices, create jobs, improve work-life balance, and do many other things to help people.

Energy prices are an ever-present concern for Americans who drive their kids to school, commute to their jobs, cool their homes, run their manufacturing plants, or harvest their crops.

The House passed Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act, and it would do just that, cut prices at the pump by opening new Federal lands to energy development. The Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act would grow Main Street jobs by reducing regulatory burdens on American businesses.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would help workers better manage their work-life balance. That is especially crucial for families like Jessica's who are stretched thin between caring for their families and working just to earn a living.

The House has also acted on behalf of veterans, and I am so proud of this. When our servicemen and -women return home, the last thing they should have to worry about is unemployment.

It is our duty in Congress to ensure there are jobs available for our veterans, but the employer mandate in the President's health care law has discouraged many small businesses from hiring more workers at a time when our economy is still struggling to recover.

H.R. 3474, the Hire More Heroes Act, is commonsense legislation that relieves the employer mandate burden on businesses that want to hire veterans.

It is just astounding to me that the Senate still refuses to take up this legislation that would help our veterans. Still, I do have hope. I have hope that we can work across the aisle to help address the problems of the middle class.

That is what the American people sent us here to do. Just this month, the House and Senate passed and the President signed H.R. 803, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, or the SKILLS Act, which helps reform and modernize our Federal jobs training programs.

By 2022, our country will lack millions of skilled workers with degrees beyond high school, such as paralegals, welders, radiology technicians, and police officers. Federally funded job training programs help Americans of all working ages gain the knowledge and skills necessary to reenter the workforce, retrain for new jobs, or increase their value to their current employers.

When far more people in my home State of Illinois have given up looking for work and have left the workforce than have found new jobs, our communities need the tools necessary to match available jobs with available and trained workers.

H.R. 803 will help put local workforce investment boards in the driver's seat to tailor their services to fill the local jobs of the 21st century. It also streamlines a confusing maze of programs and ensures the business community's voice is heard, putting businesses above bureaucrats.

At the same time, it ensures that we have strong accountability over the use of taxpayer dollars. H.R. 803 is a good example—when regular order is followed and both sides agree to talk and work out their differences—that the House can pass important legislation.

We have also passed the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, a bill I cosponsored, which permanently prevents States and local governments from taxing Internet services. Taxing the on-ramp to the Internet is just bad policy.

It hurts lower income families the most and penalizes Americans for communicating with family or for looking for a job online. Again, this bill passed with strong bipartisan support.

The Science Committee recently passed the RAMI Act, which will help

the strong manufacturing base we have in Illinois and others across the country. The bill creates a network of nationwide regional institutes, each specializing in the production of a unique technology material or process relevant to advanced manufacturing.

Small- and mid-sized manufacturers can expand their research and development capabilities and train an advanced manufacturing workforce.

The Senate also introduced a companion bill, and I trust the RAMI Act will become law soon. When it does come down to it, I truly believe we can all agree on about 80 percent of the issues facing this Nation.

Building relationships and working on common goals can help us address the other 20 percent without being divisive.

□ 2030

But where does this leave middle class families right now? They are still finding their paychecks don't go as far as they used to go. Energy prices are still high, and groceries aren't getting any cheaper.

More than 350 bills are stuck in the Senate. Many of those would help Americans get back on their feet again. We don't need political posturing. We need real solutions for hardworking individuals and families. Let's help families like Jessica's and get these bills passed through the Senate now.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. It is exactly that commitment to working together to make a difference that I think folks long for in this place. And it is exactly what you have there, H.R. 803, the Workplace Innovation Act. It is true. That is one of our success stories.

But you first came to the floor to support that in March of 2013. The reason we are able to call this a success is because the Senate finally got around to dealing with it in June of 2014—over a year. It could have been making a difference in people's lives.

I am thrilled that now we are making that difference, but we wasted a year. And the family that you talked about, a family struggling to try to decide what tomorrow is going to look like, doesn't have a year to wait.

The Internet Tax Freedom bill you discussed just came out of this body this summer. That is something the Senate could take up immediately. As you said, it came out of here with wild bipartisan support. It could begin to make a difference tomorrow—tomorrow.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HULTGREN. I agree with you. And families like Jessica's can't afford to wait any longer. They want help. They are not looking for something to be given to them. They are just looking for opportunity. They are looking for hope, and that is the legislation that we have passed, any legislation like this that just makes sense.

As I travel around my district, it is in the western suburbs of Chicago. As I travel around and talk to job creators, small businesses, entrepreneurs, people who are starting up small businesses or want to start up small businesses, I ask them over and over again—I would love for them to hire 20 more people, but I ask: What would it take for you to hire one more person, just one more person? And over and over again it is common themes of: deal with the things that are causing us to struggle. They are convinced they can continue to make a great product, provide a great service, serve their customers, beat all competition all throughout the world if they can just have an opportunity, if government can get out of the way.

Their fear is uncertainty that is coming out of Washington, D.C., uncertainty under high taxes, increase of taxes and different things, so much regulation that is out there, and now the high cost of health care, uncertainty there as well.

We have taken some commonsense steps, as my good friend from Georgia has pointed out so well. So many of these votes have been strong, bipartisan votes, people on both sides of the aisle working together, cosponsors on both sides of the aisle getting this done, oftentimes with well over 300 votes, and yet it languishes over in the Senate. 356 bills stuck in the Senate.

It is about time that we get that moving. Families like Jessica's, so many other families across this Nation want that help, want us to get out of the way, want the Senate to act, move things forward, and have that hope and opportunity once again.

I thank my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. He is such a great leader. Bringing voices together is that skill set that sometimes this institution lacks, and he has it in spades.

As I close tonight, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear, this isn't a partisan stunt. This isn't Republican machinations. 356 bills sit in the Senate right now that, if the Senate moved them, could begin to make a difference in the lives of American families.

I want to tell you about those bills: 98 percent of them passed with a bipartisan vote. 98 percent of these bills passed with a bipartisan vote. 254 of these bills passed with either no opposition or two-thirds support. Almost 200, no opposition at all; 60 introduced by my Democratic colleagues.

Making a difference for America is not a partisan exercise, Mr. Speaker, but it is a sacred trust. I am so proud of this House for moving forward on these bills to make a difference. I know that we can work together to encourage HARRY REID to do the same. I know our friends across the country, the bosses of the United States Senate, can encourage the Senate to do the same.

This country is thirsty for leadership. I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the House for providing it. I look forward to partnering with the Senate and the President to move these bills into that difference-making position for those families across this country.

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 30 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, today we have Democrats on the Financial Services Committee here where we have gathered on the House floor to talk about the Export-Import Bank, which supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and levels the playing field so that American businesses, large and small, can compete successfully in the global markets.

Tomorrow, Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican leadership will leave town for a 5-week congressional recess, and legislation to renew the Export-Import Bank hasn't even seen a vote in our committee. When we return in September, there will be just 10 legislative days to renew the bank before its charter lapses on September 30.

This ideological push to abolish the Ex-Im Bank is an irrational crusade to destroy an agency that supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and propels economic recovery without costing taxpayers a dime. The result could be the end of an institution that, over the past 5 years, has supported 1.2 million private sector American jobs, and over 200,000 jobs last year alone.

Additionally, the Ex-Im Bank reduced our deficit by returning over $1 billion to taxpayers last year alone through interest and fees. Still, critics of the bank say it is a risk to taxpayers, that it picks winners and losers, and that it interferes in the free market and, therefore, creates a less efficient economy. For all of those reasons, it should be abolished, they say.

But first, let me say, this notion that there is such a thing as pure free enterprise, that if left to its own devices would flourish with total efficiency and self-discipline and allocate resources and spread risk in such a way that accrues to the benefit of everyone in society, this notion of just pure free enterprise simply doesn't exist.

In fact, I thought one of the lessons we learned from the recent financial crisis is that markets must be embedded in systems of governance. The idea that markets are self-correcting, many of us thought, had received a mortal blow.

Regardless of the outcome, Republicans have already created uncertainty for thousands of American companies trying to compete against businesses in China, Korea, and across Europe, all of which have their own version of the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from Mr. Steve Wilburn, who is the CEO of the

green energy company FirmGreen, who lost $57 million in contracts because of uncertainty surrounding the future of the Ex-Im Bank.

At this time, and before us sharing this information with you, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, thank you to Ranking Member Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Export-Import Bank and current legislation, H.R. 4950, to reauthorize the bank introduced by my freshman colleague and fellow Financial Services Committee member, Congressman HECK from Washington.

The Export-Import Bank has been helping United States businesses of all sizes sell their products around the world for over 80 years. But despite the bank's proven track record of creating jobs, helping American businesses compete globally, and reducing the Federal deficit, a faction of House Republicans want to close the door of this important Federal agency forever.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down the Export-Import Bank makes no sense to me, and it makes no sense to my constituents. In my congressional district, Ohio's Third, 10 companies, including six small businesses, have grown because of the Export-Import Bank. These businesses have been able to expand sales internationally and create jobs locally because of the Export-Import Bank.

Earlier this month I received a letter from the CEO of Yenkin-Majestic Paint, a manufacturer in my district. In his letter, he writes: ''Normally we would not write in context of Washington crosscurrents about the bank. However, it would be very unfortunate if the Congress cannot reach a responsible bipartisan reauthorization of this work to encourage commerce for American-made products abroad and to help expand U.S. employment from sales beyond what is available on the home front.''

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of many letters I have received from affected constituents.

I have also heard from a young man who works at International Risk Consultants, a Columbus-based company that provides guidance to small businesses to export internationally. He writes: ''The Ex-Im Bank offers trade finance solutions that work for small businesses that cannot find alternatives in the private market.''

He closes his letter in this way, I think most telling: ''Perhaps the most devastating effect of not reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank will be visited upon the many firms that never began exporting but would, if they were introduced to Ex-Im Bank solutions.''

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not allow an extreme faction of the Republican Conference to execute an ill-conceived and destructive plan to close Export-Import Bank. My constituents deserve better. Ohioans deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

I urge the House Republican leadership to bring H.R. 4950, a bill with over 200 cosponsors, to the floor so we can keep the Export-Import Bank operating and, more importantly, keep Americans working.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I will read into the RECORD a letter from Steve Wilburn, CEO of the green energy company FirmGreen, who lost a $57 million contract because of uncertainty surrounding the future of the Ex-Im Bank. I will read you excerpts from his letter.

Mr. Wilburn attended the Ex-Im Bank panel I organized in April, and last month we invited him back to be one of our Democratic witnesses at a House Financial Services Committee hearing on the Ex-Im Bank. He is among the best witnesses we have ever had at a hearing.

In his letter, Mr. Wilburn explains that FirmGreen's export potential has been directly affected by the uncertainty of reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank U.S. and the aggressive financial terms offered by the Korean Ex-Im Bank.

Attached to his letter is another letter from a company in the Philippines, Green Energy Solutions, informing him that his business lost a $57 million contract. The letter begins: ''Dear Mr. Wilburn, in view of the uncertainty of the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank and project finance structure you proposed have become problematic. We have made the decision in May, this year not to proceed with your project offering.''

□ 2045

Mr. Wilburn goes on to say: ''In summation, as a combat-decorated veteran, small business owner, job creator, exporter, and concerned citizen, I believe we should not unilaterally disarm and abandon the very governmental agency that allows U.S. manufacturers and other U.S. exporters to fairly compete on the world's trading stage.''

Mr. Speaker and Members, the main criticism of the bank that I would like to discuss right now is the assertion that the bank is the embodiment of corporate welfare, benefiting a handful of large companies, which they claim represents crony capitalism.

Last April, I held a panel on the Ex-Im Bank which included a number of small business owners from across the country. They came here to Washington to discuss their work with the bank and how the bank helped their companies compete in the global marketplace. Every one of those panel members were extraordinarily decent people, hardworking business owners who create jobs and pay taxes and have families and a civic sense of duty. And this is why I am so offended by this label of ''crony capitalists'' that critics like to attach to users of the bank.

Those of us who know what it is like to live behind a label understand how they work. Once you are able to put a label on something or to someone and it sticks, then you could be done with them. And if enough people can be convinced that customers of the Ex-Im Bank are crony capitalists, well, there is nothing left to do but get rid of them.

It is so important to note that while a good amount of the bank's support goes to large companies, the vast majority of Ex-Im transactions—nearly 90 percent—help small businesses. In fact, if the Ex-Im Bank were abolished today, it would affect small- and medium-sized businesses just as much, or more, as large exporters—perhaps more, given the distinct challenges and risks small businesses face when looking to export.

Moreover, large U.S. exporters that benefit from high dollar values of Ex-Im financing also have large domestic supply chains which consists largely of small- and medium-sized businesses that benefit indirectly but in very important ways from Ex-Im support.

At a later time, I will be entering into the RECORD excerpts from Brek Manufacturing and Hansen Engineering.

This letter is from Mr. Greg Lay, vice president of Hansen Engineering. I will read this letter first from Hansen Engineering:

> Hansen Engineering company is one of many small businesses in the South Bay area of Los Angeles, California, that is dependent on Boeing contracts to support the business. Ninety percent of our contracts support Boeing aircraft, either directly or indirectly, through our prime aerospace companies throughout the world. My company staffs approximately 60 employees who live in the South Bay and surrounding areas and depend upon the support of Boeing for the well-being of their families.
>
> Without the reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank, it would be impossible for us to have a big impact on the health of our businesses and its employees and their families.

Next we have a letter from Brek Manufacturing:

> Brek Manufacturing company is a small business in California with 170 employees who have a critical interest in foreign sales of Boeing commercial aircraft. The Export-Import Bank plays an important role as an intermediary in the sale of these aircraft.
>
> This letter is to express our support for the Ex-Im Bank, as it is key to securing additional sales of Boeing commercial aircraft.

He goes on to say:

> Our representatives who support the military should also be concerned with the Ex-Im Bank because of the role it plays in supporting jobs and companies like ours, both large and small across the country.

He further states:

We supply critical aircraft structural components which are key to successful, safe air transport and air defense. There are many others like us who represent thousands of high-skilled and well-paying positions with good benefits.

Please express our support for the Ex-Im Bank to your colleagues. We are counting on them to do the right thing and support American manufacturing jobs.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) who is a leader with the bill that would reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, if we could get the support from the opposite side of the aisle that we need.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member of the committee very much.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer four elegant, simple, straightforward reasons why it is so critically important that the U.S. Congress reauthorize the Export-Import Bank prior to its expiration on October 1, and they are simply as follows: the Export-Import Bank creates jobs; it helps small businesses; it promotes fiscal responsibility; and it advances economic growth.

With respect to jobs, it has already been cited that in the last 5 years alone, the Export-Import Bank is responsible for the creation of over a million jobs, 205,000 jobs in just the last year.

But here is what has not been said: export-related jobs in America pay 13 to 18 percent more than non-export jobs. So it doesn't just create jobs; it creates good jobs. And it helps small businesses. Nearly 90 percent of all transactions of the Export-Import Bank are with small businesses. And to put a fine point on that, last year, it was 3,413 small businesses, businesses like Pexco in Fife, Washington, which makes traffic signs to promote safety during construction. Pexco recently sold $125,000—a small order by any measure—to the Netherlands, I think it was. Only one entity would guarantee payment because no one else could collect across international borders. And that entity, of course, was the Export-Import Bank.

Stac, another veteran-owned business in Sumner, Washington, with eight employees, they do exporting. They are going to hire three new employees on the basis of their international sales. But do you know what is incredibly frustrating for somebody who comes from the private sector? It is, frankly, the woeful deficiency in understanding, because the small business support that the Export-Import Bank provides does not stop with direct loans and loan guarantees to small businesses because big businesses buy goods and services from small businesses as well.

The greatest airplane maker in the world, Boeing airplanes, uses 15,000 businesses in their supply chain, and 6,600 of them are small businesses.

I was recently on an Alaska flight from Sea-Tac to National Airport in Washington, D.C., and a friend of mine named Eric Hahn, who works at General Plastics in south Takoma, was sitting a couple seats behind me. As everybody was gathering on the plane and shoving their luggage up above and getting seated, Eric jumped up, and he said, ''Denny, do you see this? Do you see this?'' And he was pointing at the plastic between the two overhead bins. He said, ''We made that. We made that.'' General Plastics has 185 employees, another small business.

The Export-Import Bank promotes fiscal responsibility. It has been more than a generation since there was any red penny supporting or subsidizing the Export-Import Bank, in the wake of reforms adopted during the Reagan years. Indeed, last October, more than $1 billion transferred to the U.S. Treasury. If we deauthorize the Export-Import Bank, our deficit is going up. Who wants that to happen? And finally, the Export-Import Bank promotes economic growth.

Let me give you a series of facts. We cannot change these facts by wishing them away. Fact number one: 95 percent of the consumers in the world live outside our borders—95 percent-plus, actually. Another fact: since 1980, global trade has increased something like fivefold—fivefold. And let me give you another fact: if we in America want to keep our middle class, we had better learn how to sell to the growing middle class throughout the world. And the Export-Import Bank is an outstanding tool to do that.

You know, America's economy is projected to grow by only about 2.4 percent a year over the next 10 years. And do you know what the shame of that is? The shame of that is, it is not fast enough to absorb even the kids coming out of high schools and postsecondary education and colleges. We simply have to grow this economy faster. And there is no better way than to participate in the exploding global economy.

Every developed nation on the face of the planet has an export credit authority. And, in fact, about 60 in all, theirs are larger than ours either in absolute dollars or in terms of a percentage of their gross domestic product. Why? Why would we unilaterally disarm? Why would we unilaterally disarm?

Finally, let me say this. Right now, tonight, as we sit, as we speak, the people of China are pouring billions of dollars into the development of a commercial aircraft. They call it the C–919. They say it will be available for sale within 2 years. Frankly, I think it is going to be longer than that. It will be 3 or 4 or 5 years. But whenever it is, they are going to create even more fierce competition for an industry that is a bulwark of America's manufacturing base, a bulwark. And what about China's export credit authority? It is six times larger in absolute dollars than America's. And as a percentage of GDP, it is 35 times larger.

So I ask the Members of the House, let us not wake up 63 days from now with no export credit authority. This is the 16th time, by my count, we have reauthorized the bank. Almost every time by virtually unanimous support. And there are more than 300 votes on this floor to pass it, if they will bring it to a vote.

In the name of jobs, in the name of small businesses, in the name of fiscal responsibility, and in the name of economic growth, let us reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), and I thank him for the leadership and the support that he has shown for the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you, Madam Ranking Member of the full committee. I am exceedingly proud to be a part of this effort. And I want to you know that when we succeed, it will be due in no small part to the energy that you have provided to help us get this legislation through.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for H.R. 4950, an outstanding piece of legislation. It extends the Export-Import Bank for 7 years, and it will increase the cap to $175 billion. I think it is an outstanding piece of legislation. And, of course, I am one of the persons who is supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by indicating that the Export-Import Bank is not one of the too big to fail institutions. It wasn't involved in the credit default swaps. It wasn't involved with derivatives. It wasn't involved with no-doc loans. It wasn't involved in all of these exotic products that nearly caused the collapse of the economy.

If the truth be told, the Export-Import Bank was one of the reasons why the economy was able to survive. It has been thriving. It has done well. It pays for itself by virtue of the loans that it makes, by virtue of the fees that it collects, by virtue of the products that it insures. The Export-Import Bank makes good sense.

I find no businesspeople in my community who are in opposition to the Export-Import Bank. It is not too big to fail, and it should not be too small to save. We ought to do what we have done 16 times in the previous 80 years, and that is, reauthorize the Export-Import Bank in a clean bill, and do it with very little fanfare.

Unfortunately, that is not the circumstance that we confront presently. Unfortunately, there are persons who believe that the Export-Import Bank no longer serves a useful purpose.

Well, it serves a useful purpose for the people in my district. And the facts speak for themselves. In my district, between 2007 and 2013, in the Ninth Congressional District, we had a total of 88 export-importers.

□ 2100

We had 39 small businesses, 13 minority-owned businesses, and four women-owned businesses, and we are proud of these businesses that are owned by women because we still contend that when women succeed, America succeeds. The Export-Import Bank is on the agenda to help women succeed.

I would add that there are businesses that have indicated that they are supportive. I have a letter from a company in Houston, the style of it is the South Coast Products Company, and I just shall read an excerpt from their letter. I have many letters to read, but I shall pick a few and just read excerpts.

This one reads—and it is addressed to the Honorable MAXINE WATERS:

> We are a small manufacturer in Texas that exports thread and valve lubricants primarily to the oil and gas industry. We have used Export-Import Banks' export credit insurance for 13 years. During that time, our export business has grown by a factor of 15 because of the security offered by our policy with Export-Import.

I shall go to the last paragraph which reads, ''Please emphasize to your colleagues that Ex-Im Bank is not corporate welfare''—this is a business, a business that has written this to us—''or a charity of any kind. It facilitates U.S. exports, especially for small businesses like us, while supporting itself. Please do not let them put our livelihoods on the chopping block for their own political gain.''

This is from South Coast Products, a Texas business.

I would also like to read a letter from the Greater Houston Partnership. The Greater Houston Partnership is the preeminent chamber of commerce in my area. It is called the partnership because we do things differently in Texas, and the partnership has also joined in this letter by a good many other entities that I shall name after having read an excerpt from this letter.

It reads:

> The Houston region continues to enjoy strong economic growth driven in large part by the Export-Import Bank. In order to keep momentum, it is crucial that Congress supports tools encouraging businesses to expand into new markets and create new jobs. The Export-Import Bank of the United States is one of these tools, and we ask that you support this legislation.

The letter is addressed to me.

It goes on to add:

> Small- and medium-sized businesses in our region also benefit directly from Export-Import. Small businesses account for nearly 85 percent of Ex-Im Bank's transactions; further, these transaction figures do not include the tens of thousands of small- and medium-sized businesses that supply goods and services to large exporters using the bank.

This is signed by the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership, the Baytown Chamber of Commerce, the Brenham/Washington County Chamber of Commerce, the Clear Lake Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Tomball Area Chamber of Commerce, the Houston East End Chamber of Commerce, the Houston Northwest Chamber of Commerce, Lake Houston Area Chamber of Commerce, League City Chamber of Commerce, Pearland Chamber of Commerce, West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce, and the Wharton Chamber of Commerce.

I close simply with these words: businesses are supportive of the Ex-Im Bank. People understand the necessity for it. We but only need to have a vote on it to get it continued.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, Members, you have heard about businesses in any number of districts that receive the support from the Ex-Im Bank.

I would like to read to you excerpts from a letter from Chairman HENSARLING's district. This is from Fritz-Pak, and this letter is about how the Ex-Im Bank helped save his business.

His name is Gabriel Ojeda, president of Fritz-Pak Corporation, and this is the excerpt I would like to read:

> During the past 5 years, we have grown our international sales from 15 percent to over 35 percent of our business. We now have major trading partners in over 30 different countries, including Brazil, Russia, India, and Taiwan. Most recently, we exhibited our products at Bauma International Trade Fair in Munich, Germany.
>
> So what is Fritz-Pak Corporation today? We are an American manufacturer of the best concrete admixtures in the world, and we sell them as far as Yellowknife, Canada, and as far south as Wellington, New Zealand. We may be small, but we think big. In an age where everything seems to be made someplace else, we are thriving here in the USA and in no small part due to the services provided by Ex-Im Bank.

Lastly, I would like to read excerpts from Mr. Mike Boyle of BES&T in New Hampshire. The CEO and president of BES&T is Mr. Michael Boyle, and he sent us a very good letter last week.

Mr. Speaker, at a later time, we will enter into the RECORD these letters that we are not able to read this evening. I thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE IMPACT OF A POROUS BORDER

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, one of my reasons for coming and taking some of this time this evening was around a frustration I have had, and I think this may be for a lot of us who are from a border State, who have been watching both the press and a lot of our brothers and sisters around this place speechify about immigration, about the border crisis, and what is happening. If you are actually from Arizona, this isn't a new issue for us. We have been bathing and living this for decades now.

I had that moment this last week, Mr. Speaker, where I realized maybe the awareness in this body is starting to change to understand the impact of a porous border and what it means to communities.

When I had one of my friends here from the Midwest come up to me and ask me a number of questions because he had held a townhall—and it was the first time he had had to face barrages of questions about immigration, about the unaccompanied minors, about the populations coming across the border, what were the potential threats, the disease, the drugs—then I realized maybe I have partially had a misunderstanding because, when I go home, the border is one of the key questions we talk about because of the effects it has had on my home State, in regards to education, incarceration, health care, and the amount of the burden that my citizens in Arizona, my taxpayers, have had to take on that ultimately were the responsibility of this Federal Government.

I wanted to go through just a handful things, a couple of numbers that we have found, talk about some of the mechanics that may be coming at us tomorrow. I know many of us are going to have some different views on legislation, where it takes us, but I want to get some of the record straight here.

Do you remember, over the last 3, 4 years, particularly before the 2012 Presidential race, we kept hearing how secure the border was? I remember my former Governor, Janet Napolitano, giving a speech telling us that the border is more secure today than ever before.

Do you remember the rhetoric that the President was bathing in, in early 2012, allowing himself to be called the ''deporter in chief''?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we later found out—and we found out sort of when many of the Democrat base activists started believing it and started protesting the President, saying: How can our Democratic President be the deporter in chief?

All of a sudden, the truth came out, and we found out that the Obama administration had manipulated the way they calculate the numbers.

The previous administration, if you were a Mexican national—and this is for the southern border—if you had been arrested within a couple miles of the border, you were captured, taken back, and released back over the border, then that did not count in the deportation numbers. This President very conveniently apparently allowed them to redefine the math.

There becomes one of our great frustrations. We have debates here on this floor, and we realized how manipulated so much of the math is, some of the underlying statistics that we will come down here and quote, and we are holding the data, and we realize that we have we got conned. We got played.

Mr. Speaker, if you are going to build public policy, and I don't care if you are on the left or the right, you have to have an administration that is willing to play the data straight. If you are going to make public policy on public data, give us honest data.

That becomes one of our great frustrations, Mr. Speaker, because I will even have my hometown newspaper quote numbers that we found out months ago weren't correct, were manipulated. They redefined the math. So just keep that in mind.

Just something that came across my desk just before I was walking over

here, one of my county sheriffs—and you have to understand, in Arizona, we have only 15 counties—our counties are big, but Arizona is a small State relative to the rest of the country.

We are also the most urbanized State in the country, something that most people don't understand. Most of our population lives in Maricopa County and then the Tucson area.

So think, Arizona is the most urbanized State because the Federal Government controls the vast majority of our land. It is also why you have these incredible opportunities of a porous border because you have distances where there is no civilization.

Our Pinal County sheriff was on the radio, apparently, today and had a quote that we have had 123,000 illegals arrested in the Tucson sector. I am assuming that is over this last calendar year.

I haven't been able to get a response on that one, but think about that. Right now, so much of the national attention is the discussion of what is happening along the Rio Grande, in Texas. Don't forget Arizona. Don't forget what is going on in our State for so many years.

I had an economics professor years ago, that we had actually had this discussion of if you were ever to try to truly understand the math and how porous a border is, how would you build an economic model to truly understand it?

He had this brilliant idea, and it still rings in the back of my head because, multiple times, we have had this discussion of if we were going to build a border enforcement bill before allowing anything else to move in this body, do you have the border State Governors be the ones to declare the border secure?

Well, do you really want to put that type of political pressure on my Governor in Arizona, the Governor of New Mexico, small States where, let's face it, some of the activist groups with their budgets could manipulate our Governor's races, our elections? So what would be an honest economic method?

My old professor had this one thing: look at the price of drugs on the street, look at the price of certain types of labor; but he liked the drug calculation because if illegal drugs that are being sourced in other parts of the world and the price stays stable or is actually going down on the streets across the country, particularly in communities like Phoenix, which is often a distribution center, you actually have an economic model to understand if the border is truly secure.

Mr. Speaker, in conversations I have had with some law enforcement over the last year, apparently, a lot of the illegal drug prices on the streets in my community are stable or going down; but, yet, I had a President who is willing to stand behind microphones—I had the head of Homeland Security willing to stand behind microphones and declare the border more secure than ever, but the underlying fact is, now, we know we weren't being told the truth.

On occasion, we will go home, and we will hold townhall meetings and discussion groups in the chambers, and some of the activist groups will come and sit down with us and say: Why won't you do this? Why won't you do that? Why won't you accept the Gang of Eight bill? Why won't you do this?

You turn and say: How would you hand that type of policy, that type of legislation to this administration? Do you really trust them? Do you really trust the Obama administration to keep its word? Do you really trust the Obama administration not to play games with the math? Because we already have multiple occasions here where I can demonstrate to you the math has been played you with.

So then I wanted to chase after something else that we came across. How many speeches here, how many discussions, how many press conferences, how many talking heads on evening cable have we seen over the last month saying, oh, the unaccompanied minor issue, well, was a surprise to all of us, we never expected this, if we had just known—which is an amazing thing because I have a few documents here, and they are budget documents, and we all know what goes into starting to model and build budgets.

□ 2115

Here is one. It is a newsletter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and it was talking about some of the Catholic services. They do wonderful work. They do it at some great prices. But this was a newsletter from last November, so November 2013. On that one, the Department of Homeland Security estimates more than 60,000 unaccompanied minors could enter the United States in 2014. It was out there in writing.

Then we came across some other things that we found very interesting. Here is actually from 4–13, so over a year ago, a number of budget line items for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services in regards to unaccompanied minors. The original 2014 budget request they had been working on earlier was going to be $494 million, and somehow on 4–13, so well over a year ago, they knew something was wrong and they added another $373 million to that budget line item. Yet earlier today, I watched a Member of the other side get behind a microphone and tell me how surprised they were.

So let me pull what we voted for last January. Unaccompanied alien children, line item, and this was woven into the continuing resolution we did last January, so you know the numbers were worked up months before that. We went from the 2013 estimate, $376 million, to $868 million. That is what we pushed out of here in January.

So back to that whole trust conversation, as we put forward policy in dealing with our crisis on our border, don't forget States like Arizona that have had to take this on for years and had to carry the burden of the cost as those here in the Federal Government, here in this bubble that is Washington, D.C., looked at a small State like Arizona and said: Stop making so much noise; you are bothering us. Stop telling us one thing in your speeches, but we can find documents that show your staff knew something very different.

Tomorrow we will have a piece of legislation to step up and deal with parts of the border crisis. It is not a half a loaf. It is not a quarter of a loaf. It is not an eighth of a loaf. It is sort of the heel of the loaf. But for those of us in Arizona, I believe it does a handful of things that we have been demanding.

I have a piece of legislation to put 10,000 National Guard troops on the border, and I had a little fun with a couple of Members who have been here for a long time. I had one Member who has been here for a long time, and she was just outraged that we would want to put that many troops on the border. So I said: But you supported this in 2006 and 2008 when we had Operation Jump Start, and I think at that time we put 7,000 National Guard troops on the border as auxiliary services to the Border Patrol.

So think of that, 2006 to 2008, who controlled this body? It was the Democrats. We had a Republican President, and NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker here. And it is fascinating, now we are a few years later, that formula has flipped. We are proposing it, and the very people who supported it a few years ago now are just appalled. The duplicity around this place sometimes is stunning.

One of the things that I support that will be voted on tomorrow, it is not just putting National Guard troops, if our Governor so will; there will be money behind it, the ability to pay for it. One more time asking States like Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, that if you are going to step up and take these responsibilities that belong to the Federal Government, you need to cover our costs. I don't think it is enough money that is in the bill, but remember, this is short term. What is going to run tomorrow is actually only between now and the end of the fiscal year, which is the end of September.

Updating the 2008 language, we have heard a lot of discussion about this. The reality of it is we have a White House, Department of Homeland Security, I believe, that has already been manipulating the actual language. If you sit down and read it, it had to do with those who were being exploited and being brought across the border, trafficked. This is a little different mechanically than someone who goes out and hires a coyote or a family who takes their children and hires the services.

But nevertheless, we have been told over and over, if we don't update the 2008 law, our hands are tied by so many of our law enforcement on the border. So we are going to do that.

There are a couple of other mechanics here, but I want to make it perfectly clear for many of us—and hopefully I am speaking for many of my supporters and friends and family and my State—this isn't enough. It may be just the beginning.

I do hope we get the chance to discuss the one issue here that continues to be a bit of friction. The President's deferred action, many of our friends on the left keep trying to tell us that that had nothing to do with what we are seeing at the border, but as we have already just walked through the documents, once the deferred action, referred to as DACA, had gone into effect, they knew the numbers were coming. They were calculating. We now have some charts that much of this crisis was being watched for months. It finally just became overwhelming.

Illegal immigration—and legal immigration—work on incentives and disincentives. We have created incentives. This President has created incentives to break our laws, and until we step up with a number of policies that change those incentives, I believe we are partially chasing our tail here. We will do some good things. We need to step up the quality of our law enforcement and our border enforcement, but we also need an administration that we can trust, an administration that will tell us the truth, and an administration that will actually follow our laws.

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

THE CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be recognized to address you here on the United States floor of the House of Representatives in this most deliberative body that we have and are. I appreciate the comments and the position taken by the gentleman from Arizona ahead of me. He is one who has lived along the border for a lifetime. He deals with the issue every day, every week. He is one of the individuals that I look to to inform me, but also I have taken a real interest in it myself.

Even though I am from the heart of the heartland, from Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I have a great appreciation for the Constitution and the rule of law. Because of that, I have watched as the lawlessness has grown along our border.

I will say that certainly in all of the time that I have been in this Congress and in the years building up to it, and less so in the years prior to that, and I take myself back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986 due to the counsel that he had around him, I believed at the time that he would veto that bill because of his reverence for the rule of law would overcome all of the counsel that came from the House and the Senate and the people around him. Well, Reagan relented and signed the bill on the promise that we would legalize roughly a million people in exchange for the enforcement of the law thereafter and that there would never be another amnesty again so long as this country would live.

The 1 million became 3 million, and the amnesties that were added to that in smaller proportions added up to at least 6, perhaps 7, in addition to the 1986 amnesty. And here we are today, having fought off this amnesty these years for more than a decade that I have been directly involved in the immigration policy, and we are on the cusp of it again.

The President of the United States stood up there in front of you where you are, Mr. Speaker, and he gave his State of the Union address here on the floor of the House of Representatives and essentially, and figuratively, he waved his ink pen at us and he said: Congress, you do what I tell you on immigration. I want comprehensive immigration reform. I want you to pass the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty act.

Now I am speaking figuratively, of course, because that is not a direct quote of the President, but it is certainly the message that the President delivered: Do what I tell you to do, or I will use my, in one other setting, his cell phone, or his ink pen, to act in a unilateral—he didn't say it, but he knows it—unconstitutional fashion.

I can think of another night during the State of the Union address when our President came here and he spoke right in front of you, Mr. Speaker, and he pointed down here to the Supreme Court and he lectured the Supreme Court on what they should do, as if somehow he were article III, somehow he was the man who commanded the Supreme Court of the United States. And the camera was looking over at the Justices as the President lectured them on the Constitution and the rule of law as if the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court needed to get a lesson from an adjunct professor of the University of Chicago School of Law who taught Constitution law for 10 years in Chicago. He should go to school with every one of those Justices, Mr. Speaker.

And one of them, the television cameras repeated it over and over again until they read the lips, and they interpreted his lips to say ''not true, not true.'' That seat that that camera was focused on has been empty ever since. It has been empty ever since because that Justice, and I suspect a number of other Justices, decided I am not going to listen to that again. I am not going to listen to a President that is out of bounds, a President who believes somehow he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can stand here at this rostrum as a guest of the House of Representatives and wave his ink pen or finger at us and announce that we shall do in this Congress what he commands or he will do so in a unconstitutional fashion. Essentially, what did the President say? So sue me. The President says: I am going to do what I am going to do. I know it is lawless, it is unconstitutional, so sue me.

So today we passed here on the floor of the House of Representatives a resolution that declares that the House of Representatives has standing to go before the court to command the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

We have had multiple hearings before the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives. We have had excellent constitutional scholars come forward. There hasn't been one who can carry water for the President's position and hold his own under the scrutiny of the constitutional lawyers and other scholars that we have on the Judiciary Committee who take them apart one by one, argument by argument, piece by piece. And yet the President of the United States persists in asserting that he can be article I, the legislative branch of government, the United States Congress, and he can be article III, the judicial branch of government, and the sole commander of the executive branch, article II.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He leads from behind. He stepped back and followed the French into Libya, and he waited for the British to go before the House of Commons and vote down David Cameron's initiative to go into Syria, and then the President of the United States, following—and leading from behind is the very definition of following—the President of the United States then offers to Congress, through trial balloons through the press, that he would like to have Congress endorse military action in Syria.

Where is our leader? Where is our Commander in Chief? Well, he is off in the never, never land of advancing administrative amnesty, calling together his smartest, leftist lawyers that he can find, Mr. Speaker, and saying to them: Put your think tanks together. You guys go grab the best brains you can find, attached to the leftist brains you are, and see if you can come up with a strategic plan that I can grant some administrative amnesty to the maximum number of people because, Lord knows, there aren't enough undocumented Democrats in America. We need more of them. We need an endless supply and endless stream of them. And where do they come from? Well, they come across our southern border primarily, although they come in other ways.

□ 2130

And Democrats in here, when the President says to Congress: Thou shall pass the bills that I tell you to pass or I am going to use my pen to unconstitutionally—that is in parentheses, Mr.

Speaker—enact executive edicts that will do what I want done, regardless of whether it has the support and the will of the people or not—we are the support and the will of the people—when the President said that he is going to enact those immigration unconstitutional executive edicts, when the President uttered that, I saw a little less than half of this Chamber rise in a spontaneous standing ovation, enthusiasm for the President's statement.

It reminds me of the one Democrat who said: I am marching for abortion rights because my mother didn't have that opportunity. Who would say that? If your mother didn't have the opportunity to have an abortion, but you want to march so that you wish she would have, that means you wish you had never been born. And this Congress with less than half of it, a bunch of Democrats over here, cheered the President when he said: I am going to usurp your article I legislative authority, and I am going to write legislative law with my pen the way I see fit. And they cheered.

These are the same people that stood here on the floor of the House a year ago last January and took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States so help them God. And they say: Well, we were glad when the President decides he is going to roll over Congress, roll over the House, roll over the Senate, roll over the judicial branch by intimidating them into, some say, a decision on ObamaCare that would not conform with the constitutional directives that they have.

We are in a mess, Mr. Speaker. We are in a mess, and we have the President of the United States poised during August, when this Congress has every year been out of session because our Founding Fathers and our early, early leaders recognized that Washington, D.C., gets to be a hot and humid place in the month of August, and you need a little break to get out of the circle of the Beltway that causes Potomac fever to go back to your districts so you can look real people in the eye and hear from them. That has been the tradition of this country.

Some people complain that Members of Congress actually go home. I would say on the other way around, if we didn't go home we would hear a lot of complaints. It is important that we go back to our districts and go out and hear from the people that we have the honor and privilege to represent, and we will do that, maybe as early as tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

But the President is poised to follow through on his threat to issue the edict, not a lawful act, not a lawful executive order, an edict, that he would give a lawful status to 5 or 6 million illegal aliens, many of them, maybe most of them, probably not all of them, criminal aliens.

He has issued orders to the Department of Justice to examine how they can get an early release for people who are in our prisons who have been sentenced. That is hundreds of thousands, as many as 400,000 felons that the President would release on the streets of America. He has released criminals to the tune of 36,000-plus out onto the streets. That is in one category. There is another category of tens of thousands more.

And he has opened up our borders by signing the documents and the Morton Memos—not physically signed, he had his subordinates do that—and the Morton Memos say we are not going to enforce a law against people who didn't commit a felony or aren't guilty of these three mysterious misdemeanors. And they said that if you came into the United States illegally, theoretically through no fault of your own, if you did so before your 18th birthday and you did so before December 31 of 2011, then you get to stay for the duration of this permit that he manufactures lawlessly out of thin air.

And then he manufactures a work permit so that these people can compete for jobs against naturalized and natural born American citizens and green card holders, who likely did it the legal way.

Because he gets a political kick out of this, a political bonus out of this, because he is bringing in undocumented Democrats, and they have a plan to document them so they can vote, we have a situation here where the constitutional underpinnings of America are in crisis mode. The employment in America is at great risk and under great threat, and the security of our border is very weak.

I went down, Mr. Speaker, last weekend, down to the southern tip of Texas, down to the mouth of the Rio Grande, planted a flag right there at the southern tip where the waters of the Rio Grande flow out into the sea, and then followed the river to Brownsville and went through the ports of entry at Brownsville, other facilities in Brownsville, on up into McAllen and to the ports of entry there, to the border patrol centers there, to a resettlement center there, and on up all the way to Laredo.

And from what I saw and what I heard, from our Border Patrol, from our Customs and Border Protection, from the Department of Public Safety in Texas, and others, they are good people, a lot of them with uniforms on, that are doing a good job, doing the best they can with what they have to work with.

We have a lawless order from the President, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, which is more accurately DACA, Deferred Action for Criminal Aliens. DACA has become the magnet that the coyotes have used to advertise throughout the Central American countries, in particular, El Salvador, Honduras, and also Guatemala. People that are already in the United States oftentimes will save up money, maybe borrow money, and send it down to Central America to the tune of, the lowest number that I pick up is $4,000 a head, on up to 5, 6, 7, 8, maybe even $9,000, for the coyotes to transport an illegal alien into the United States.

They are coming into America in the southern tip of Texas and the Rio Grande Valley sector of the border in numbers that work out this way. The unaccompanied alien children, UACs as they are known, and referred to sometimes as ''unaccompanied alien juveniles,'' number this way: this fiscal year, from October 1 to June 15, 57,000 UACs, unaccompanied alien children—57,000. That number has surely grown to over 60,000, probably over 70,000, predicted to go to 90,000 for this fiscal year.

The peak of this thing seems to have passed behind us. We are either in a temporary lull, or we have seen the peak behind us. But, in any case, when we think of numbers in the area of 60,000 unaccompanied alien children coming into the United States, that is only 20 percent of the overall population coming in. So we are at 300,000 or more. But of those roughly 60,000—the number that we surpassed—here is how they break down: 80 percent male, 20 percent female.

The 80 percent male and the 20 percent female also need to take into account that these are not kids that range from age 1 day to 1 day before their 18th birthday, Mr. Speaker. These are unaccompanied alien children that have a demographic breakdown that works like this: 80 percent male, 83 percent that are either the ages of 15, 16, or 17. Once they are 18, they are no longer qualified as UACs—83 percent.

So I do the simple math, Mr. Speaker, and I say: 0.8, 80 percent, times 0.83, 83 percent, 15, 16, or 17 years old—that means that 66.4 percent of these unaccompanied alien ''children'' are young men ages 15, 16, and 17 years old. They come from the most violent countries in the world. The six most violent countries in the world are south of Mexico. It is not Mexico, it is south of Mexico, Mr. Speaker. Eight of the 10 most violent countries in the world are also south of Mexico.

It is a fact, according to the United Nation's data, that of the most violent countries in the world, only Honduras is more violent than the city of Detroit. Yet, there are those in this Congress that are convinced, because the Central American countries have a high degree of violence, that the people are leaving those countries because of the violence, and they are scared and they are running off. Well, if that is so, then one would think they would be running out of Detroit at a pace similar to the pace they are running out of Guatemala and El Salvador and other violent countries down there—probably run a little faster out of Honduras than they are out of the other countries, than they are maybe out of Detroit.

But as I said in a Judiciary Committee hearing, in response to the witness' testimony that was there, I said: If we are going to bring these kids to

the United States because they are afraid where they are, we had better not take them to Detroit because they will be in more danger there, unless they came from Honduras. Those are the facts, and those are the data. Yes, they come from violent countries, and they come from countries that are controlled to a high degree by drug cartels.

But here is what is happening. The families that are sending people here usually have one or more members in the United States now. They may have left their kids back in their home country in Honduras. They will send money down there, they might borrow money. Then usually locally they will hire a coyote that is going to smuggle them up into the United States.

Then the family most often, not 100 percent of the time, but most often, whoever is in custody of this young girl that might be 12 or 13 or 14, or on up to 17 or older, they go down to the local pharmacy, where a prescription is not required, and they buy a monthly supply of contraceptives, birth control bills, and they take it back and they start giving those birth control pills to that girl, and then send her across 2,000 to 2,500 miles of dangerous Central America and Mexico to get on the train of death—it is called ''The Beast,'' and ride that train up as near the Rio Grande as possible. Then that child has to get off of there and make their way to the Rio Grande River, then pay a coyote to get a ride across the river, and then submit themselves to the U.S. authorities.

We went to center after center, we talked to people after people that had been working with these unaccompanied alien children, and we asked them how many of them are sexually assaulted, how many of them are raped? And the answers came back a guess, but a range, a range between 30 percent and 70 percent.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker. Think of having a daughter and living in El Salvador and deciding, I want to send her to her mother in the United States or her aunt in the United States, or being an aunt in El Salvador and you want to send your niece to her mother in the United States. You get a wire that sends you down $5,000 or $6,000, and you go out into the neighborhood and you solicit a coyote, and then you say, I want to send this niece or my daughter up to America, but why don't you wait a few days because I have got to go down and buy some birth control pills and make sure she is ready for the trip, because I am pretty confident she is going to be raped along the way.

That is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. It is not going on now and then; it is going on from a third to 70 percent of the time for the girls, and they told us that the numbers of boys were equivalent to the numbers of girls who were sexually assaulted. That was a question that was repeated over and over again.

So this President has done real damage and destruction to the rule of law. The result of that is America is flooded with illiterate, unskilled people into the job categories where we have the highest available employment, the highest ratios of unemployment. The double-digit unemployment exists in the lowest-skilled jobs. There is no metric out there that suggests that we should be bringing more unskilled people in, more people who are illiterate in their own language into America, thinking somehow that that is work that Americans won't do.

Nuts. There is no work that Americans won't do. There has been no work that I won't do. I have done some of the toughest, nastiest, most difficulty, and some of the dangerous jobs that the country has to offer, and I haven't come close to doing the jobs that the United States Marine Corps does on a regular basis.

What is the most dangerous job that we ask an American to do? How about rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah? How about taking on radical al Qaeda extremists in places like Afghanistan?

When the Marine Corps goes into Fallujah for the first or second battle, and we have seen what has happened since then, what do they get paid to put their lives on the line? If you figure it at 40 hours a week, something like $8.49 an hour, Mr. Speaker. That is back then when I calculated it, when we had operations going on then. If you can pay a United States marine $8.49 an hour to lock and load and go into a place like Fallujah, you can't convince me that there is work that Americans won't do, especially if it pays an appropriate wage and we respect the work that gets done.

So we have a President who has decided he is going to defy the rule of law, and he is going to manufacture law as he goes and create work permits out of thin air.

□ 2145

When we see this calamity of the huge hole in our southern border, primarily at McAllen, Texas, the House of Representatives decides it wants to overreact to the President of the United States, and since they are afraid that they will somehow get the blame if nothing gets done in the month of August, they decided to bring a piece of legislation here to the floor.

This piece of legislation was written by a staff person that was once that of JOHN MCCAIN, and we know what he has brought for immigration policy. It has been very troubling to me to deal with the legislation that he has supported, but I have this in my hand here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

It doesn't do what it is advertised to do. It doesn't do what needs to be done, but it grants this. If there is an unaccompanied alien child, here are the consequences for failure to appear to a hearing:

> Any alien who fails to appear at a proceeding required under this section, shall be ordered removed in absentia if the government establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien was at fault for their absence from the proceedings.

No evidence can be admitted into that proceeding after the fact, and it can't be admitted if they don't anticipate that there is not going to be an appearance of the alien, so that means the government has to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it was the alien's fault they didn't show up.

The only way I know that you can do that is if you have a video camera on them, and they are sitting on the couch, Mr. Speaker. This is a wide open hole that grants a pass under that provision. Then it says:

> In General—at the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be admissible to the United States.

They get a new hearing under a new section created, which is 235, and if the preponderance of the evidence indicates that they might receive asylum and if they think they are likely to receive asylum in a separate category, then 50 percent plus 1 is preponderance—likely is 50 percent plus 1. Fifty percent of 50 percent is 25 percent, plus one, are the odds that they need to claim in order to receive a hearing for asylum.

So if you have got a one in four shot at it, Mr. Speaker, you are going to get a hearing for asylum. Then you are going to get an asylum hearing, and then if you are turned down at the asylum hearing, you get to go to a removal hearing. That is three bites at the apple. They are all renewable; times two, that is six different bites at the apple.

No such thing exists for Mexican unaccompanied alien children. The determination is made under the Wilberforce law of 2008 by the Border Patrol whether or not they go back to Mexico.

They purport that this bill treats the other than Mexican unaccompanied alien children the same as the existing law treats unaccompanied alien Mexican children. Mr. Speaker, if it does, there is language in here that then diminishes our ability to send the Mexican kids back. That is what we have. We have a bill that has been whipped to be something that it is not.

I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee tonight. There was a long discussion and debate over it, Mr. Speaker, but here is what we have: my amendment said that we have got to fix the 2008 William Wilberforce language.

By the way, no Republican voted for that, not one. It was introduced on December 9, 2008. It was taken up by a unanimous consent request after everybody left town on December 10, 2008. It was passed by voice in the House, sent to the Senate. The Senate caught the lateral and passed it by voice to the President.

We didn't see that bill. It became a component of what they have utilized as an open door; coupling the 2008 bill

with an expansive reading of the asylum language and the President's DACA language is what is bringing these tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien minors here, which are only 20 percent of the overall group that are coming.

There are also family units—usually, mothers with a child or children. There are individual males coming in, in significant numbers. I have said that we have imported at least 40,000 15-year-old, 16-year-old, and 17-year-old boys—prime gang recruitment age—and that doesn't give you the data on those that are 18, 19, 20, 25 to 31; and those are just the ones that are covered under DACA.

I offered an amendment that would have cut off all funding to DACA. It mirrors the Cruz-Blackburn language. It is good language, and it should be part of this bill. It is not, by the information I have, Mr. Speaker.

There is a 2008 fix that I wrote over a month ago that needs to be part of this bill. It is not, by the report I am getting from the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that there was even a vote on it up in the Rules Committee.

There is asylum language that has been offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, that fixes some of the expansive utilization of asylum that is allowing for people to be distributed all over the United States at taxpayers' expense. That is not part of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have a deliberative process in this Congress because they are not going to allow a legitimate vote, and the language that is out here is bad.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote ''no'' on this bill that has come before us, and I am going to have to consider what I do on the rule, but if this House sends a message to support cutting off all funding to enforce or implement DACA, that will be constructive because it will say to the President: these are the Republicans that have at least a chance of standing up against you if you decide that you are going to function in a lawless, unconstitutional manner in the month of August—or any other month—with regard to this granting any expansion of the lawlessness that we have seen today.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2338

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTIONS FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–567) on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2577. An act to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4028. An act to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6678. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0015; FV14-906-2 FIR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6679. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base [Doc. No. AMS-FV-13-0088; FV14-985-2 FR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6680. A letter from the Supervisory Financial Program Specialist, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Government participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1530-AA05) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6681. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Products, User Fees, Requirements for the Submission of Data Needed to Calculate User Fees for Domestic Manufacturers and Importers of Tobacco Products [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-0920] (RIN: 0910-AG81) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to Compliance Certification Content Requirements for State and Federal Operating Permits Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0162; FRL-9913-88-OAR] (RIN:2060-AQ71] received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6683. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Nitrogen Oxides Exemption Request [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0895; A-1-FRL-9913-56-OAR] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0400; FRL-9914-44-Region 6] received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: The 2014 and 2015 Critical Use Exemption From the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0065; FRL-9911-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR80) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6686. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0046; FRL-9913-15-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6687. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Solvent Degreasing Operations Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0214; FRL-9914-24-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Bellefontaine Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0791; FRL-9914-22-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Locally Enforced Motor Vehicle Idling Limitations [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0890; FRL-9914-31-Region 6] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions, Clark County Department of Air Quality [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0495; FRL-9914-17-Region 9] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6691. 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. (Moran, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-102] [RM-11696] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6692. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-154] received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6693. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6694. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 25 [Docket No.: 140305202-4478-02] (RIN: 0648-BE07) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6695. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9 [Docket No.: 140107014-4014-01] (RIN: 0648-XD329) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6696. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Nanticoke River; Bivalve, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0138] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6697. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Notice of Arrival Exception [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0797] (RIN: 1625-AC12) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6698. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0005] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6699. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Miles 255.0 to 256.5, Florence, AL [USCG-2013-0753] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6700. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; United States and Canadian Military Exercise Jump Training, Lake Erie, Hamburg, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0260] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6701. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Meridian Health Fireworks, Navesink River, Rumson, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0353] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6702. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Incorporation by Reference; North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria; Hazardous Materials Safety Permits [Docket No.: FMCSA-2014-0135] (RIN: 2126-AB73) received July 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6703. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-5304C; Camp Lejeune, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0272; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6704. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Elkin, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0046; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-1] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6705. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Foreign tax credit guidance under section 901(m) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6706. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rules Regarding the Health Insurance Premium Tax Credit [TD 9683] (RIN: 1545-BM23) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 696. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–567). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5255. A bill to enhance the procurement of information technology by establishing a United States Digital Government Office and United States Chief Information Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5256. A bill to encourage compensation transparency; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction relating to the compensation of the lesser earning spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. WAGNER,

Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to index the dependent care credit and income exclusion for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5259. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5260. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent disability fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5261. A bill to establish a North and Central American and Caribbean border security cooperation initiative, enhance the security of Mexico's southern border, improve United States short term detention standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 5262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5263. A bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, Education and the Workforce, and Financial 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. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the work opportunity credit permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 5265. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Hamlet, North Carolina, as the ''Edward 'Ed' James O'Neal Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5266. A bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5267. A bill to protect the pets of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 5268. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to prohibit the assembly or manufacture of secure credentials or their component parts by the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 5269. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase transparency and reporting on campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5270. A bill to promote the transportation of liquified natural gas from the United States on United States flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5271. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5272. A bill to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 5273. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of veterans to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 5274. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow voluntary agreements for Social Security and Medicare coverage of employees of Guam and American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5275. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the amount of loan forgiveness for which teachers in teacher shortage areas are eligible; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 5276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat bicycle sharing systems as mass transit facilities for purposes of the qualified transportation fringe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5277. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 5278. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on sugar-sweetened beverages, to dedicate the revenues from such tax to the prevention, treatment, and research of diet-related health conditions in priority populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5280. A bill to strengthen the current protections available under the National Labor Relations Act by providing a private right of action for certain violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for individuals under age 18, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5282. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Medgar Wiley Evers, in recognition of his contributions and ultimate sacrifice in the fight for racial equality in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5283. A bill to establish national goals for the reduction and recycling of municipal solid waste, to address the growing problem of marine debris, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations to attain those goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the work opportunity tax credit and to allow the transfer of such credit in the case of contracted veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr.

WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LONG, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 5285. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5286. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a more equitable geographic allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 5287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5288. A bill to establish a National Care Corps through which qualified volunteers provide care, companionship, and other services to seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5289. A bill to establish the Indian River Lagoon Nutrient Removal Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5290. A bill to establish a Military Community Infrastructure Program to provide grants for transportation infrastructure improvements in military communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5291. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to goods exported for processing abroad and reimported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5292. A bill to provide public safety officer disability benefits to officers disabled before the enactment of the Federal public safety officer disability benefits law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 5293. A bill to address non-compliance by the Russian Federation of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and 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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5294. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5295. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5296. A bill to require a demonstration program on the accession as Air Force officers of candidates with auditory impairments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5297. A bill to improve transparency in charity regulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an enhanced credit for the rehabilitation of buildings located in low-income communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5300. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to primarily consider, and to separately report, the domestic benefits of any rule that addresses emissions of carbon dioxide from any existing source or new source that is an electric utility generating unit, in any such rule, and in the regulatory impact analysis for such rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5301. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 695. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding steps that Congress should take to restore democracy and change the way we do politics in the United States by reducing the influence of money and corporations and promoting the participation of the people in politics and government; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BARR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VELA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 697. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2014 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. NUNES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 698. A resolution condemning the attack that occurred at the Oak Creek Sikh Gurdwara on August 5, 2012, and honoring the memory of those who died in the attack; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

295. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 397 urging the Pentagon to explore alternatives to increase the cost-effectiveness of maintaining the Army National Guard in ways that do not adversely impact its mission readiness; to the Committee on Armed Services.

296. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 61 urging the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives to release the TBI report ''MLK Document 200472''; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California introduced a bill (H.R. 5302) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Special Forces Command Sergeant Major Ramon Rodriguez of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 5255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to ''lay and collect Taxes'' and ''provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111–148, as amnded. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 5265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 5266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 5268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, granting Congress the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 5270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 5271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.''

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 5273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4 Section 3

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The changes made by this bill to the Higher Education Act are within Congress' authority under Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . .''

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5279.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article ' of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article 1

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:
H.R. 5289.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 section 8 Constitution of the United States, which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:
H.R. 5290.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. OWENS:
H.R. 5291.
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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REED:
H.R. 5292.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—promoting the general welfare

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:
H.R. 5293.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 5294.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article X, Section Y, Clause Z

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 5295.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several states).

By Mr. TAKANO:
H.R. 5296.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 5297.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:
H.R. 5298.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: 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
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. TURNER:
H.R. 5299.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: 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 Mrs. WAGNER:
H.R. 5300.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 5301.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:
H.R. 5302.
''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 129: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 279: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 292: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 303: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 333: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 440: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 460: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 523: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 543: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 647: Mr. REED and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 676: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 690: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 725: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 728: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 792: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 831: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 851: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 954: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 975: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1020: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1070: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1074: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1148: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1250: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1284: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1318: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1339: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1387: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1428: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1431: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1449: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1462: Mr. COOPER and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1527: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1563: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1620: Mr. LANCE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1696: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1725: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1812: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 1852: Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1878: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1910: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1921: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2001: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2056: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2086: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2116: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2169: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2323: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2417: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2450: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2457: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2468: Ms. ESTY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2504: Mr. KILMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2506: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2536: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2540: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2594: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2662: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2673: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2707: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2745: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2835: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2841: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2870: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2957: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2994: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3123: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3276: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3327: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3395: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3426: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3456: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3471: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3555: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3560: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3600: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3680: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3708: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3711: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3714: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3717: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3722: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3740: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3742: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3833: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3850: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3877: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 3899: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3940: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3991: Mr. MARINO and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 3992: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4149: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4158: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4162: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4172: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. HALL and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4214: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 4216: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4221: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4252: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4319: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 4365: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4378: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4385: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4426: Mr. TONKO and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4427: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4498: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4504: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4510: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 4525: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4544: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4567: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4577: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4584: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4620: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4632: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4664: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4674: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4682: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4717: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4723: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4726: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4748: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. REED, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4763: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4793: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4811: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4815: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4818: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4833: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4837: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4847: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4857: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4863: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4864: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4865: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4886: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4906: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4930: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4933: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4942: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4951: Mr. GALLEGO and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4960: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4964: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4970: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4989: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4995: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5002: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5007: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5009: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5011: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5014: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5023: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5051: Mr. DELANEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5052: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 5059: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5064: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5069: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 5078: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 5082: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5088: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5101: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 5110: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 5113: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5130: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 5137: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5143: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 5146: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5160: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 5168: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5179: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5182: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5185: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 5194: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 5207: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 5219: Mr. HONDA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5226: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 5227: Mr. LONG and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5238: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5239: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 5245: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 5253: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. ESTY and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H. Res. 35: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 208: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 231: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H. Res. 281: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 440: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H. Res. 489: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 518: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 522: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 536: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 587: Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 620: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. Labrador.
H. Res. 683: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 689: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUSH.