United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2014 No. 129

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. 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.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have stepped away from a Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health to come to the floor. The purpose of that hearing is once again to attack the Affordable Care Act, criticisms of CMS, and to lay the foundation for the Republican goal of repealing the Act entirely.

I have frankly lost track of the number of attempts to repeal the bill. Fifty? Sixty? You know, it really doesn't matter. The Affordable Care Act is here to stay and will be throughout the tenure of President Obama.

Despite some difficulties in its implementation, the President is justly proud of the health care reform as a signal accomplishment of his administration. Many of the problems that we are facing in the implementation of the act have been as a result of Republican intransigence.

Remember, despite the fact that the legislation embodies most of what had been bipartisan principles—indeed, those strongly advocated by Republicans over the last 20 years or more—there was unrelenting opposition.

Republicans in the Senate refused to cooperate and refused to legislate, denying the 60-vote threshold necessary to move the bill forward. As a result, the bill was adopted through a process called reconciliation, where you just melded the two bills together.

The result was not a bill that anybody would have designed, but it easily could have been made better, should our Republican friends have chosen. Instead, they have continued this unyielding assault.

Even without their assistance, the results are pretty remarkable. We have the lowest rate of medical inflation in years. The Congressional Budget Office has consistently now been lowering the long-term cost estimates for Medicare.

This is probably the most powerful evidence yet that we are getting runaway health care costs under control, which was and remains the greatest single threat to the fiscal stability of our country.

We have been doing much more than merely controlling costs. There are more than 8 million people with marketplace insurance, and about three-quarters of them receive tax credits to help reduce the cost. Six million low-income people have been enrolled in Medicaid. Another 6 million children have been able to stay on their parents' health plans.

129 million—Americans, I daresay that includes most of us in Congress—can no longer be denied care because of preexisting medical conditions.

As I said, there is lots that can be done to improve the system. Today, I had a chance to address the Case Management Society of America about one of them. Congressman PETRI of Wisconsin and I have introduced a transitional care benefit that would greatly reduce the chance of hospital readmissions that are not just costly, but they represent a failure to deliver health care to our citizens and reduce the stress and strain on families with loved ones who have left the hospital. This could save billions of dollars and frankly doesn't remotely depend on whether or not you support ObamaCare.

Another great example is legislation that Dr. PHIL ROE of Tennessee and I have introduced, dealing with the Federal Government finally placing a value on the conversation with patients and their families for conditions surrounding the end of life.

There is value-based insurance, which I am cosponsoring with Representative BLACK of Tennessee. Representative ROSKAM of Illinois has the PRIME Act to deal with Medicare fraud. Representative GERLACH of Pennsylvania for several years has had legislation for a secure access card.

The list of opportunities is long and represents an extraordinary chance to build on reform, not just a futile effort at undermining it.

Someday, the American public is going to insist that we grow up and do our jobs, and there would be no better place to start than in building on the promise of health care reform not just to save money, but to improve the lives of Americans of all ages.

The hypocrisy here is breathtaking: refuse to legislate and then attack it for its faults; starve the IRS and CMS

Printed on recycled paper.

of resources to properly administer the law and then complain that the IRS and CMS are not properly administering it.

The American public has a right to expect better from the people's House. Someday, they will get it.

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, although criminal forfeiture laws have been an important tool and a useful tool for law enforcement, civil asset forfeiture has been used too many times to seize, forfeit, and indeed profit off the property of Americans without even charging them with crimes—innocent until proven guilty.

The activity can be a boon for police budgets, as the Federal asset forfeiture fund exceeded $2 billion in 2013 and equitable sharing agreements between the Department of Justice and local police departments accounted for over $600 million.

While policing certainly is a vital element of an effective society, let's also be mindful of the fact that our Constitution emphasizes individual rights above all. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 5212, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act, to limit the scope, the power, and the reach of the government to abuse their forfeiture powers in violation of individual rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

I urge all my colleagues to support this needed reform effort and to again assure our citizens of their civil liberties and the opportunity to defend innocence or prove guilt.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my press secretary has kept me pretty busy the last few days, talking about the President's decision to delay executive action on immigration, in two languages. I made it clear that from a political standpoint, in the short run and the long run, I think the President should have taken action before election day in order to be more transparent with the American people about the policy we all know is coming.

It makes the job harder for me to generate enthusiasm among Americans to vote at all, let alone enthusiasm for voting for Democrats when there are members of my own party asking the President to hold his pen and his phone in abeyance until after the voters vote.

From a policy standpoint, every week we delay is bad for our country. From a humanitarian perspective, deporting the parents of U.S. citizens is not in our national interest. Making it impossible for spouses of legal immigrants and citizens of the United States to pick up the visas that have already been issued to them is not in our national interest.

Keeping the fear of deportation hovering over immigrant communities, like Pilsen and Little Village in my district in Chicago, has a damaging impact on the fabric of our community. It dampens the economy along commercial thoroughfares, like 26th Street, a key engine of the Chicago economy and tax base.

Perhaps more important to those living outside of immigrant communities is to know that when the President acts, he will announce a tough but fair solution for millions of immigrants who do not have visas or any way of getting visas, but who have lived and worked here peacefully for years, even decades.

It would work something like this: if they come forward, if they submit their fingerprints at their own expense to the FBI, and if they pass a rigorous criminal background check and meet other requirements, we will issue them a biometric identification card that says that they are not a priority for deportation.

Not only do we get them in the system and on the books, but now they are in a program that needs to be renewed periodically with strict rules. This creates a huge incentive not to violate the rules of the program or the rules of our society.

I know the President has heard all of these arguments, and I don't think I will convince him to change his mind again and move forward with key improvements to our deportation policies before November 4, but let us be clear, I think he has already made two important decisions.

Number one, there is no longer any question that the President of the United States has the legal authority to act on immigration and deportations under current law. Even Republicans who have hired the best lawyers at taxpayers' expense to prepare their lawsuits against the President agreed and didn't include immigration in their farfetched list of Presidential ''overreaches.''

This is settled law, and despite the shouts of talk radio and a few on the Republican side, there is no real serious debate about the rock-solid legal ground from which the President can act and has already acted.

Secondly, I know the President has decided going big, going broad, going generous, and going quickly after the election is the right decision because he and Secretary Jeh Johnson have to set enforcement priorities about which people they will deport first and which people they will deport last based on national security and economic interests of this country.

He will act up to the limits of current law, and believe me, I can hear the cries from the other side, ''He can't act because we, Republicans, may try to do something on immigration in the lame-duck. The President can't act because we, Republicans, are going to put the bipartisan coalition back together again in the new 114th Congress, and we will get reform passed in both Houses; or, you know, we were just kidding when we said all that stuff about immigration after our defeat on election day in 2012.''

They will say, ''This time, we really mean it because 2016 and the electoral college are staring us in the face''—but no, I know the President and the Democrats will not fall for that again.

I don't see the President saying he will act if you don't act, as we have been saying for 2 years. This time, I see the President acting first, acting broadly, and acting generously, laying out a broad array of executive actions to mitigate the damage that is being done to our country by congressional inaction on immigration reform.

If the Republicans are so inclined, they can take legislative action. It is what we have been begging them to do for two decades on this issue. We may even work with you if you are serious about it, but it will no longer be accepted as a delaying tactic for action by the executive branch of government. It will be a response to Presidential action.

I think the President will have the courage to act, and then it is Congress' chance to act.

THE RETIREMENT OF BILL SCHWERI

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri, upon his retirement as the director of Federal Relations at the University of Kentucky.

During his 42 years at the university, Bill has been a champion for progress in education, health care, and energy research across the State. Behind the scenes of Kentucky's highly esteemed flagship university, Bill has been a driving force, seeking out partnerships, programs, and funding to help the most distressed region of the Commonwealth. I am certain there is not a single resource that Bill hasn't researched for the benefit of southern and eastern Kentucky.

No one knows the value and power of creating and sustaining longtime partnerships like Bill. If the University of Kentucky needed a partner to improve education or access to health care, Bill ensured the connection was secured with his genuine, kind, and humble approach.

Most leaders seek recognition or credit for their own efforts, but that has never been the case with Bill Schweri. His work has led to exponential growth of UK's research enterprise and jump-started new research initiatives that have enabled the university to be successful in competing for Federal grants and contracts.

This riveting scientific research on cancer, fossil energy, transportation, and agriculture is blazing new trails in every aspect of our everyday life in our country, to say nothing of how our State is better off for it.

□ 1015

He has fought for legislation that is important to UK and student financial aid. Bill has been a leader in the Science Coalition and actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Over the years, he has deservedly gained the utmost respect of his peers in Federal relations.

As he departs his post, Mr. Speaker, at the University of Kentucky, it is my intention to ensure Bill Schweri receives the recognition that is due him for his tireless efforts on behalf of students and families all across Kentucky, and specifically living in Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District. We hope he knows he always has the thanks of a grateful Big Blue Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me as we honor my friend Bill Schweri as we bid him a joy-filled retirement.

POTABLE WATER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just last month, hundreds of thousands of residents in Toledo, Ohio, were left without access to potable water and faced an extended drinking water ban, after unsafe toxin levels, likely caused by a Lake Erie algal bloom, were found at a city water treatment plant. In January, Charleston, West Virginia, residents faced a similar ban on their drinking water after a chemical spill.

George Bernard Shaw once said:

> Success does not consist in never making mistakes, but in never making the same one a second time.

One would think, after two new incidents that left hundreds of thousands of Americans without access to clean drinking water, this body would jump into action to prevent this from ever happening again. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the House hasn't only refused to act, yesterday we actually voted to prevent the administration from acting.

Again and again my colleagues continue to introduce bills and riders that would endanger our drinking water while ignoring basic scientific principles in the process. Today more than 117 million Americans get their drinking water from systems that rely on rivers, streams, and wetlands which, at this very moment, are not clearly protected under the Clean Water Act. Let me say that again: 117 million Americans are getting their drinking water from bodies of water that may not be protected from pollution or destruction.

American families deserve clarity, and that is exactly what the administration is trying to provide with their proposed Clean Water Act rule; and, unbelievably enough, that is exactly what the House voted to prevent yesterday.

For years we relied on the Clean Water Act to protect the Nation's waters. For my constituents back home in Chicago, that meant everything from the wetlands on the shores of Lake Michigan to the inland streams that flow across the Great Lakes region. But two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 changed all that, leaving us with a confusing, time-consuming, and frustrating process for determining which of the Nation's waters are now protected under Federal law and which are not.

It is imperative that we close what has become a harmful loophole, and that is what the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers are trying to do with their proposed rule clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act.

Let's be clear: The EPA and the Corps of Engineers are acting within the authority granted them by Congress under the Clean Water Act to legally clarify the statute's jurisdiction. This clarity is desperately needed, especially in the Great Lakes Basin. Half the streams in the Greats Lakes States lack clear water protection simply because they do not all flow all year.

This lack of protection has taken its toll, slowing permitting decisions for responsible development and reducing protections for drinking water supplies and critical habitats. The EPA and Army Corps' proposed rule would restore Clean Water Act protections to wetlands and tributary streams because the science clearly shows that these water bodies are connected.

Before proposing its rule, the EPA analyzed more than 1,000 peer-reviewed scientific articles, and the findings are irrefutable. Tributary streams and wetlands are clearly connected to downstream waters. Pollution is carried down the river, polluting bigger and bigger waterways.

Healthy wetlands improve water quality by filtering polluted runoff from farm fields and city streets that otherwise would flow into rivers, streams, and great water bodies across the country. Wetlands and tributaries provide vital habitat to wildlife, waterfowl and fish, reduce flooding, and replenish groundwater supplies.

We cannot protect and restore the Great Lakes and our drinking water supplies without first protecting and restoring the wetlands and upstream waters that feed into them. Congress passed the Clean Water Act with the intention of protecting our waterways, and that is what it did for almost 30 years. Now this administration is trying to bring back these protections this House has undermined.

Let's not make the same mistake twice. Let's let the experts do their job.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay special tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also known as the VFW, on the 100th anniversary of its organization in September 1914. The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was also organized in 1914.

Over the past century, members of the VFW have worked tirelessly to ensure that veterans receive the respect, honor, and support they deserve. The VFW was formed when the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the National Society of the Army of the Philippines merged during a conference at the former Schenley Hotel, which is now the William Pitt Union at the University of Pittsburgh.

A Pennsylvania Historic Society marker that sits between the Soldiers and Sailors Hall and the William Pitt Union commemorating the occasion reads:

> The Veterans of Foreign Wars organized September 14–17, 1914, at the former Schenley Hotel near here. Veterans who had served in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and China were among its founders.

Since its founding, the VFW has done tremendous work to serve veterans and family members. The organization played a central role in the creation of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the GI Bill. In addition, the VFW helped spearhead the creation of the Vietnam War, Korean War, World War II, and Women in Military Service Memorials.

It continues this legacy of service by helping veterans and their family members secure VA benefits, including disability claims and pensions. The VFW continues to play an important role as Iraq and Afghanistan veterans return home and adjust to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join us in recognizing and expressing sincere gratitude for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the important work they have done and continue to do to stand with those who have stood for us.

SOCORRO, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to highlight the historic city of Socorro, in El Paso County. It is located in the center of El Paso's Mission Valley, a valley named for three historic missions founded by Spanish priests, soldiers, and colonists.

Socorro is also home to the Socorro High School Bulldogs. They are known for many things, but particularly they are known for their prowess in baseball. Socorro High is a former State

champion in baseball. In a State as big as Texas, that is a pretty impressive feat.

The roots of Socorro began to take shape in 1680 when Governor Antonio de Otermin and Father Francisco de Ayeta led the Spanish and Piro Indian refugees who were fleeing the New Mexico Pueblo Indian revolt to the El Paso area. Two years later, they built a mission, Nuestra Senora de la Limpia Concepcion del Socorro, the second-oldest mission in Texas. Unfortunately, this first mission was swept away by a flood on the Rio Grande in 1744 and a second mission was built.

Today it may be hard to imagine, but the Rio Grande in those days was a wild river, much different from the dry riverbed or placid stream of today. And a powerful flood also washed away the second mission in 1829.

In 1843, the main part of the present Socorro mission was completed, and at that time, Socorro had a population of about 100 people. The city of Socorro is one of those cities in Texas that has seen several flags flown over it. Founded by the Spanish, it became a part of Mexico from 1821 to 1848, and as a result of the U.S.-Mexican war, Socorro became part of Texas.

The area around El Paso can be arid and harsh, but the secret to Socorro's longevity has been its acequias, a well-designed system of irrigation canals still in existence today. These acequias provided water for crops and vineyards.

The development of Socorro suffered a setback in 1881 when the railroads laid their track all the way to El Paso but they bypassed Socorro. This shifted the development and the political power into the city of El Paso itself. And yet the determined city of Socorro continued to grow, and it diversified and developed various industries. Its resolute citizens were determined to stay in the area.

Later on, unscrupulous developers started to build homes and residential subdivisions there that didn't have paved streets or water or sewer, but Socorro residents again rose up against these builders of these colonias to make sure that their city survived and prospered. And today, the city of Socorro is home to some 32,000 people, making it the 95th largest city in Texas.

The city of Socorro is El Paso County's second largest municipality, and there is a lot of history in Socorro, a lot of places to go and see. If you have got a young kid, a young child, you will want to hang out where the community gathers, and that is at Bulldog Championship Park, which includes a splash park, an amphitheater, walking trails, and a pond.

There is also the Socorro Entertainment Center, known as Speaking Rock, operated by the Tiguas, a Pueblo tribe located in the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo. The Entertainment Center welcomes recording artists like B.B. King and the Gipsy Kings, Everclear and Korn, just to name a few.

Socorro is served by the Socorro Independent School District, with one high school, three middle schools, and five elementaries.

I invite people visiting the 23rd to stop by Socorro, enjoy Texas culture. It is an infusion of Southwest history and Southwest traditions.

SUPPORT THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider the Employee Health Care Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

As I traveled West Virginia during the August recess, I heard from small business owners and workers across the State that their health insurance premiums are increasing. I also heard that their deductibles are increasing quite rapidly.

Given that the Obama administration's own Centers for Medicare & Medicaid studies found that 11 million small business employees will see their premiums increase due to ObamaCare, it was sad, but not surprising, that businesses in West Virginia and around the country are feeling the pinch of this law's misguided policies.

Yesterday a report issued by the American Action Forum found that the Affordable Care Act regulations are reducing small businesses' pay by $22.6 billion annually, and the rising premiums spurred by the law have cost our Nation's economy more than 350,000 jobs.

In my State of West Virginia, more than half of our private sector workers are employed by small businesses. Making sure that health insurance on the small group market is affordable is important to both the family budgets and to make sure those small businesses can continue to grow and provide jobs.

We saw last fall the tremendous problems and uncertainty that occurred when roughly 5 million Americans who purchased insurance on the individual market received cancelation notices, but recent testimony at the House Energy and Commerce Committee has indicated that millions more workers who have employer-sponsored plans could get similar notices starting as early as this year.

If a worker is forced to change health insurance policies, their new plan might not include their doctor or their community hospital. This is another example of overreaching government that is taking away the freedom of individuals and businesses to make the health care decisions that best fit their unique circumstances.

The bill the House will consider today is very simple. If a plan was offered on the group health insurance market in 2013, that plan can continue to be offered for the next 5 years. Any worker covered by one of these plans will not be fined under the individual mandate. The Employer Health Care Protection Act keeps the President's promise that people who like their insurance, health insurance, can keep it.

□ 1030

It also provides more affordable alternatives for small businesses whose health care costs are soaring. This bill is a commonsense step forward.

There is still much more work that needs to be done. We need to go back to the drawing board and enact true health care reform. We should build on the good ideas, like helping those with preexisting conditions and allowing children to remain on parents' benefits until the age of 26. These are good things.

We should get rid of bad ideas like the job-killing employer mandate, the individual mandate, and regulations that have cost many Americans the insurance plan and the doctor that they choose. We should enact meaningful medical liability reform, we should help spur association health plans, and allow insurance to be sold across State lines to broaden competition in the individual insurance market.

We need to come together to fix our broken health care system. But today, the least we can do is keep the promise that the President made to the American people and allow current plans to continue to be available. I ask my colleagues to support the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

THE WISDOM OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the effective action and wise caution shown by the President of the United States with regard to ISIS. We were all disgusted by the beheading of American journalists and alarmed by ISIS' early military successes.

Those who oversimplify the Middle East focus exclusively on the evils of ISIS and demand its immediate destruction without sufficient examination of the costs and the effects. The President recognizes that the situation calls for action but that its complexity also calls for caution. He has ordered over 150 airstrikes, which have punished ISIS, killing hundreds of its fighters and securing military victories at Mosul Dam, protecting the Yazidi minority, protecting our Kurdish allies, and protecting the Shiite Turkmen, four important military victories. And, just as importantly, we have pushed back ISIS and prevented its further expansion in Iraq.

Yet, the simpleminded argue that all of our problems in the Middle East would disappear if only we had a President with a different personality. Or

they assume that ISIS can be destroyed immediately without any American boots on the ground. The ground forces necessary to destroy ISIS immediately, that deployment would involve hundreds, if not thousands, of American casualties. Even if we had a victory over ISIS that was swift, our forces would be the ones on the ground. We would then be viewed as responsible for providing security, which would require a prolonged presence.

Now, some fantasize that Turkey or Saudi Arabia or somebody else—just not us—will be willing to deploy ground forces and suffer major casualties. Well, keep in mind that Turkey and Saudi Arabia weren't willing to suffer any casualties to destroy Saddam Hussein in our final war against him, and that these two Sunni nations hate some of the enemies of ISIS as much they hate ISIS. If there are going to be troops on the ground, they will not just magically appear from others in the region.

The greatest flaw in the simple thinking is to focus exclusively on whom we want to destroy without asking who will be empowered by such destruction. Who are the enemies of ISIS that ISIS is fighting today? Who would step into the vacuum if ISIS were rapidly destroyed? Four entities: the al-Nusra front, ISIS' chief rival in Syria. The al-Nusra front, of course, is part of al Qaeda. Second, Assad, who has killed over 191,000 of his own people. Third, the extremist Shiite militias and perhaps former Prime Minister Maliki. These are forces that killed hundreds of Americans last decade. And fourth, Hezbollah and its patron Iran, who killed hundreds of Americans in Lebanon in 1983 and also killed hundreds of Americans in Iraq last decade.

Now, there is constant discussion that ISIS might have the ability to conduct operations outside the Middle East, perhaps against us. Hezbollah and Iran have killed hundreds of people in actions in Asia, South America, Africa, and Europe. So let us be clear: those who will take power if ISIS is swept aside are nearly as evil as ISIS. Let us applaud a President who has taken decisive action, acted with caution, achieved significant military victories, and done it all without a single American casualty.

Finally, there is the issue of Congress. What is our role? Some think that our role is to dodge tough votes, leave town next week, and stay away until Veterans Day, all without voting on what America is doing in the Middle East. Unfortunately, we ought to do our job. The War Powers Act allows the President to act for 60 or 90 days. After that, if Congress refuses to act, the President either has to violate the Constitution or summon Congress back and hope that we do our job. We ought to pass a resolution authorizing air operations for a significant period of time while not expanding the President's limited rights to deploy ground forces.

We ask our pilots to do their job. We in Congress should do ours. Let's consider a War Powers Act resolution. Let's take the tough vote.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

Our Nation has certainly come a long way in advancing the rights of women. In fact, just a few weeks ago, our country celebrated Women's Equality Day, a day commemorating the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, granting women the right to vote. Women, united together against incredible odds, have fought for the right to participate in our democratic process. And, now, 94 year later, our fight for our dignity continues in our own homes—the war being waged against domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act embodies that fight against women being brutalized by those who claim to love us. The Violence Against Women Act provides the resources for women to access police protection, legal services, and social services.

The passage and reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act was a victory for our entire country—a victory for Native American women who had been raped and brutalized on tribal lands with impunity, a victory for LGBTQ victims whose agony was ignored because of their gender identity, a victory for young women in college whose institutions were derelict in their response to ''boys just being boys,'' and a victory for children whose emotional wounds had scabbed over with no healing balm.

We can take comfort knowing that the Violence Against Women Act is making a true difference in the lives of countless women across the country. It has helped reduce domestic violence by shifting the way our culture responds to it. For instance, our Services-Training-Officers-Prosecutors, or STOP, grant program provides vital funding to local communities, giving them the tools they need to strengthen the States' criminal justice system response for victims.

And the Violence Against Women Act isn't just socially responsible, it is fiscally responsible, as well. In its first 6 years alone, the Violence Against Women Act saved taxpayers at least $12.6 billion in net averted social costs. A recent study found that civil protection orders saved one State, Kentucky, on average $85 million in a single year.

The road to this victory wasn't traveled alone. As I look around, I see many of those who stood with me in the face of partisan opposition and obstruction. I see the faces of friends and champions like Representative DONNA EDWARDS, Representative TOM COLE, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, Representative JOHN CONYERS, and Leader NANCY PELOSI. But I don't want to just talk about Members of this body but talk about those who walk outside these Halls, champions like President Obama, Vice President JOE BIDEN, President and Secretary Clinton, Kim Gandy from the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and all those Native American tribes who showed up to stand for the reauthorization.

As I stand here remembering those who have walked with us, I am reminded of my very own home district of Milwaukee. Our community will, once again, host the annual Brides Walk sponsored by the UMOS Latina Resource Center. This walk commemorates a Dominican American woman who was brutally murdered by her jealous ex-boyfriend in New Jersey on her wedding day. This beautiful bride was shot dead in her wedding dress. This event, the Brides Walk, was inspired by a staunch advocate for women's rights, Josie Ashton, who raised awareness about domestic violence by walking from New Jersey to Florida wearing her own wedding dress and spending the night sleeping at shelters from New Jersey to Florida to elucidate the problems and challenges of domestic violence, and remind us that sometimes so-called love can turn to abuse.

This event, the Brides Walk in Milwaukee, will be celebrated by women donning wedding gowns and walking through the streets of Milwaukee speaking against domestic violence. They will be accompanied by brave men who walk by their sides. And so I urge people in Milwaukee to join the March Against Domestic Violence in Milwaukee and to use social media to bring attention to this pressing issue.

THE DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we only have 24 legislative days left in the 113th Congress, yet the Republican majority has failed to pass any meaningful legislation. The last 2 years have been wasted with partisan rhetoric and legislative initiatives that amount to nothing more than talking points. House Republicans have made this the least productive Congress in recent memory.

They have waged a sustained war against low-income citizens by blocking commonsense legislation that would raise the minimum wage and restore emergency unemployment insurance. They continue to oppose efforts to ensure women receive equal pay for equal work. For the first time in the history of our Nation, they are pursuing a frivolous lawsuit against the President at taxpayer expense, and I continue to fume about that lawsuit.

Republicans seem proud that this prestigious body has been labeled the Do-Nothing Congress.

For the past 2 years, Democrats have repeatedly called on the Republicans to tackle a pro-jobs, pro-middle class agenda. Democrats have consistently put forth proposals that would grow jobs, provide workers with a living wage, and fix our broken immigration system. Instead of working with Democrats to bring about the change supported by the majority of Americans, Republicans have refused to act.

Instead, the Republican majority has spent the 113th Congress appealing to the fringes of the Republican Party. They wasted hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars trying to defend the Defense of Marriage Act. They held hearing after hearing after hearing to pursue conspiracy theories about Benghazi at the expense of our Nation's delicate work in a volatile region. And for the first time in the history of our Republic, the Republicans voted to sue the President of the United States for delaying a health care mandate that they themselves have long opposed.

□ 1045

My Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, routinely walk away from key discussions and negotiations, failing to lead, but worse, failing the American people. They have, however, succeeded in making this Republican-controlled House one of the least productive and most divided in our Nation's history.

In the Senate where 60 votes are needed to pass any bill, Republicans have also been successful in blocking important proposals that have the overwhelming support of the American people. As a result, Americans' confidence in Congress has fallen to less than 10 percent.

The American people desperately need their elected representatives to come together to advance policies that benefit our citizens. The American people don't care about Republicans or Democrats. They care about us working to improve their lives, but Republicans insist on driving us further apart.

Instead of doing the work we were elected to do, House Republicans have scheduled another 5-week break beginning in October. I guess obstruction must really be exhausting to all of them.

There is so much work that remains to be done. I pray my Republican colleagues hear me. Now is the time to work the will of the American people. That is what we were sent here to do.

I urge the majority to end this Congress on a high note. Cancel the 5-week break. I am serious. Cancel the 5-week break. I can handle it if you can handle it.

Let's raise the minimum wage, reform our immigration system, and ensure equal pay for equal work. It is what the American people expect and deserve.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the urgent need for 24 States to expand Medicaid for the 5.7 million Americans who fall into the Medicaid gap.

Among those excluded are 435,000 cashiers, 341,000 cooks, and 253,000 nurses' aides. These hardworking Americans should not have to choose between groceries and medicine or between rent and a doctor's visit.

On behalf of all Alabamians, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my colleagues, Representatives BUTTERFIELD and JOHNSON, for heading up the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, of which I am a proud member.

It is painfully unsettling that the 24 States not expanding Medicaid are the very States where the concentration of those living in poverty and without health care is the most acute. The 24 States that have rejected Medicaid expansion are home to over half of the Nation's population, but 68 percent of the poor, uninsured, Blacks, and single mothers. These constituents have the highest burden of illness and costs to our entire health care system.

The 235,000 Alabamians and 5.7 million Americans who fall in the coverage gap are our most vulnerable citizens. About 60 percent of the Nation's uninsured working poor live in these 24 States.

These individuals pay their taxes, they work hard, and they contribute to our community. Our government should support them in return. To not expand Medicaid for these hardworking Americans is reckless disregard for their dramatic needs and their important work that they do in our community.

Expanding Medicaid is not only a moral imperative, but an economic imperative as well. There is not a State in the country that will benefit from its refusal to accept Federal dollars provided to them to expand their Medicaid program.

Alabamians need jobs, and they need health care. Without raising a cent in taxes, my Governor and State leaders can achieve both job creation and health care coverage by expanding Medicaid.

The facts are clear. There is not an economic development investment in Alabama's history that would provide the State with 35,000 new jobs like Medicaid expansion would. Our State leaders cannot be honest with their constituents in arguing that they are interested in economic development while turning down $375 million a quarter.

In the State of Alabama, the income ceiling for Medicaid in its current form for a family of three is $3,560 annually. That is less than $10 a day for a family of three. This is the lowest Medicaid income ceiling in the country. So families that earn a mere $15 a day are left behind when it comes to being able to afford access to affordable health care.

While I understand the political realities in which we operate and in which my Governor operates, I do not understand the shameful neglect of our most vulnerable constituents, our rural hospitals, and our fragile economy that is presented in our State's refusal to accept Medicaid expansion.

Our most sacred responsibility to serve our constituents shall not be examined and instituted through such a dangerous partisan lens. With each day that my State of Alabama delays expansion, more of our constituents are unable to work due to unrelated health conditions.

Americans who are both impoverished and sick should not have to wait one more day while our State leaders play political football with this urgent issue.

This is why I am so proud to stand with my colleagues in the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus today in sending a clear message to our State leaders that enough is enough. We need to expand Medicaid now for every State in the Union.

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 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Cliff Lea, First Baptist Church of Leesburg, Leesburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Living Lord, it is an honor to come and open our hearts before You today. We acknowledge Your greatness and power over us and all things. Thank You for salvation.

It is with our deepest gratitude that we thank You for the privilege of being called Americans. With humility, let us realize the responsibility this privilege entails. Let Your presence in us be the light that causes this Nation to shine bright in the world.

Grant Your favor, wisdom, and protection to our troops here and abroad. Place within our leaders and Representatives, here in the House and the Senate, a desire to make God-honoring decisions. May our President be guided by Your truth. In our differences, let us see You first.

Please give each of us in this place and every citizen of this Nation a contrite heart and willingness to follow Your way.

In Christ's name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SPEECH ON ISIS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS, has been doing what terrorists have done for millennia: decimating villages, persecuting religious minorities, and massacring the innocent, including the brutal public beheadings of two American journalists.

For the past month, as lawmakers and leaders around the country have called for President Obama to outline a plan to respond to this enemy, the President has been vacationing, golfing, and fundraising for partisan allies.

The President initially admitted that he doesn't have a strategy for dealing with ISIS, a brutal group he once compared to a jayvee team. He then indicated his goal was reducing ISIS to a manageable problem.

This won't do.

Tonight, the President addresses the Nation. I hope he uses the opportunity to make a change. I hope he uses his speech to provide a clear strategy. I hope he provides long overdue leadership on this issue. The American people and the world are waiting.

PASSING OF TOM McCORMICK

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mourn the passing and recognize the life of Tom McCormick: loving husband, father, marine, man of great faith, and dedicated public servant to the city of Dublin, California.

Following graduation from high school, he joined the U.S. Marines and served honorably in the Korean war, where he received a Purple Heart.

Tom loved Dublin deeply, serving 17 years as an elected representative for the Dublin-San Ramon Services District, where he pushed, and was one of the first in the State to push, for water recycling systems. We can also thank Tom for his role in helping to create and establish the Dublin Heritage Park.

Tom also had a big heart. In 1975, he and his wife, Claudia, took in some of the last South Vietnamese refugees.

Tom will be missed.

I send my condolences to his wife, Claudia, of 42 years, who also served as a Dublin City Council member; his sons, Marshall and Thomas; and stepchildren, Melinda, Desiree, and Kathy.

HARVEST HOPE ADDRESSES PRESIDENT'S JOB POLICIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last month's jobs report revealed the worst numbers of the year. Millions of Americans are continuing to drop out of the workforce, destroying opportunity. A clear symbol of the President's failure is that 14 million more people are forced to depend on food stamps than when the President took office.

The State's recent article explains families are hurting as a result of the President's failed job policies.

Harvest Hope Food Bank is serving an unexpected increase of needy families. CEO Denise Holland says: ''Every morning when we open up, the lines are waiting for us all the way to the road. The people who are suffering from hunger have not seen an improvement in their financial condition yet.''

House Republicans have passed over 40 job-creation solutions which are blocked in the Senate. The President should change course so we can, together, work for job opportunities.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President's actions should be based on remembering September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

My sympathy to Mayor Rita Crapps and the families of Batesburg-Leesville.

HONORING JOE SCHNEIDER

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to tell the story of a constituent of mine whose life has exemplified the American Dream.

Joe Schneider was born in Kernei, Yugoslavia, in 1929. While his father was off fighting in World War II, Joe led his displaced family on a journey throughout Eastern Europe. As refugees, the war years were extremely challenging, and he eventually lost a leg at the age of 15.

His family was given the opportunity to leave Austria and arrived in the U.S. as immigrants in 1951. Without speaking a word of English, he set out to start working as a tailor. He finally lived his dream when he founded Joe's Tailor Shop at 50. For more than 25 years, his small family business created employment and provided for more than 20 families. As a resident of Hanover Park, Illinois, Joe was known for his commitment to his community.

In 1953, Joe met Katharina Schaeffer, who was also an immigrant from Kernei. They had three children and three grandchildren together. The family was blessed to be able to celebrate Joe and Katharina's 60th wedding anniversary in February.

Unfortunately, Joe passed away recently, but his American Dream and love for his country and his family will live on forever. I send my condolences to his family and especially to Herman, his son, who continues that tradition of the American Dream and is leading manufacturing in our district, adding to the strength of this Nation.

RUSSIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin lives in an alternate reality, one where the state is still all-powerful and can control reality for its citizens.

In the 1930s, Stalin could make people disappear by sending them to the gulags and then erasing any mention of them in state archives. By controlling all information, he could pretend that black was white and up was down.

Today, in Russia, Putin wants to pretend that the Ukrainian insurgency is homegrown, that Russian soldiers on the other side of the border are lost or just volunteers. He wants to pretend that Kiev is controlled by Nazis. His state-owned media dutifully reports these fictions as fact.

The Soviet Union hasn't existed in more than 20 years. It collapsed out of weakness, and Russia remains weak and wholly dependent on energy exports today. Putin can pretend all he wants, but the reality is that he does not have the power of the secretary general or the czars. Let's not let him turn his dreams into reality by abandoning our friends and NATO allies. We must stand up for their freedom and support them more vigorously.

BOKO HARAM

(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, I stand today with my colleagues in remembering the more than 200 girls who were abducted from their school on April 14, 2014. It is hard to imagine the fear, pain and the anguish they have suffered at the hands of the monsters who kidnapped them.

As a father, I understand what these girls' families are feeling. I have not forgotten these girls, and I will continue to work with my colleagues for their safe return and for the elimination of the terrorist group Boko Haram.

The world and mainstream media have mostly moved on from the events in Nigeria, but amid all the horrors that regularly compete for the world's attention, this one should not be forgotten. Among these missing girls are future lawyers, doctors, and teachers, women who could some day lead their country.

I call for my colleagues not to forget these girls and come together to combat Boko Haram, al Qaeda, and ISIL.

COLORADO FLOODS

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of the 1-year anniversary of the horrific floods that hit the State of Colorado 1 year ago.

Starting on September 11, floods ravaged communities and wiped away homes, schools, and businesses. The widespread damage was unlike anything I have seen in my lifetime in Colorado.

As the flooding was happening and in the immediate aftermath, I joined neighbors and leaders to survey many of the damaged areas. We worked together to make sure that we provided the much-needed relief.

In west Longmont, I saw railroad tracks ripped and tangled. I saw vehicles lying upside down and garages filled with mud. I also saw people working in the spirit of community, striving to recover, helping each other.

I couldn't possibly name all of the heroes involved in the flood response and recovery, but I would like to recognize a few:

St. Vrain and Left Hand Water Conservancy District Director Sean Cronin has provided invaluable resources to water districts and ditch companies to help them provide water to communities for agriculture;

John Zadel and Stan Linker of the Central Weld County Water District worked to get water systems for small communities like Frederick and Firestone back in operation;

Local fire districts like Mountain View, Hygiene, Johnstown, and others were on the front lines of flood response.

In the year since the disaster, we have made tremendous progress, but there is a lot more work to be done. Communities in Weld, Morgan, and Logan continue their work today.

With the great resilience of the people of this State, I have no doubt we will come back stronger than ever and continue working together for the good of our great State.

SECOND DISTRICT MANUFACTURING TOUR

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this August work period, I had the pleasure of meeting with businesses and workers across my district as part of my Second District Manufacturing Tour. I was fortunate to witness firsthand the creation of products made in Illinois and had the privilege of hearing from workers about what Congress could be doing to support America's workforce.

The Second District and our Nation is made better by the presence of manufacturers like Smedberg Machine Corporation. They build the parts used in locks and bridges, products we rely on every day.

The future of our economy is made brighter by members of the Kankakee County Chamber of Commerce, whom I met with to discuss economic development, jump-starting the middle class, and the future of American business.

Speaking of America's future, I must acknowledge our national champion, Jackie Robinson West Little League team from the great State of Illinois. They are a shining example of how far hard work and teamwork can get you and what happens when you have the opportunity to pick up a ball, a pen, a book, or a skill.

As we return to business, I urge my colleagues to follow the example of these Little League and business heroes because hard work, teamwork, and innovation make us all better.

Lastly, I salute the heroes of 9/11.

STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIS

(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, this summer America has witnessed the horrific actions of ISIS as it marched into Iraq as part of its mission to create an Islamic state.

As a 29-year Air Force veteran, I know trouble when I see it, and so do the American people. ISIS is a direct threat to America and our democratic way of life. Congress and the American people want, need, and deserve a clearly defined strategy from our President to defeat ISIS—not a strategy to degrade or contain or manage, but a strategy to defeat ISIS.

Tomorrow Americans remember the 13th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. As we remember all those we lost that day, let us also remember the hard lessons those attacks taught us: that we must always be vigilant in protecting the American way of life and all that we hold dear.

□ 1215

THE FCC AND THE NFL

(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 Buffalo Bills. This was apparent yesterday when it was announced Terry and Kim Pegula will be the new team owners. The Pegulas have time and again shown their commitment to western New York through their ownership of the Buffalo Sabres, financing of the new HarborCenter development on Buffalo's Inner Harbor, and now as owners of the Bills, keeping the team in western New York where it belongs.

This is excellent news for the team's future. Still more good news came for football fans yesterday when FCC Chairman Wheeler announced plans to consider repeal of the sports blackout rules at their next meeting.

Commissioner Ajit Pai was recently in Buffalo advocating for the same, and it appears now that momentum is building to return the game to the fans who support their teams and end blackouts once and for all.

The Federal Government certainly should not support such outdated and unfair practices, and I am hopeful that the FCC will end the backing of NFL blackout rules on September 30.

OVERREGULATION

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, over the last few decades, the Federal Government has regulated activities of the American people in increasingly minute detail. It was the Founders' desire to protect our individual liberty by having a government which was energetic in its ability to perform the duties entrusted in it but limited in its scope, a concept incompatible with the current degree of overregulation.

The result is diminished job opportunities and higher costs for the average American. When jobs are lost, when new businesses never open, it is the low-skilled, the young, new worker and those already suffering from chronic unemployment who are harmed the most.

The story of America is the story of someone starting out with nothing and achieving the American Dream. The secret to our success has always been our free and dynamic society that enables everyone to fulfill their unique human potential. It is time for Congress to decide whether it values paperwork or

people. Don't regulate the American Dream out of existence.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, about 5 months ago, we were shocked and disturbed by the news that 200 schoolgirls were kidnapped from their beds in Nigeria by the militant terrorist group Boko Haram. The #bringbackourgirls raised awareness around the world of the plight of these innocent victims.

Boko Haram continues to terrorize families across Nigeria, attacking villages, gunning down civilians, and burning churches. Kidnappings and beheadings have become commonplace. Boko Haram has been responsible for the deaths of more than 900 men, women, and children in the last 3 months. The people of Nigeria are living in a state of fear, and I can't imagine what the kidnapped girls are facing in the months of captivity.

We will not rest until every girl is home and safe.

HONORING LYNNE MOFENSON, M.D.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Lynne Mofenson, M.D., who is retiring after 26 years of service to the Federal Government and is currently the chief of the Maternal and Pediatric Infectious Disease Branch at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

Now, I have a full list of Dr. Mofenson's accomplishments and her prestigious and wonderful resume for the RECORD, but just a couple of points:

Dr. Mofenson received the 2012 Federal Employee of the Year Award from the Partnership for Public Service. The award is one of nine Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals bestowed on public servants who make high-impact contributions to the health, safety, and well-being of Americans. She was recognized for playing a pivotal role in preventing the AIDS epidemic among U.S. children through an effective means of preventing pregnant women from passing HIV on to their infants, and for dedicating her career to conducting research on HIV, which has influenced and informed national HIV policy.

Dr. Mofenson has continued to work with her colleagues in this country and around the globe to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission and to improve the treatments for children with HIV infection. Please join me in honoring the lifelong work of this extraordinary scientist.

BOKO HARAM MUST BE STOPPED

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in June, I joined colleagues on a trip to Nigeria. The focus of the journey was the kidnapping of 270 innocent young girls at the hands of Boko Haram terrorists. It has now been 5 months since they were taken from school and from their families off to unimaginable circumstances.

Since then, Boko Haram has only become more brutal and more vicious, continuing its rampage in Nigerian villages killing, torturing, kidnapping, raping, burning, and announcing the creation of an Islamic state in northeast Nigeria.

Their reign of terror has been overshadowed on the world stage by events elsewhere. Overshadowed but not forgotten, Boko Haram must be stopped, and the girls must be brought home.

RECOGNIZING ARNOLD PALMER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a true American treasure and one of my constituents who still spends his summer months in his native Youngstown, Pennsylvania, Arnold Palmer.

Today, Arnold celebrates his 85th birthday, and he continues to serve as an inspiration to me and the millions who make up ''Arnie's Army.''

Arnold rose from humble beginnings and has achieved remarkable things in his life. Taught the game of golf at the age of 3 by his father, Deacon, who was the golf pro at Latrobe Country Club, Arnold made a name for himself in the amateur ranks. His promising collegiate career was cut short when he enlisted in the Coast Guard in honor of a friend who died. After he fulfilled his military service, Arnold returned to Wake Forest and won the U.S. Amateur Championship in 1954.

Arnold's achievements on the golf course are nothing short of legendary: seven-time major champion; 1960 and 1962 PGA Player of the Year; and 92 overall professional victories.

Perhaps Arnold's most enduring legacy, however, lies in his decades of philanthropic work. Over the years, he has raised millions of dollars for the Latrobe-area hospital for charitable care. He helped to build a 30,000-square-foot cancer center and sponsored construction of a nature preserve for all of Westmoreland County to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call Arnold Palmer a son of western Pennsylvania, as well as my friend, and I ask that all Members wish him a very happy birthday.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the world and mainstream media focuses on other world events, the Boko Haram terrorists continue to bomb, pillage, rape, and behead innocent men, women, and even children in Nigeria. Yesterday, I met with some of the girls who bravely escaped from their captors.

As the girls relived their nightmare, the trauma of this experience was visible on their faces. I reassured them that Congress has not forgotten them and that I will be reintroducing legislation to help safely return their friends and family members and to eradicate Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited Nigeria, a young woman, Abuja, told me that Boko Haram beheaded her husband and put his head on the bed next to her as they raped her.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is using kidnapped girls as suicide bombers. Boko Haram is beheading men, women, and children—let me repeat—and children. They must be stopped.

Tweet today: #bringbackourgirls and #joinrepwilson.

Tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet. Tweet all day, tweet all night, tweet all week, and tweet all month. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, when the President was trying to sell ObamaCare to the people of Montana, we were promised that if we like our health insurance, we can keep it. But millions of Americans, including 38,000 Montanans, were forced out of their health care plans, and President Obama's promise was named the Lie of the Year by PolitiFact.

The promise he made to Montanans should be honored.

The Employee Health Care Protection Act, H.R. 3522, will protect the health care plans of 50 million Americans who get coverage through their employer and provide relief for workers who could see their out-of-pocket costs increase due to ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3522 and help ensure that no more Montanans see their health care costs rise or are forced out of plans that they like and that they chose.

EXPAND MEDICAID NOW

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are finally increasing access to health coverage for millions of Americans, those who need it the most are left without.

Nearly every day, I hear from constituents in my State of Maine who are suffering because they are caught in a political battle over the expansion of Medicaid. These people are our friends and neighbors, and many of them have chronic conditions, injuries, or mental illnesses that prevent them from working. But because they live in States that have chosen not to expand the program, they have been left without any affordable options.

Instead, people are putting off getting health care until their needs are critical. Hospitals and health centers end up picking up the tab, and our economy continues to be strained.

In Maine, almost 70,000 people are struggling without health care because Medicaid hasn't been expanded. I call on Governors across the country, including my own, to think about these people rather than politics when they make decisions about health care in their States and expand Medicaid now.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD LISTEN TO THE VOTERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President should listen to the voters and not grant amnesty to illegal immigrants by executive order. A recent survey by the polling company found that three-quarters of voters want the President to work with Congress to change immigration policies, not act on his own.

This overwhelming opposition to unilateral executive action is bipartisan—93 percent of Republicans, 81 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Democrats want the President to follow the legislative process.

Voters also support immigration policies that put American workers first. Supermajorities from all demographic groups say that Americans who need work should have the opportunity to do the jobs now held by illegal immigrants. They believe that government has a responsibility to protect American workers from competition with illegal workers.

The President should listen to the voters and put the interests of Americans first.

SAFE CLIMATE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to urge this Do-Nothing Congress to acknowledge the dangers and the reality of climate change.

This week we got startling news that once again is falling on deaf ears here in the House of Representatives. The World Meteorological Organization announced that atmospheric carbon levels reached a record high in 2013. And the Audubon Society found that nearly half of all bird species in North America—but, unfortunately, not including the ostrich—are at risk of severe population decline due to climate change. But despite the clear and present danger to the species, the ostrich-like Members of this body have their heads buried in the sand of denial.

We can no longer ignore the science. The time to act is now. I support the President's decision to reduce carbon emissions, and I urge my Republican colleagues to take their heads out of the sand so that together we can address this global threat.

□ 1230

TAYLORVILLE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honor to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to wish my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois, in my home county of Christian County, a happy 175th anniversary.

I was only 7 years old when my parents moved our family to Taylorville, where my mom and dad were opening their very first restaurant. While my family has called Taylorville home for 37 years, I can say what made Taylorville and Christian County a great place to live when we first moved there still makes it a great place to live now.

My parents wouldn't have been able to achieve the American Dream without the support of friends and neighbors in Taylorville and Christian County, and without a doubt, I would not be standing here today if it weren't for the help and friendship of so many people throughout my years in Taylorville and Christian County.

As Taylorville and Christian County prepare to celebrate their 175th anniversary, it is an honor for me to be able to stand here today and offer my congratulations and best wishes.

GETTING BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Congress is back in Washington, and it is time to get to work on the priorities of the American people, but I rise today with serious concerns about the Republican agenda, which has failed to tackle important issues that would grow the economy and strengthen the middle class, such as raising the minimum wage, making education more affordable, and guaranteeing women equal pay for equal work.

Instead of ignoring the challenges facing hardworking Americans, we should be investing in their future and, in so doing, in the future of our great country.

We have a plan that will get the middle class back to work called the Middle Class Jumpstart. This legislative action plan will raise the minimum wage, guarantee women equal pay for equal work, make education more affordable, and invest in rebuilding our country and reinvigorating American manufacturing.

In order to move our country forward and build ladders of opportunity, we have to invest in our greatest asset, hardworking middle class families, and we have to take action now.

HONORING BEAVER COUNTY'S VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America.

I join Beaver County residents and all western Pennsylvanians in thanking them for their service to our Nation, as well as their efforts to bring The Wall that Heals, a traveling Vietnam Memorial, to Beaver County for the second time.

The Wall that Heals is a half-scale replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C. It travels across the country and provides greater access to the memorial for those who may not be able to visit it in our Nation's capital.

At more than 600 members strong, the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America is the largest chapter in Pennsylvania and the third largest chapter in the Nation. Thanks to their efforts, The Wall that Heals will be in Quay Square in Darlington from September 24 through September 28.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of all Vietnam veterans and thanking the members of the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 862, for their hard work in once again bringing The Wall that Heals to Beaver County.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The Ex-Im Bank provides small and large U.S. businesses more job-creating opportunities to sell their products

internationally. By providing loans and financing, the Ex-Im Bank has helped U.S. businesses compete in international markets that has generated over $266 billion in export value.

Since 2007, businesses in California's 16th District in the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent, has helped finance tens of millions of dollars of loans' worth of exports that have created jobs in the Valley. The Export-Import Bank supports American jobs and helps level a playing field in the face of fierce competition that we experience from countries in Asia and around the world.

Rather than kick this can down the road, we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank. This issue has never been a partisan issue and nor should it be so today. We ought to be doing our jobs and working together.

TAX EXTENDERS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for the last month, I have traveled up and down the 25th District of Texas talking with my constituents about their biggest concerns.

They are fed up with Washington's out-of-touch economic policies that are hurting their families and their businesses. Business owners and individuals need certainty when it comes to their money and their taxes. That is why we need to quickly pass a tax extenders bill so business owners can stop playing defense and focus on what they do best, creating jobs.

Since Texas doesn't have a State income tax, Texans need to know if they can continue deducting their sales tax from their Federal income taxes. Business owners need to know if they can continue taking risks and innovating with the R&D credit. Companies need to know that they are not the target of tax bias by extending the bonus depreciation credit permanently.

Ensuring these incentives is just the first step for true comprehensive tax reform, but these are good, sound policies that my constituents want and that our economy needs. Let's give America the certainty they deserve and pass the tax extenders.

And remember the 9/11 victims. In God we trust.

LET'S ADDRESS THE ONGOING CRISIS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support my colleague and good friend, FREDERICA WILSON, in her effort that she has undertaken to #bringbackourgirls, addressing the horror of Boko Haram having extracted these girls from their lives, but we also, in addition to that responsibility, have an exacting responsibility with reference to ongoing circumstances that the President will address tonight.

On August 14, nearly a month ago, I wrote to the President asking him to be mindful of a letter that I include in my remarks to Speaker BOEHNER. What I wrote to Speaker BOEHNER was:

> I respectfully call upon you to bring Congress back into session, so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility to address the ongoing crisis in Iraq. As you know, the situation there is becoming increasingly more complex and continues to defy easy resolution.
>
> There is no doubt that the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, ISIS, will continue to terrorize the people of Iraq, leading to an increase in tens of thousands of Iraqi Christian, Yazidi, and other refugees who have been driven from their homes.

We must ask Congress: exercise our constitutional responsibility.

SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Suicide Prevention Day, which is recognized on September 10. Suicide is a tragedy that touches more of us than most might realize. It is also a great challenge for our military.

In addition to an alarming suicide rate, half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting, according to recent Army studies, and a large percentage had never been deployed in a combat role.

Today, as we draw attention to the issues and prevention strategies that might save just one life or more, I am proud to say the House in May passed bipartisan legislation that would improve the military's approach to suicide detection and prevention.

While currently the Department of Defense does a thorough physical assessment for military recruits, no similar mental health evaluation is performed.

H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, will bring mental health to parity with physical health through the enforcement of a mental health assessment for incoming military recruits.

On Suicide Prevention Day, I am calling on the Senate to pass this important legislation. Our servicemembers deserve as much.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today in Emancipation Hall, the United States Congress and the United States Government honored the fallen heroes of 9/11 with a Congressional Gold Medal ceremony—three gold medals: one to the individuals who died in Shanksville, Pennsylvania; one to the folks who died at the Pentagon; and another to those who died at the World Trade Center. Their names are all in this memorial book, nearly 3,000 innocent victims of radical Islam.

Radical Islam and al Qaeda continues to stay in ISIS. The President will address the Nation tonight about the dangers ISIS presents to the world, to democracy, and to the United States.

I plan to support the President in his request for us to join him militarily, economically, and in other measures to see that ISIS does not hit our homeland, attack democracy, and create a caliphate that will be dangerous to freedom-loving people all over the world.

I attended the National 9/11 Memorial Museum 2 weeks ago. It is stirring. It made me think of the heroes, the firemen, the policemen, the first responders, and the people on that airplane, but it also made me think of the hate of al Qaeda and ISIS.

We must respond. We are America. God bless America.

WE MUST BE EVER VIGILANT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, recent insecurity throughout the world is a reminder that we must be ever vigilant in defending our Nation against those who wish to attack us and destroy our American values.

Tomorrow is the 13th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and once again, we pause to remember the innocent lives lost at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the heroes on Flight 93 in Pennsylvania.

We also pay tribute to the brave men and women who answered the call of duty and have courageously joined the Armed Forces to serve our Nation and fight the global war on terror.

September 11, 2001, changed our great Nation. It awakened us to the ever-present threat by those who wish to attack our country and our citizens, but it also stiffened our resolve and unified our Nation. Immediately after the horrific attacks, we came together as a nation, American spirit running high, and we emerged determined and stronger than ever before.

As we combat today's threats, our American spirit is enduring, and our leadership in the world is the strongest tool we have against terror.

God bless America.

DON'T DENY LGBT VETERANS FEDERAL VA BENEFITS THEY HAVE EARNED

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Republican members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, with one notable exception, voted to deny LGBT veterans the Federal VA benefits they have earned if they happen to live in a State that does not recognize marriage equality.

The Defense Department provides for LGBT soldiers and their families, regardless of where they live, but not the VA. While they are wearing a uniform, they and their families are covered, but once they take it off and become a veteran, too bad. If they live in Florida or Texas or Nevada, too bad.

It doesn't matter that they fought to defend this country, not a particular State. It doesn't matter that the VA and the VSOs support giving them benefits. It doesn't matter how brave they were, how much they sacrificed, or how long and honorably they served, too bad. They get nothing, according to the Republicans.

This is unfair and unjust, and they should be ashamed for lacking the courage to do the right thing by our Nation's heroes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, 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 September 10, 2014 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1934.
That the Senate passed S. 898.
That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 539.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 717 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 717

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-56, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 717 provides for consideration of H.R. 3522, the Employer Health Care Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, equally divided between the majority and minority. One clarifying amendment has been included to clarify that group health plans for the upcoming year can be covered under 2013 plans. The minority is afforded the customary opportunity to offer one motion to recommit, should they so choose. This is a fair rule to allow us to give some relief to Americans who want to keep their health insurance plan but are being told that, because of the Affordable Care Act, they may not.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the President has quickly forgotten some of the promises he made to the American people about this law. In a June 2009 speech before the American Medical Association, President Obama, addressing the house of delegates, said:

> We will keep this promise to the American people. If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

In March of 2010, the President said:

> Your employer, it's estimated, will see premiums fall by as much as 3,000 percent, which means they could give you a raise.

It is obvious that both statements were not only nonoperational, they were completely false. Individuals and businesses have experienced or will face in the future the loss of current health insurance if it does not comply with Affordable Care Act coverage requirements. The Affordable Care Act is, quite simply, a job killer. Employers are reducing hours and limiting pay increases just to keep up with the demands of the law.

Just a few weeks ago, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that over half of employers are changing insurance in response to the Affordable Care Act. These changes aren't being done for the benefit of the employees. All across the country, employees have lost doctors, seen premiums rise, seen hours cut, or had their coverage dropped. This will continue as long as the Affordable Care Act continues with the benefit mandates, burdensome taxes, and unreasonable regulation. In fact, employees are paying more in out-of-pocket costs than ever before. Premiums have skyrocketed under the Affordable Care Act, but access to doctors has narrowed.

Today, H.R. 3522 offers a solution to this problem. This bill would allow employer-sponsored plans that were available at any point in 2013 to continue to be offered. This bill would also help protect both employers offering these plans and their employees enrolled in them from the Affordable Care Act's costly taxes and penalties.

The President recognizes that there are serious flaws in his signature health care law, a law that he championed and, in fact, was written at the White House. Since the law was passed, the President has signed seven bills into law that repealed parts of the Affordable Care Act, bills that passed both the House and the Senate, went to the President for his signature, and he signed them.

In addition to these statutory changes, there have been attempts to fix this broken law through a series of unilateral executive orders and regulations. Can we really expect the same administration that wrote this disastrous law to now fix it?

Last year, the President unilaterally decided to delay the employer mandate. Even the administration doesn't believe that businesses and their employees can handle the burdens imposed by the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 3522 is offering the American people a legal solution to get out from under the crushing demands of the health care law. The law would grandfather in employer plans that existed before the law went into effect. With the passage of this bill before us today, no employee would have to lose their coverage or have their out-of-pocket costs soar because of the Affordable Care Act.

It is clear that H.R. 3522 offers the only feasible lifeline to millions of employees who want to keep their health care plan. It is Congress' job to protect the American people. I urge men and women on both sides of the dais to pass this law so that Americans will have the opportunity to keep their plans and their doctors and reduce their out-of-pocket costs.

To be clear, this bill before us today, if signed into law, will not fix the Affordable Care Act. No piece of legislation, short of a full-fledged repeal, could ever achieve that. The bill we are voting on today serves to stop the hemorrhaging that is occurring as a consequence of this ill-conceived government takeover of the American health care industry. As a physician, I know that sometimes it is important to just stop the hemorrhage if you are going to save the patient. That is what the House of Representatives will do today. I hope all colleagues from both sides of the dais will support this.

I encourage everyone to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill and stand with millions of Americans who are losing their employer health care coverage and access to their doctors, despite what has been promised to them repeatedly by this disastrous law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I am hearing quotes given about what people promised when and what is happening now, and yet under this very rule that we are considering, I fail to see how it is consistent with promises that our current Speaker has made.

On January 5, 2011, our current Speaker, promised:

> You will always have the right to a robust debate and open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives, and to be heard. Furthermore, to my friends in the minority, I offer a commitment: openness.

And yet how ironic is it that this very rule is the 75th closed rule of the 113th Congress?

Now, what does a closed rule mean? A closed rule means that even if Democrats or Republicans have great ideas about how to improve or amend a bill, they are not even allowed to be discussed or voted upon on the floor of the House.

A closed rule means the only say that I or my friends get as Members of Congress is to say ''yes'' or ''no.'' We don't get to improve upon the idea. We don't get to make it work better for our country. We don't get to offer changes that will reduce costs to taxpayers or improve the efficiency of the bill.

We had a commitment from this current Speaker to have an open process, and yet here we have before us the 75th closed rule. This is the diamond jubilee of closed rules that we are celebrating here on the floor of the House today with this 75th closed rule that doesn't allow my Democratic or Republican colleagues to bring forth simple, commonsense ideas to improve the bill before us and make it work for our country.

In addition to the diamond jubilee of closed rules, we also have the 53rd attempted repeal of ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act. Now, we get that. Our friends on the other side want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We have heard that. This is the 53rd time we have heard that.

Whenever our colleagues on the other side are serious about rolling up their sleeves and working in a bipartisan way to improve the Affordable Care Act, to make it work better for our country, to increase competition, to reduce costs, we are happy to have that discussion.

I myself am the sponsor of several bills to change the Affordable Care Act, as are many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but instead of having that discussion, we are having the 53rd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act under the 75th closed rule of the current Congress. I think the American people are learning no longer to be surprised by these kinds of maneuvers. We wonder why the approval of rating Congress is at a record low of 12 percent.

There was a commitment from our Speaker to allow us to represent our constituents, to allow us to make our case, to allow us to offer alternatives. We are going to do that under the previous question. We are going to do that under the motion to recommit. But in terms of actually being able to amend this bill, the process has been closed, not only from my fellow Democrats, but from the many fine Republicans who have ideas to make this bill better and make health care more affordable.

This Congress deserves better, and I know that we can do better.

I know that under this rule, my colleague, Mr. BURGESS, managed to have his amendment included. They use a self-executed amendment in the rule. That means that by passing this rule there is a special amendment that actually becomes part of the bill. We don't even have the opportunity to debate the merits of that amendment, whatever they are, but any other ideas from Democrats or Republicans are closed down for the 75th time. They are not even able to bring them forward.

My colleagues have a lot of ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act. I am the sponsor of a number of bills. Rather than bringing forth the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act, let's move forward. The country is ready to go. Let's make sure that Americans that have used the health care marketplace to enroll in affordable, high-quality health care are able to continue doing so. Let's make sure we improve the Affordable Care Act rather than end it.

Instead of rolling back protections that benefit millions of Americans, let's get back to work on the issues that matter, like reducing costs in health care, like fixing our broken immigration, like raising the minimum wage and making sure that we can get our economy going with an infrastructure investment.

For instance, on immigration reform alone, this body's failure to act continues to cost taxpayers money every day. There is a bill that passed the Senate with more than a two-thirds majority. That is not easy to do over there. If that bill were simply allowed to come to a vote in the open process that the Speaker promised and allow us to vote for our constituents, I think it would pass.

We have a bipartisan bill in the House called H.R. 15. It is a version of the Senate bill. We can bring that bill forward under a rule. Let's do it. It will pass tomorrow and address our broken immigration system and save taxpayers over $200 billion over 10 years, create hundreds of thousands of jobs for Americans, secure our borders, and make sure that the rule of law in our country is restored. The longer we put that off, the worse that issue becomes and the harder it will be to address.

Again, while this bill is an anniversary of sorts—the diamond jubilee of closed bills and the 53rd attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it doesn't offer anything new to the American people, and it doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans who have thoughtful ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act to bring them forward at all to be discussed on their merits or voted on here in this body.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Again, Mr. POLIS, I think, very powerfully stated how this majority once again is denying a free and open amendment process, or even a limited amendment process, with this totalitarian version of debate.

I also want to speak in opposition to the underlying bill. We heard a lot about skyrocketing premiums. I come from a State where a Governor actually embraced the Affordable Care Act. What we saw just a few days ago, with the new premiums that are released for 2015, was reported on by Kaiser Family Foundation, which is the gold standard for health care reporting in this country, is that the State of Connecticut is actually going to see a 4 percent reduction in the plans sold through the Affordable Care Act exchange. My friend from Colorado is one of the real lucky States. They are looking at a 15 percent reduction in terms of their silver plans that are sold through the exchange.

Again, this chart which we have prepared for today shows that, rather than skyrocketing premiums, what we are seeing in State after State after State in terms of premiums for next year is that there are either reductions or very modest increases.

The bill that we are going to be voting on later today would actually damage the progress that is being made in a lot of these States because it basically expands plans that protect discriminating against people with preexisting conditions, which was, sadly,

what the insurance market looked like before the Affordable Care Act was passed. It, again, allows cherry-picking plans that picked healthier populations as opposed to what we are seeing with the plans that have been implemented and now are high-functioning.

□ 1300

256,000 people enrolled through the exchange in the State of Connecticut last year, far shattering all the projections that HHS had set forth, because we had a high-functioning Web site—kudos to Governor Malloy—but also because people voted with their feet; that when they actually got the facts and had a chance to look at the coverage that was being offered and the price that it was going to cost, they, again, shattered all the projections. And we are poised to move forward again next year.

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

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to yield an additional 45 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. In the small group market, what we are seeing is that since the enrollment ended for the individual market, the shop exchange, as the small market is called, tripled in terms of small businesses in the State of Connecticut that enrolled, with protections so that people with preexisting conditions, who are born with diabetes, or arthritis, are not going to be shut out of the market, which these old plans that the Cassidy bill seeks to enshrine and enlarge did under the provisions of that legislation.

We, as Mr. POLIS said, need to roll up our sleeves and talk about ways that we can improve the law. This is a huge, terrible step backwards, which, for all these States which are seeing rate reductions for 2015, would be lost.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting recitation.

I wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to Bloomberg View and an article by Megan McArdle from September 9 of 2014, just a couple of paragraphs in the article that prices—talking about reissue rates—that prices are not being based on claims data. She points out, and I am quoting here: ''Companies began setting these rates just a few months ago after open enrollment closed, and because so many people bought in the last few weeks, they had no meaningful idea of what their expenses would be, that is, the insurance companies.''

And, further quoting: ''The companies that are coming in are looking to gain market share, not make a profit.''

Continuing to quote: ''The other reason we cannot learn much from these data right now is that for the next year, insurers are operating under the expectation of large subsidies from the Obama administration via the various reinsurance provisions in ObamaCare. These provisions expire in 2016.''

Continuing to quote: ''Right now, it is just not very risky to write a policy that loses money because your losses are capped. Starting in 2017, all that changes. Insurers are going to need to price policies with the expectation of making money and the fear of losing it.''

Mr. Speaker, what Megan McArdle is saying is, right now you don't really know much about the renewal rates on insurance policies because there is distortion in the market because of the reinsurance provisions in the Affordable Care Act.

But I will share this with you. I bought insurance in the Texas Federal fallback exchange. I bought a bronze plan on Blue Cross/Blue Shield. It is the most expensive insurance I have ever had in my life. Trying to plan and trying to budget for next year, I can't because here we sit, September 10, and I do not know what the renewal rates are going to be. And in all likelihood I will not know until around election day, with very little time to plan.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up two pieces of legislation. The first is the Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2014, and the second is a constitutional amendment to address the issues surrounding Citizens United.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

I rise to urge the defeat of the motion on ordering the previous question on this rule.

Most Americans would be outraged to see the 113th Congress, on track to be the most unproductive Congress in this Nation's history, return from a 5-week recess, only to waste more time. Yet, that is what is happening today with the GOP's 53rd attack on the Affordable Care Act.

We could be doing so much more. We could stand up against special interests and advance the American people's priorities.

We could raise the minimum wage to prevent big corporations from paying workers starvation wages.

We could stand up to the gun lobby and pass background checks to stop criminals from buying guns online.

We could stand up to companies that use fancy corporate inversions to skirt their responsibility to pay taxes towards American infrastructure, American schools, and American research.

Yet, these priorities will just as surely go ignored this 113th Congress as they did in the 112th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that we are not dealing with the people's business today. Since the 2010 Supreme Court decision in Citizens United, Congress has become mired in dysfunction. The people's House is now paralyzed by the threat of attacks from corporations and a handful of billionaires with their Super PACs and their secret front groups.

When Members spend more time fundraising and dodging Super PAC attack ads than working on bipartisan solutions and championing their constituents' priorities, our democracy is dysfunctional. And that dysfunction is a form of corruption. It is money from the left and the right, and it is only getting worse.

This year, the Supreme Court ruled 5–4 in McCutcheon that the wealthy have a right to hold more influence over elected officials than actual voters. This idea threatens our entire system of elected self-government, and we have an opportunity to take action today.

I urge my colleagues to do the courageous thing, to do the right thing. Join me to support the Democracy for All Amendment, H.J. Res. 119, to amend our Constitution and overturn these destructive Supreme Court rulings.

In the Senate this week, our colleagues are considering Senator UDALL's companion to my constitutional amendment. And while the Senate has this important debate about money and politics, this House is rehashing tired old attacks on ObamaCare that everyone is sick of.

The Democracy for All Amendment is simple. It says that the American people have a right to pass laws protecting the integrity of our elections by limiting money and politics.

It is time to get money out and voters in and end this ''pay-to-play'' democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion ordering the previous question, to allow consideration of the Democracy for All Amendment to overturn Citizens United, and allow the American people, and not the special interests, to once again set the agenda in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Bill of Rights guarantees free speech, but free speech is not free if only the wealthy can afford it.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) certainly convinced me. I hope he convinced you as well that, rather than repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time, let's take this body back from the special interests and return it to the people of this country. And his motion will do that if we defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss the other proposal if we defeat the previous question, I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge we defeat the previous question for two reasons, and I want to speak to one of them.

Right now, corporations can move their tax address overseas and avoid or

lower their U.S. taxes. Middle class and other typical families cannot do that at all. They can't simply change their address and lower or eliminate their taxes.

Since the beginning of this year, more than a dozen large corporations have announced their plans for inversion. And yet, they will continue to benefit from being headquartered in our country, taking advantage of everything this country has to offer, whether it is our wealth of educated workers, government funding of basic research, tax credits like R&D, or our robust financial markets.

They will pay less in U.S. taxes, so much that the American tax base is expected to lose $20 billion over the next 10 years if we do nothing to address the issue.

And who will make up this difference? Basically, middle class taxpayers.

The Republican answer? To do nothing, leave town next week, or, some say, to wait for tax reform at some undetermined time.

Republicans are taking the President to court for use of executive authority, his executive authority. At the same time, Republicans in this House fail to use their own authority, failing to do their job.

Addressing this issue cannot wait. This is an immediate problem that requires an immediate legislative solution. Voting ''no'' on the previous question provides all of us an opportunity to do just that and will allow us to bring up legislation to address this problem.

If you vote to move the previous question, essentially you are saying, I rubberstamp this inversion process where corporations essentially move their address and lower or eliminate their taxes. No one should be doing that.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote ''no'' on the previous question as well so we can allow consideration of the Democracy for All constitutional amendment, which would allow us to put some reasonable limits on this outside spending, these huge expenditures of funds by Super PACs and outside groups that are crowding out the voices of everyday citizens.

When I go around my district, when I talk to people, the average person feels like their voice can't be heard. When they go into the political town square to try to make their views known, there is a megaphone being held by these Super PACs and these outside groups that is drowning out the voice of everyday citizens, so that their opinions, their perspective can't be heard.

If you go to a town meeting, usually, the way they organize it is you sign up and everybody gets a chance to talk for 5 minutes. The way the system is headed with these Super PACs, because there are no limits on the amount of speech they can buy, if you go down to the town hall meeting now, in a sense, you get there and you find out that some Super PAC has reserved 59 minutes out of the hour of time for talking on the issues, and everyday citizens only have 1 minute left.

That is why we need some reasonable limits, because the big money is taking over the microphone, and they are not letting anybody else have their opinions heard.

A constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All constitutional amendment—I want to salute my colleague, TED DEUTCH of Florida for leading the effort on this—would put reasonable limits in place so that everybody can have a voice, so that everybody can participate in a pluralistic democratic society where all voices are heard.

I urge that we vote ''no'' on ordering the previous question to allow consideration of this important constitutional amendment to give a voice back to everyday citizens out there in our country.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question and to urge support of the Democracy for All Amendment that we intend to offer if the question is defeated.

The last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people. The Supreme Court decisions in Citizens United and McCutcheon have opened the floodgates of unlimited spending on campaigns.

Protections against special-interest influence on our elections have steadily eroded, along with public confidence in government. The result is campaigns dominated not by ideas, thoughtful debates, or visions for the future, but by television ads, mostly negative and mostly funded by unaccountable outside groups.

In my State of Kentucky, MITCH MCCONNELL and his special interest allies have spent more than $8 million, running nearly 26,000 TV ads in our Commonwealth. The vast majority are from outside groups attacking Mr. MCCONNELL's opponents. Many bend the truth and intentionally mislead Kentuckians, which is a lot easier to get away with if the attacker isn't accountable to voters.

Under our current political system, these groups are allowed massive influence over our campaigns, much more than any average citizen or group of citizens could ever exert.

It is system riddled with loopholes, lacking meaningful disclosure, and more awash in corporate influence than ever.

□ 1315

In Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL's race is expected to cost $100 million. That would pay the annual salaries of about 2,000 public schoolteachers in our Commonwealth. While Senator MCCONNELL and other supporters of the Citizens United decision call this ''freedom of speech,'' it is actually the freedom to deceive. To be fair, dishonest ads are coming from both sides by both parties. These are ads made possible by Citizens United, and if The Washington Post Fact Checker actually had to present real Pinocchios for all of the dishonest ads made possible by Citizens United, Geppetto would be the busiest man in America.

That is why we need to pass the Democracy for All amendment—to put a stop to this runaway special interest spending on campaigns and to return Congress to the people it was meant to serve.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of defeating the motion on ordering the previous question.

The GOP has put forward H.R. 3522, which would undermine the Affordable Care Act by putting insurance companies back in charge of health care for everyday Americans. That is right. I mean, it is not a surprise, putting corporate special interests ahead of the interests of the American people. Instead, they are now taking the 53rd vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We could be enacting a commonsense constitutional amendment, as my colleagues have said, that would better serve the people's interests. The Democracy for All constitutional amendment seeks to address the failure of our current political system, where the megaphones of moneyed interests are now drowning out the voices of ordinary Americans.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in 2010 of Citizens United, which struck down the limits on independent campaign spending by corporations, we have actually seen those with deep pockets threaten our democracy, spending unlimited, hidden amounts on our elections, and it gets worse with each passing election.

Two years ago, outside groups, including more than 1,200 so-called Super PACs, spent $970 million on our elections. That is nearly $1 billion in secret, dark money. It is not fair, and the American people know it. $123 million of anonymous cash was also spent. Overall, spending totaled nearly $7 billion.

Earlier this year, another Supreme Court decision struck down decades-old caps on the total amount that any one individual can contribute to Federal

candidates in a 2-year cycle. Now those individuals—and there are only a handful of them across the United States—can contribute unlimited amounts from their own pockets into elections. The result has only increased the role that money plays in American politics.

Recent reports show that undisclosed political spending, better known as ''dark money,'' will, once again, reach record levels in this November's election.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Recently, the Center for Responsive Politics announced that dark money has already exceeded $50 million—seven times the amount that was accrued at this time in the last midterm election.

Justice Breyer wrote in this last Supreme Court decision: ''Where enough money calls the tune, the general public will not be heard.''

We are not being heard, and that is exactly the position that we find ourselves in today because, as the Republican House votes to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time since its enactment, they have given us a choice. The Republicans want us to choose corporate insurance special interests, or we can choose the interests of the American people by passing a constitutional amendment that would restore democracy, government, and our elections back to the people of the United States.

It is time that we pass this constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to let us begin to address the interests of the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I just want to address the issue of the insurance companies.

They have never enjoyed the type of unprecedented power that they have today until the passage of the Affordable Care Act. The insurance companies—executives from the insurance companies—meet regularly down at the White House with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We are not privy to those discussions. We have no earthly idea what goes on in those meetings, but we do know that insurance companies are enjoying unprecedented profits right now since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Their profits have increased. Their stock prices have increased.

Why is that? It is because of the individual mandate that was included in the Affordable Care Act.

No longer do insurance companies need to be interested in the longitudinal relationships with their insureds. You have got to buy what they are selling. Don't even get me started on their own narrow networks, which can restrict patients' abilities to see a doctor or to go to a hospital, to see who they want, to buy the medications that they need or to be reimbursed for the medications that they need. A lot of that has gone out the window. Talk about people with preexisting conditions. Most of us buy on price. Since we buy the lowest-cost price on the Bronze plan, we find ourselves now confined by narrow networks.

Who is really now prejudiced against a person with a preexisting condition under the current arrangement?

This bill today does not undo the Affordable Care Act, but it provides one more little measure of sanity for patients who wanted to keep their insurance policies before this regime took over.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously important topic because this Congress, unfortunately, and our government are affected so much by political contributions. Because of Baker v. Carr, ''one man, one vote'' exists, but that one vote is not equal to the voice of corporations or individuals with unlimited amounts of money. The fact is those people, those corporations, have gotten more of a voice than any one person's vote.

Most Members of Congress spend a great deal of time raising money when they should be studying issues, listening to debate, participating in debate, listening to constituents. The amount of money that is in this system and determines who comes into this body is beyond anything the Framers of the Constitution ever imagined. The amendment that we offer would allow the Congress to put limits on the amount of money that can come into the system. It promotes the idea of everybody being equal, of ''one man, one vote'' and our representing people equally. It simply gives Congress the power to set limits.

I don't know why anybody in this Congress would object to giving Congress the power to set limits on corporate spending involving campaigns, which takes away the fundamental aspect of democracy that each person is considered to have a voice and one's perspectives presented on this floor in equal opportunity with those who are the most wealthy. There is nothing that affects this House in a more adverse way than money. This amendment can help this House be more representative of the great democracy that we represent and intend to represent and make it the democracy that it is supposed to be. It simply gives Congress that power.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. I would urge this amendment to be considered and to be voted on in order to uphold the idea that each individual and his position is sacred and equal, that money is taken out of the system in the best possible ways, and that corporations don't continue to have the extraordinary influence they have had on this body.

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

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

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3522.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

While the title of this legislation and those supporting it claim that it will protect employees, in fact, it will prevent millions of Americans from accessing the consumer protections and important reforms included in the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

H.R. 3522 would permit any health insurance issuer offering coverage in the group market in 2013 to continue to offer that coverage through 2018. These insurance policies would not have to comply with the consumer protections that went into effect in 2014.

This bill is different—and much worse—than the Administration's grandfathering policy. It means that insurance companies would be able to cherry pick, offering low rates for inadequate bare-bones policies for some groups but discriminate against, charge higher prices, or offer weaker coverage for others.

The bill would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat. If this became law, insurers will be able to continue to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children has pre-existing health conditions. And small businesses will face higher premiums and continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee has an accident, develops a chronic health condition, or has a complicated pregnancy.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, businesses have added nearly 10 million jobs and in just the past few months, more than 10 million people who were previously uninsured have gained health insurance coverage. Premiums have risen at historically low levels, and the life of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 13 years.

We have come far in the effort to stop the worst abuses of the insurance industry and provide Americans with true coverage that protects them from bankruptcy, annual and life-time limits, discrimination, and from being dropped from their plans when they need them the most. Rolling back critical reforms and returning to a broken system is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and work together to improve the law for all Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers. We are prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. No, I have no additional speakers. I am prepared to close.

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

Instead of focusing on rolling back protections for the benefits of millions of Americans for the 53rd time, this House should get back to the work of focusing on real problems, like the need to overhaul our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our country. Instead of solving immigration problems that are facing our Nation, the House continues to vote on bills that take our country backwards.

Before we left for recess 5 weeks ago, the House voted to deny DREAMers the ability to stay here, and they subjected them to deportation proceedings. This body's continued failure to act on comprehensive immigration reform means that the President must act instead. For more than a year, I have come to the House floor to decry the fact that the House Republicans have failed to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress—or any bills to secure our border, any bills to provide provisional work permits, any bills to require workplace authentication. Not a single one has been brought to the floor of the House.

I am deeply disappointed that the President has put off taking action on this bill until after the November elections, but the President will have no alternative if this Congress continues to fail to act. Sadly, over the next 2 months, the current administration will continue to deport tens of thousands of hardworking mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers because of the lack of courage of this body to act and because the President continues to refuse to act with the authority that is already granted to him by the nature of his office.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to act right now means he will go big and bold tomorrow, but the truth is the President can't do it all alone. He needs Congress. If we are serious about securing the border, it will take an appropriation—it will take resources—from this body to secure the border. I am confident the President will do whatever he can with the money and resources he has to do it, but if this body is serious, we need to require the President to secure the border and make sure the President has the resources to do that. I am hopeful the President will use his powers to reform our antiquated visa program, which restricts an employer's ability to hire key talent and only provides an additional incentive for companies to move overseas so that they can hire the people they need.

These are issues that the President can and should address now, not just when it is politically convenient. Unite families, make America more competitive, and challenge Congress to get immigration reform done.

Of course, any relief the President provides would be just a temporary fix. Only this body can find a permanent solution by rewriting our immigration laws to restore the rule of law with regard to the 11 million people who are here illegally, to reform our visa and green card systems going forward, to secure our borders, to ensure workplace enforcement, and to make sure that we can facilitate legal commerce between Mexico and the United States.

But once again, rather than addressing the issue that came up the most of any issue in my 10 town halls—immigration reform—we are faced with the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the 75th closed rule—the diamond jubilee of closed rules—that doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans to offer a single amendment to this bill. Amendments that are germane, that improve the Affordable Care Act, that have bipartisan consensus support are not even allowed to be brought forward and are not even discussed for 10 minutes on the floor of this House of Representatives.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In 2006, the Democrat manifesto, ''A New Direction for America,'' states:

> Bills should come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

The fact remains that, when the Democrats took control of the House, they did precisely the opposite.

Throughout the 111th Congress, which was the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI'S time as Speaker and which was the first 2 years of the Obama administration, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process. Under Republican control, the House has returned to the consideration of appropriations bills under an open process with 22 open rules.

□ 1330

This year, the House has considered 404 amendments, 189 of which were offered by the Democrats. When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis will show that the Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives.

One word on the previous question: defeat of the previous question would not allow any of these proposals that we have heard about today to be considered because they would not be germane to the rule, so I do urge my colleagues to support the previous question.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect millions of Americans who are facing the loss of their employer-sponsored health insurance and that they were promised—a promise is a promise—they were promised they could keep.

I certainly thank my colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his thoughtful piece of legislation and his work in this effort.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 717 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 joint resolution, 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 joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H. J. Res. 119, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4679) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 119 or H.R. 4679.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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. 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 TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 276) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 276

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR.

Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12423, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice and in accordance with the procedures of the Commission under that section, reinstate the license and extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of project works to the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 276 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license and extend for 3 years the deadline for commencement of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir. Hydropower is a critical component of our all-of-the-above energy strategy, and this bill will help facilitate the construction of an affordable and reliable source of domestic electricity.

As many people around the country understand, many Members of the House and Senate have very strong differing views with the President and his administration over the direction that we are going on energy in America, particularly the impact that regulations are having on the electric generation system in America.

It looks like it is going to be creating a lot of chaos, but when we have projects like this hydro project at American Falls Reservoir, I think there is unanimous agreement that we need to move forward expeditiously on these types of projects.

This bill has passed the U.S. Senate, and I would urge all Members of the House to support it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support the American Falls Reservoir hydropower legislation, introduced by Senators RISCH and CRAPO of Idaho. The bill would authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license for a hydroelectric project involving Idaho's American Falls Reservoir, and it gives the project 3 additional years by which to begin construction.

This bill allows FERC to get this project licensed expeditiously while ensuring that the appropriate environmental analyses are completed and considered.

The noncontroversial legislation before us today has passed the Senate by unanimous consent in two consecutive Congresses.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I also urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 276.

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. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EPS SERVICE PARTS ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5057) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5057

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 ''EPS Service Parts Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXEMPT SUPPLIES.

Section 325(u) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) EXEMPT SUPPLIES.—

''(A) FEBRUARY 10, 2014, RULE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An external power supply shall not be subject to the final rule entitled 'Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for External Power Supplies', published at 79 Fed. Reg. 7845 (February 10, 2014), if the external power supply—

''(I) is manufactured during the period beginning on February 10, 2016, and ending on February 10, 2020;

''(II) is marked in accordance with the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016;

''(III) meets, where applicable, the standards under paragraph (3)(A), and has been certified to the Secretary as meeting International Efficiency Level IV or higher of the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016; and

''(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

''(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

''(bb) was manufactured before February 10, 2016.

''(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of products exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that fall below International Efficiency Level VI.

''(iii) LIMITATION OF EXEMPTION.—The Secretary may issue a rule, after providing public notice and opportunity for public comment, to limit the applicability of the exemption established under clause (i) if the Secretary determines that the exemption is resulting in a significant reduction of the energy savings that would otherwise result from the final rule described in such clause.

''(B) AMENDED STANDARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may exempt an external power supply from any amended standard under this subsection if the external power supply—

''(I) is manufactured within four years of the compliance date of the amended standard;

''(II) complies with applicable marking requirements adopted by the Secretary prior to the amendment;

''(III) meets the standards that were in effect prior to the amendment; and

''(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

''(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

''(bb) was manufactured before the compliance date of the amended standard.

''(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of a product exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that do not meet the amended standard.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), who is an important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman WHITFIELD for his leadership on the Energy and Power Subcommittee, and I certainly appreciate the work you have done on energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the EPS Service Parts Act of 2014. This bill simply seeks to achieve congressional intent of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 regarding exemptions for certain service parts.

I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congressman TONKO, for working with me on this legislation, and I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for bringing this bill to the floor.

In the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, Congress recognized the need for manufacturers to continue to produce and distribute service and spare parts to be used with older out-of-production products that didn't comply with the new energy efficiency regulations produced by the 2007 bill.

The most common forms of EPS products are laptops, desktops, tablets, printers, and network products—products we use every day. Congress anticipated issues surrounding older service parts. The 2007 bill provided that from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2015, the energy standards would not apply to EPS made available as service or spare parts for end use products manufactured before July 1, 2008.

The reason for this legislation is to make a technical correction to provide explicit authority to the Department of Energy to create a similar exemption when the Department of Energy updated their EPS efficiency standards.

The existing language in the 2007 bill, according to DOE, has the opposite effect. It actually prevents DOE from extending this needed exemption in its February 2014 rulemaking on EPS efficiency standards.

The EPS Service Parts Act is in line with the original intent of the 2007 energy bill. It allows for continued production and distribution of replacement EPS for use with equipment manufactured before February 10, 2016, the effective date of the new DOE efficiency standards.

By passing this legislation, the bill will benefit both U.S. consumers and manufacturers. It will allow manufacturers such as Dell or Hewlett-Packard to maintain and distribute supplies of replacement parts for older equipment. It will also allow for warranty and contract compliance by these manufacturers.

Without this legislation, manufacturers would be required to redesign and qualify service on spare EPS parts at significant expense solely to support products that are no longer in production.

Manufacturers would also be forced to destroy existing inventories. Again, they would have to be destroyed—existing inventories—that were intended to support service and spare parts.

Also, in addition to meeting energy efficiency standards, the redesigned EPS parts would also need to be recertified to all the applicable safety, efficiency, and other environmental specifications.

Because of the low volume of services and spare parts, this would be a very costly and job-costing undertaking for manufacturers. Companies have estimated increased costs in the millions of dollars with no corresponding benefit to energy savings or the consumer.

This bill has the support of the Information Technology Industry Council, the Alliance to Save Energy, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, the Consumer Electronics Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The bill saves money and avoids a regulatory overreach not intended by, but accidentally instigated by a previous Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the bill.

Again, thank you to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5057, the External Power Supply Service Parts Act of 2014.

I thank my colleague Representative GARDNER and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their cooperation and support in bringing this measure to the floor.

External power supplies have become regular fixtures in homes and workplaces around the world as we have expanded our use of rechargeable batteries to power the many electronic products we use every day. Because these products are so common, lowering their power consumption translates into substantial energy savings for consumers and savings for businesses.

Earlier this year, the Department of Energy finalized a rule to strengthen the energy efficiency standards for these products. I support that rule.

H.R. 5057 is not intended to undermine the new standard. H.R. 5057 simply creates a short-term targeted exemption to enable a smooth and orderly transition to the new standard for both manufacturers and for the current owners of equipment purchased prior to the adoption of the new standard.

This narrow exemption enables manufacturers to continue to provide service and replacement parts for existing equipment. It allows owners of equipment to keep it functioning for the full intended life of that given product.

The bill ensures the exemption included in this legislation will not result in a significant delay in reaching the new energy efficiency targets for EPS equipment.

The bill provides DOE with the authority to establish a reporting requirement to track the number of parts that are shipped and of those that do not meet the efficiency standard.

If the Department finds that this exemption is undermining the energy savings that are projected under the new efficiency regulations, the Secretary can issue a rule to limit or rescind the exemption.

H.R. 5057 strikes an appropriate balance, I believe, that keeps us moving forward on efficiency goals for external power supplies while providing manufacturers and owners of current products the assurance that service and spare parts will be available.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Representative GARDNER, for working with me and working with our colleagues on this bill.

I urge all Members to support the legislation, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER for being the cosponsors of this legislation and thank Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. UPTON for working with all of us to bring it to the floor, as well as the staffs on both sides of the aisle.

As both Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER stated, this bill is a technical correction to existing law that will allow external power supply manufacturers to continue to sell service parts compatible with older technology to the benefit of consumers and manufacturers. It is a good piece of legislation.

I would urge all the Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5057, as amended.

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. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

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 717;

Adoption of House Resolution 717, if ordered;

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2678, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4751, if ordered.

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.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 717) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, 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 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

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
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
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)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
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
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)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Roskam
Rush
Tierney
Yoho

□ 1534

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. OWENS and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—233

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
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
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Rush
Schrader
Tierney
Walz
Waxman
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1542

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 490 and 491. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 490—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 491—Adoption of H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, I, along with other leaders, committee chairs, and ranking members, received a classified briefing from the administration regarding a significant piece of the President's strategy to confront the international terrorist organization known as ISIL.

This piece involves a request for additional authority to be included in the continuing resolution. Tonight the country will hear from the President of the United States as he addresses the Nation on this situation.

Additionally, all Members of the House will receive a classified briefing from the administration tomorrow morning on both the threat and the strategy to confront it.

I think I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that we stand ready to listen and work with the President to confront this growing threat.

Now, given the severity of the situation and the need for all Members to properly evaluate the President's request, the House will postpone consideration of the continuing resolution which was originally scheduled for tomorrow.

However, votes on other measures will still take place tomorrow after the classified briefing, and all Members are encouraged to be in attendance.

LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2678) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the ''Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 422, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—422

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
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
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
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
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
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
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—2

Massie
Rigell

NOT VOTING—7

DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Rush
Tierney
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1551

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 110–229

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4751) to make technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 422, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—422

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
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
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
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
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
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
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
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
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Dingell
Gallego
Latham
Nunnelee
Perry
Rush
Tierney
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1559

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493 I was temporarily off the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 717, I call up the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–56, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–584, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3522

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 ''Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. IF YOU LIKE YOUR GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN, YOU CAN KEEP IT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including any amendment made by such Act or by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010), a health insurance issuer that has in effect health insurance coverage in the group market on any date during 2013 may after such date offer such coverage for sale through December 31, 2018, in such market outside of an Exchange established under section 1311 or 1321 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18031, 18041). A group health plan shall not be treated as not complying with the requirements of such Act (or the amendments made by such Acts) insofar as it provides health benefits through health insurance coverage that is permitted under the previous sentence.

(b) TREATMENT AS GRANDFATHERED HEALTH PLAN IN SATISFACTION OF MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—Health insurance coverage described in subsection (a) shall be treated as a grandfathered health plan for purposes of the amendment made by section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of States with respect to the regulation of health insurance coverage in the group market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. 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 H.R. 3522.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014, sponsored by my good friend and colleague and important member of the Health Subcommittee, Dr. BILL CASSIDY of Louisiana.

This bill is a necessary tool for America's workers that will allow for health insurance coverage in the small group market during the 2013 calendar

year to be continued to be offered through calendar year 2018. In other words, if you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it.

It has been over 4 years since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, and we are still hearing from constituents, small business owners, and employees who are continuing to struggle with the adverse effects of this law.

Here is what Roger from Columbia, Pennsylvania, wrote to me last year:

I am the third generation family owner of a business. We have 32 employees and have been providing health insurance for our employees and their families for over 25 years. This week, we received a renewal notice from our current provider, which is a 40 to 50 percent higher premium than our current contract, with less overall benefit coverage. If we choose to renew early, before the ACA takes effect, our premiums will increase 11.4 percent. Our President told us that the ACA would decrease health insurance costs.

My constituents—businesses, as well as individuals—have bitterly conveyed to me the myriad of concerns they face.

Eastern Lancaster County School District announced it would ''outsource'' about 100 of its support staff workers to private companies to avoid possible penalties under ObamaCare.

In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, the community college decided to cut hours for 400 adjunct faculty and other employees, so it wouldn't have to pay $6 million in ObamaCare-related fees.

From Auntie Anne's franchises, I have been told they have put their growth plans on hold, hiring has been pushed off, and they may no longer be able to afford to provide employee insurance coverage. In 2012, they experienced a 19 percent increase in insurance premiums and a 30 percent increase in 2013.

Here is what Tom and Rosemarie had to say from Lititz, Pennsylvania:

I have been crunching numbers to prepare for ObamaCare, and this is what I face: close my doors December 31, 2014 . . . or . . . pay $40,000 a year to insure my employees or ''pay'' a fine of $2,000 per employee per year over the first 30, at the price of $166 per month per employee over the first 30. So now, the 10 that have insurance, as well as my husband and I, will no longer be insured because the penalty is more affordable than to cover . . . this is ridiculous. I am outraged.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this. We can enact patient-centered free market reforms, where private insurers engage in robust competition and create the same kind of market-based inducements to reduce prices and improve services that occurs in most other parts of the American economy.

We can start by enacting H.R. 3522. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. American workers who like their health care plan should be able to keep it, just like President Obama and the supporters of the Affordable Care Act promised.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing concerning H.R. 3522, the ''Employee Health Care Protection Act,'' which is scheduled for floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code requires individuals to maintain minimum essential coverage or pay a penalty. Section 2(b) of H.R. 3522, both as reported out of your Committee and Rules Committee Print 113–56, modifies which health care plans would meet the requirement of minimum essential coverage. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3522, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3522, the ''Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2013.'' As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on Ways and Means' Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 3522, and I agree that your decision does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 3522 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than another political attack on the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I think this bill serves as House Republicans' 53rd vote to repeal or undermine the health care law.

If enacted, this bill would allow insurance companies to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children have preexisting health conditions. The impact is taking away from millions of workers key protections and puts insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

Even worse, I believe, it gives insurance companies the best of both worlds: millions of new customers through the ACA, but the ability to continue to cherry-pick employers with young, healthy workforces.

In fact, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the bill would have serious adverse effects on premiums, causing them to rise substantially for many small firms, and the CBO agrees. This bill causes serious harm.

Republicans are claiming that this is just another effort to help people keep the coverage they have, but let's be clear, if your insurance starts covering your child to the age of 26, you are not losing your old coverage, your coverage is simply getting better.

If your insurance starts covering preventive services like annual physicals and vaccinations and cancer screenings for free, that is not losing your old coverage, that is your coverage getting better. There is no evidence employers are dropping coverage en masse.

So Republicans are left to claim people are losing their coverage when their coverage is actually getting better. This is again the Republicans misleading the public.

Mr. Speaker, when the ACA passed, employers and health insurers had the option to grandfather their coverage. They could keep that coverage the same, and it would not have to comply with the new ACA reforms. They could even raise premiums and cost-sharing and still stay grandfathered.

For plans that did not grandfather, a host of important new consumer protections went into place before 2014. For example, plans had to limit their profits and overhead to 20 percent of the premiums they collect. If they failed to meet this standard, they must pay rebates to their customers. As a result, small businesses have saved a total of $2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

Mr. Speaker, in November 2013, the President announced that individuals and small businesses who are not yet ready to transition into the new, more fair, secure health coverage guaranteed by the ACA could remain in their existing plans for another year.

In March of this year, the President extended that policy, so that individuals and small businesses could keep their plans into 2016, but this bill goes much further and allows these plans to be sold to new customers.

So we are not talking about people keeping their plans. We are talking about selling old lousy plans, discriminatory plans, to new customers.

Since the ACA was passed, we have added key new benefits and protections to employer coverage, but at the same time, we have added 10 million jobs, we have helped 10 million people get health coverage, we have seen premiums rise at historically low levels, and we have extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by 13 years.

This is amazing progress, and we should not turn back. That is what the Republicans would have us do with this

other repeal of the Affordable Care Act: turn us back to the old days where the insurance companies reigned, where discriminatory practices reigned, and where preexisting conditions were a basis for not getting coverage.

I urge Members to vote ''no.'' This should not be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his diligence on this effort and on behalf of the American people to allow them the choice and the options that they are seeking in their health care.

My colleague is concerned that we are looking at repeals and that we are looking at replacements and we are looking at allowing choice and options for Americans. We are going to continue to do that because what we have found, Mr. Speaker, what we have found is that premiums are rising.

□ 1615

In my State, they are going to go up another 18 to 20 percent this year. We have an insurance product in the marketplace that many of our constituents tell us is too expensive to afford. We are seeing narrowed networks. People have an insurance card, but guess what. They don't have access to the queue. They can't see the doctor. We are hearing from our hospitals that they are seeing their emergency rooms crowded.

So yes, indeed, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. It is the right thing to do. If you like your health care plan, under this bill you would be able to keep your health care plan. We would be helping the President to fulfill a promise that he broke. Let's get back on track and let's fulfill that promise.

This is what the American people want right now, by the administration's own admission. These aren't my numbers. It is the administration's number. Up to 80 percent of the small business health plans would not make the ObamaCare cut because they are not government-compliant. The operative word here is they are not government-compliant. The government is forcing people into a plan that they don't want, don't like, and can't afford. This is the administration admitting this. They are taking away options and choice in the marketplace.

We have heard from small business owners all across our district who are struggling to find ways to provide health insurance to their employees and still manage to stay in business. What they are looking for is a way to provide jobs and increase wages. ObamaCare is making it more and more difficult.

We have heard from our constituents about how their insurance premiums and their copayments are escalating and the complaints they have from employees because they don't like the ObamaCare plans. We have heard that they do not understand why they are forced into purchasing government-compliant insurance which does not meet their needs.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act, will provide some relief to the small business community by allowing them to maintain their current health insurance plans. If you like the health insurance plan that you have, you would be able to keep it. It is fulfilling a promise. It is what small business employers want. It is what the American people want.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a very simple question: When will the Republicans accept their share of responsibility in guaranteeing the health security of all Americans?

The bill under consideration today, H.R. 3522, is really nothing more than a senseless, heartless, 53rd vote by the Republicans to eviscerate the Affordable Care Act.

Where the ACA is a historic leap forward in health security for millions of Americans, this bill is a shameless stumble backward to the days when insurance companies could exploit the American people with impunity.

Where the ACA promotes women's health and security, this bill allows health companies to charge more to women for their coverage than they do for men.

Where the ACA ends the reprehensible practice of price-gouging Americans with preexisting conditions, this legislation allows insurers selling small business health plans to charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

This legislation would also allow insurers to impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that health security will run out for many Americans when they get sick—a tragic state of affairs that often results in folks going bankrupt in the face of a pile of unpaid medical bills.

This legislation sends us back to a dark day when too many American families had to choose between a roof over their head and food on the table or paying their health care bills.

The ACA was passed into law to protect hardworking Americans, in part, by making bad, exploitative health insurance plans a thing of the past. The fact that they are wanting to add more people to it is really reprehensible. This legislation allows insurers to sell the same bad business plans that they had before to more people until 2018.

The Republicans have been in charge here and haven't proposed any alternative whatsoever. This legislation jeopardizes the health security of American families by rolling back vital insurance protections made law by the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: When will the Republicans act on behalf of the health security of the American people? When will they stop having these PR campaign events just before we are going home so they can send out press releases and say they have done something, when they have done absolutely nothing except try to remove the ACA? When will they care about the people?

Sadly, not today.

This bill is an embarrassment and demands a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, a valued member of the Health Subcommittee and prime sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about keeping a promise and doing right by the American people. The Employee Health Care Protection Act is a bipartisan bill that allows American workers, if they choose, to keep their employer-sponsored health care plan that they depend upon for health care security.

I am amused my colleagues across the aisle seem to think the American worker doesn't know what is best for herself, her family, or her business. It just amazes me they have so little regard for the average American. They feel like they must tell the average American what is best for them. They cannot make their own decisions.

Frankly, I am disappointed that this legislation is even necessary. President Obama and congressional supporters of ObamaCare made unequivocal promises dozens of times that Americans can keep their plan if they wished. Yet, last year, millions of Americans found their health care canceled because it did not comply with ''Washington knows best, you don't'' rules set forth in ObamaCare.

Ninety-three thousand Louisianans lost their health care in the individual market, and thousands more in the group market are in danger of losing their plans unless we pass this bill.

The President apologized to Americans who lost their coverage, saying that he is ''sorry that they are finding themselves in this situation based on assurances they got from me.'' If the President were truly sorry, he would call Senator REID and tell him to pass this bill and provide relief from ObamaCare to the millions of Americans who relied on a false promise. He would then work with this body to repeal and replace ObamaCare with market-based solutions that give the power

to the patient, not the Washington bureaucrat.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill. The Employer Health Care Protection Act allows American families to save money on health care, increases access to affordable health care choices, and will raise wages for workers. On top of that, it will decrease the deficit by $1.25 billion over the next 10 years. It is a commonsense bill that provides relief to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep the promise to middle class workers and ensure that, if they like their health care plan, they can keep it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522 marks the 53rd vote to repeal or undermine ObamaCare. But worse, it means taking away guaranteed benefits for the consumers that you seem to be so concerned about.

Does anyone really believe that Americans want insurance companies to be able to deny them coverage or charge them more due to a preexisting condition? Do they want insurance companies to be able to refuse to pay for their lifesaving treatments because they have hit an annual limit? Do they want insurance companies to be able to not cover maternity services for pregnant women, as so many plans did?

I believe we can all agree the answer is ''no.'' That is why we have to reject H.R. 3522 and all other efforts to repeal or undermine the consumer protections of ObamaCare. Americans simply can't afford it. They can't afford to have insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

This isn't about consumer choice. This is about turning over decisions to insurance companies that want to cut the benefits.

I want to end my remarks by just mentioning one story of why the Affordable Care Act is so important to constituents. This is from John. He says:

> I wanted to share with you the good news that by accessing health insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act, my little business, a law firm, was able to avoid a substantial premium increase and, in fact, obtain the same full coverage at reduced deductibles and copayments and add dental care for thousands a month less than our old premiums costs, which we had just been advised was to be raised approximately 14 percent. I have been practicing law for over 37 years and have always felt a responsibility to provide full health care benefits for all my employees, including clerks and staff, paying the total premium for all participants. My firm expanded at one point to include my then-partner, seven associate lawyers, and multiple staff, though we are now downsized to three lawyers and two office staff that we now are able to provide insurance for. Thanks for your efforts. Thanks for the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, another valued member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

I would like to begin with the words President Obama first said to the American Medical Association in June of 2009 before any committee in Congress held a markup of what later became the Affordable Care Act. He said to that group of physicians, and repeated on many occasions after that:

> If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away from you, no matter what.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, like many assurances that were delivered to the American people about the President's health care law, this has been nothing more than an empty promise. Since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, millions have been notified their insurance plans have been canceled.

I commend Chairman PITTS of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce for holding numerous hearings to examine this very issue. That is precisely why we need to pass H.R. 3522. Mr. Speaker, this commonsense legislation would simply allow health insurance companies to continue to offer group coverage that was in effect in 2013.

I commend our physician colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this legislation.

If the President will not keep his promise to the American people that ''if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan,'' then we need to do it for him. H.R. 3522 accomplishes that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is frustrating to me because, again, we have just another effort to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act when we should all be working to implement the Affordable Care Act. Just to show what a waste of time, if you will, that this debate is today, I wanted to read a statement of President Obama's policy that was issued today with regard to this legislation. It says:

> The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3522 because it threatens the health care security of hardworking middle class families. The Nation is experiencing the lowest rate of health care price inflation in nearly 50 years, and exceptionally slow growth in other measures of health costs, which have combined to dramatically slow the growth of small business premiums.

□ 1630

> With health care costs rising at low rates and choices for small businesses improving through the Health Insurance Marketplace, this bill would be a major step backwards.
>
> H.R. 3522 would roll back the progress made because of the Affordable Care Act and would allow insurers to deploy practices such as charging businesses more when a worker has a preexisting condition, or when it has more workers who are women than men. The bill would allow insurers to go back to capping the amount of care that enrollees receive, or to excluding coverage of proven preventative care. The administration supports policies that allow people to keep the health plans that they have. Its transition policies allow States and issuers to do just that. But policies that reverse the progress made to extend quality, affordable coverage to millions of uninsured, hardworking middle class families are not the solution. Rather than refighting old political battles to sabotage the health care law, the Congress should work with the administration to improve the law and move forward.
>
> If the President were presented with this bill, he would veto it.

So, again, this is just a waste of time. We have so many other things that we need to work on in this House before we adjourn, particularly jobs and the economy. Instead, we are trying to repeal, again, the same legislation that actually has created more jobs and kept health care costs low, and it is just, again, a complete waste of time.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this piece of legislation, also the sponsor, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation.

I rise today in support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

When the President said, ''If you like your plan, you can keep it,'' that was deemed PolitiFact's Lie of the Year.

Then, millions of Americans across the country in the individual market received cancelation notices. They felt the impacts of the broken promises of the President's health care law.

Now the specter of cancelations looms again. Up to 50 million people who get health care through their employers could have their plans canceled or disrupted because of rules and regulations in the President's health care law. That is 1 in 6 Americans, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my constituents wants to keep their plan, they should be able to. Support this bill, and make the President keep his promise to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President of the United States.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his leadership, and my colleague, BILL CASSIDY, for this wonderful bill, H.R. 3522.

This bill is very simple. It will allow people to keep the health insurance

they had before ObamaCare took it away, their choice.

Eighty percent of those people in this country are women who have made those choices in health care, and this would put it back in place.

President Obama infamously stated, as my colleague before me stated, ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period.''

However, many plans offered prior to the ACA were not compliant with the numerous requirements this law required. As a result, millions of Americans were no longer able to purchase their old plans.

One of many of the business owners who provide health care coverage for their employees right there in my district, Mr. Steve Lozinsky, who runs Sparkle and Shine Cleaning Service in Apex, North Carolina, called me just the other day concerned about this issue.

Steve has about 240 employees, and he will be forced to lay off 31 of them because of the ObamaCare mandate.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of employers like Steve Lozinsky, who take care of their employees, who consider them family and want to do the right thing, it is because of them, and every American and every family in this country, that we need to pass H.R. 3522.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a direct assault on the health security of American families. The bill would allow insurance companies in their small business health plans to charge more for women's coverage, meaning workers in small businesses with more women than men have to pay more.

It would charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions, meaning workers in small businesses that have more people with preexisting conditions have to pay more. And these small businesses would face higher premiums and would continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee had an accident or got diagnosed with cancer.

Under the legislation, insurers group plans' could also impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that insurers could cease to provide any coverage after an individual's care reached a certain overall cost and impose extensive waiting periods before an employer could enroll in coverage.

Now, if the Republicans were serious about helping America's small businesses, they would be bringing up, instead, a bill to expand access to the ACA's small business health care tax credit, as actually proposed by the Obama administration.

The President has proposed allowing small businesses with up to 50 workers, rather than the current 25, to qualify for the credit, and adopting a more generous phaseout schedule.

Furthermore, instead of strengthening the small business tax credit, Republicans have actually voted to repeal the tax credit three times.

Republicans are completely misrepresenting what this bill does, calling the bill's section 2 ''If you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it.''

Well, first of all, the bill does not require that insurers keep selling these group policies. Insurers discontinue policies every year, and there is nothing in this bill that prevents them from doing so.

But more important, the bill goes well beyond the issue of people keeping plans they have now. Instead, it allows insurers to sell group plans that do not include ACA consumer protection to new customers through 2018.

Once again, the Republicans are misrepresenting what this bill does, and they are simply trying to repeal or undermine the ACA, which has been so successful in expanding insurance coverage, keeping down costs, and eliminating discriminatory practices.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the time remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats constantly say that the ACA is not a perfect bill, and that they want to make changes. If they are sincere about that statement, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522, a bill that received bipartisan support at Energy and Commerce to protect American workers who will lose their plan under the Affordable Care Act.

Thirty-nine Democrats joined us last year and voted for a similar bill to let Americans keep their plan in the individual market. We should work together to provide that very same protection to the tens of millions of American workers who depend on employer-sponsored health coverage.

Last fall, millions of Americans all across the country had their health plans canceled, despite repeated promises from the President and his allies in Congress that if you liked your health care plan, you would be able to keep it. And so, in the fall of 2013, health plan cancelations were concentrated in the individual market.

Sadly, millions of Americans with employer-sponsored coverage, group plans, will also face plan cancelations because of the Affordable Care Act. And some experts have testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that approximately 50 million young American workers with fully insured coverage face plan cancelations or disruptions because of ACA requirements and regulations.

Forbes warned last year, and I will quote: ''Starting in October 2014, many employees of small businesses will start getting the same notices that are now being mailed to individuals, informing that their existing health plans are also being canceled.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, Americans rightly feel misled by the President, by congressional Democrats. Their false assurance that Americans could keep their health care plan was recognized as the 2013 ''Lie of the Year.''

So, we have this legislation before us this year to apply to the group plans. As long as they were in existence in 2013, they could be available today. And I urge Members to support the legislation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is bad for consumers. It is bad for small businesses. The only beneficiaries of this bill are the health insurance companies that want to sell bad policies, charge higher premiums for women, for children with preexisting conditions, and who want to put limits on health care coverage when people need it the most.

I want to take a minute to go back to the time before the Affordable Care Act and remind my colleagues why we passed that health care reform in the first place.

Before the ACA, consumers were seeing health insurance premiums rise by double-digits each year. Not anymore.

This morning, the Kaiser Family Foundation released a new report on small employer premiums. The report found that since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, premium increases for small business coverage have slowed considerably. This past year, premiums barely budged.

Before the ACA, there was no requirement for how much of your premium dollars go to an insurance company, how much of that had to actually go for your health care. Your premiums could be used to pay for exorbitant executive salaries, lavish conferences, and other expenditures that had nothing to do with the health coverage for the insured.

Now, consumers are saving billions of dollars from this new requirement that insurers actually spend premium dollars to provide health care.

Before the ACA, parents could find that they had no coverage at all for a child's preexisting conditions, even something as common as asthma. Today, all parents are guaranteed the peace of mind that their insurance will cover their children's medical needs.

Before the ACA, an individual struggling with cancer could find that the insurance plan would impose annual coverage limits and simply stop paying for care. Today, this is no longer the case.

Before the ACA, small businesses had few choices and no leverage with insurance companies. The ACA put consumers and small businesses back in charge, and it did so in a way that is cutting health cost growth and providing coverage to millions of previously uninsured Americans.

So what do we have on the other side of the aisle from the Republicans? Sour grapes.

We took a Republican idea, implemented by their very own Presidential candidate in Massachusetts, and we took that idea and made it work for the whole country, made it work for families, made it work better than even the most optimistic supporters had expected.

And Republicans are mad. So rather than work to implement the law, they have been working to thwart it. Sour grapes.

This bill is just another example of that mentality. It would not help small businesses. To the contrary. Small businesses that wish to grandfather and keep their old coverage already have that opportunity.

This bill would let insurance companies sell non-ACA-compliant policies to any business, policies that do not protect against benefit limits, rate hikes, discrimination against women or against children with preexisting conditions.

□ 1645

The bill would allow insurance companies to cherry-pick, offering low rates for inadequate, bare bones policies for some groups and then discriminate against, charging higher prices or offering weaker coverage for others.

Mr. Speaker, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities yesterday released a new analysis of the bill and what it would mean. The analysis concluded that it would ''likely cause premiums to rise substantially for many small businesses and undercut health reform's small group market reforms and consumer protections.''

So I am opposed to this bill. It is not about helping businesses. It is not about helping families. This bill puts insurance companies back in charge, and it returns the insurance market to the days when they could discriminate with impunity. I am not for that, and I hope my colleagues are not for that. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The President not only made a promise that, if you liked your doctor you could keep your doctor, he said, if you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan no matter what—period. He also promised reductions in premiums of $2,500 per family.

Americans are not seeing the $2,500 reduction in premiums that the President promised under the ACA. Instead, Americans are seeing higher premiums and deductibles under the President's health care law. Some of the premium increases are outrageous, and the deductibles—I don't know how a family could save the $10,000 to $15,000 for their deductibles that some of them are telling us they are going to have. In fact, the administration's own actuaries have confirmed that premiums are going up under the ACA. Earlier this year, actuaries from CMS estimated that 65 percent of small businesses will see premium increases under the Affordable Care Act. Middle class Americans working for these 11 million small businesses will see higher premiums, meaning less take-home pay for working Americans.

The American people want real health care reform, but the ACA is making things worse. The President's health care law has led to canceled health care plans, fewer choices, higher premiums, and higher deductibles for middle class families. Ultimately, the law needs to be replaced with better solutions that lower costs and provide better health care choices.

However, let's be clear about what H.R. 3522 actually does. The bill does not repeal the ACA. We have heard the mantra of how many 50-some votes there have been to repeal. Instead, this bill simply lets American workers keep their health care plans, and it expands coverage options.

Congressional Democrats constantly say that they want to change the parts of the ACA that don't work. If they are sincere about that pledge, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522. This is a bipartisan bill to protect American workers who will lose their plans under the health care law. As I said last year when we had a similar bill for the individual market cancelations, 39 Democrats joined us and voted for that bill to let Americans keep their plans in the individual market.

Congress should work together to provide the same protection to the millions of American workers with group coverage, and that is what the Employee Health Care Protection Act does. Families, not Washington, should decide if they want to keep their health care plans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

My friend on the other side of the aisle said that this doesn't repeal the Affordable Care Act, but in reality, it does. This is the 53rd time. When I was a little boy, I went to PS 53 in the Bronx. I feel we have now reached that level of 53, with no end in sight, and I really wish that both sides of the aisle could put their heads together and keep what we like and fix what we don't like.

All of the major bills that have ever been put into effect, be it Medicare, be it Medicaid, be it the civil rights bills of the 1960s, had to be tweaked because, when you have an omnibus bill, you really don't know what its effect is going to be until you roll it out and you see, and then you make changes. I mean, that happens with every major bill. The problem is that most of our friends on the other side of the aisle hated the law and never really wanted it to succeed. So, if you don't want it to succeed and if you throw roadblocks in its path and if you have a situation in which Republican Governors are refusing to expand it, you will have failure because, if you don't want to work with something and if you don't want to make it better, it won't get better. In my home State, where we embrace it, it has worked. It hasn't worked in every single instance but in a vast majority of instances. Again, we should change what doesn't work and keep what works.

In New York, this year's insurance rates, on average, were—and here is another 53—53 percent lower than the rates in 2013 for comparable coverage. Our exchange, New York State of Health, has already announced next year's rates, which will continue to be more than 50 percent lower than they were before our insurance exchange was established.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research & Educational Trust's annual Employer Health Benefits Survey, individuals obtaining health insurance from their employers are generally facing ''similar premium contributions and cost-sharing requirements in 2014 as they did in 2013.'' Furthermore, we know that these individuals are often benefiting from more quality, comprehensive coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to return to the bad old days when insurance companies where permitted to discriminate against small businesses that employed large numbers of women, older individuals, or those with preexisting conditions. I don't want to return to the bad old days when you couldn't keep your child on your premium until that child was 26 years old, as you can under the Affordable Care Act.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this legislation, and I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to really sit down with us. Let's put our heads together, and let's once and for all help fix this bill. There are a lot of good features in it. We should expand on those. The things that we think need to change we should change, but, please, let's not ever vote to repeal again. We don't need to have a 54th time. Enough is enough.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to close the debate.

The frustrating thing for me and for so many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle is that we know how successful the Affordable Care Act has been, and yet the Republicans continue

to negate the positive aspects of the ACA and seek to undermine it with the repeal or with legislation like this that would seriously undermine the goals and the success of the Affordable Care Act. I just want to point out that, since the Affordable Care Act was enacted in March of 2010, 9.9 million private sector jobs have been created.

According to the latest estimates from the CBO, the overall number of Americans receiving employer-based coverage is expected to grow from 156 million in 2014 to 166 million in 2023, and the number of uninsured is expected to fall by 26 million Americans. Also, since Massachusetts enacted health care reforms that were almost identical to those in the ACA, the percentage of employers offering coverage has increased from 72 percent in 2007 to 77 percent in 2010. Since the ACA was enacted, the Nation has seen 4 years of the slowest health care spending growth since recordkeeping began in 1960. Slower growth in health care costs translates into slower growth of employers' health benefit costs, helping businesses and workers save money. Indeed, employers' hourly health benefit costs rose just 1 percent after adjusting for inflation over the year ending in June 2014, near the bottom of the historical range.

In addition to slowing down the rate of growth of health care spending, which is benefiting employers, the Affordable Care Act is also producing premium savings for America's small businesses due to its 80–20 rule. That rule requires that insurers spend at least 80 percent of premiums on medical care rather than on CEO pay, profits, and administrative costs. If an insurer fails to meet this standard, it must pay rebates to its customers. As a result of this rule, according to a recently released report, America's small businesses have saved a total of $2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is that the Affordable Care Act is delivering on the promise of affordable, quality, and dependable health coverage for millions of Americans, but that doesn't stop the Republicans. We can't shake their obsession with undermining the law, and that is what they are doing again with this bill. The vote on this bill will be the 53rd GOP vote to repeal or to undermine the ACA, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act, a bipartisan bill authored by our committee, particularly by Dr. BILL CASSIDY as the prime sponsor, to protect the health care choices for literally millions of American workers.

Last fall, we learned the harsh reality that the President's oft-repeated promise that if you liked your health care plan you could keep it—you have heard that here today—was simply not true. Many were shocked to learn that their individual policies were being canceled because of the President's health care law. They didn't like that at all.

Sadly, the wave of canceled plans under the President's broken promise has not ended. The very backbone of America's health care system, employer-sponsored coverage, provides health care security to about 170 million American workers and family members. The President's health care law now threatens the health care plans of many of America's middle class workers who rely on employer-sponsored coverage. Many with employer-sponsored coverage will face the same plan cancelations that millions of Americans received with their individual policies last fall.

This legislation provides a thoughtful solution and relief from the President's broken promises. The bill before us simply allows America's small businesses and workers to choose from health care plans that were in effect in 2013. The bill would also allow other small businesses and workers to choose from more affordable group health care plans available before the President's health care law.

America's workers and families know their health care needs better than do Members of Congress or officials at the Department of HHS. This bill empowers Americans with more choices, the same choices that they were promised. If Americans like their health care plans, they should be able to keep them—period, end of story.

I am also pleased that, this week, the nonpartisan CBO confirmed that this bill would lower the deficit by more than $1 billion, provide more health plan options with lower premiums, and, yes, raise wages for American workers.

We have all heard firsthand of the struggles facing middle class American families because of the health care law. Tom Harmon, from my district, and the trusted workers at American Waste—in a little town called Union, Michigan—are seeing their health care premiums more than double. Sadly, their deductibles are much higher to boot, forcing them to deal with higher health care costs. Rather than make life easier, Washington, through this President's health care law, has, in fact, made life more expensive for Tom and the working families of American Waste in southwest Michigan.

In conclusion, I am proud to say that this bill, H.R. 3522, is a bill dedicated to helping workers across the country who are struggling with the costs and consequences of the President's health care law. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Dr. CASSIDY's bill. America's workers deserve the chance to pick the health care plans that best suit their needs, not lose them.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3522.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of Mr. CASSIDY'S bill—the Employee Health Care Protection Act H.R. 3522,

This bill is very important to ensure employers and their employees can keep their plan—a broken promise from President Obama.

Just last week I was contacted by the Cornerstone Staffing Inc. based in Omaha who is currently facing hard decisions in order to be in compliance with this disastrous law.

Cornerstone Staffing is a woman-owned nine-year-old local business that will now suffer due to a law that no one read.

Cornerstone Staffing Inc. has 15 full time employees with a range of 150 to 450 temporary employees at any given time.

Previously they didn't offer insurance to all temporary workers but had the flexibility to secure coverage for those workers who needed it.

Now, Cornerstone Staffing Inc. is forced to provide coverage to all of their employees—whether they need it or not—which means they can't afford to place as many individuals in needed jobs.

Not only will H.R. 3522 bring some relief to companies and their employees but it will also increase government revenue by $400 million. This is common sense.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and give some relief to families across the nation. I am submitting a letter Cornerstone Staffing Inc. sent to me regarding their problems with the President's health care law.

HELLO CONGRESSMAN TERRY, We have met briefly in the past, actually my company was previously located on the second floor of your office building on Burt Street. I work for Cornerstone Staffing Inc, we are a nine year old, local, woman-owned staffing firm servicing the Omaha metro area.

I'm very late in the game sending this message but we recently met with representatives from Silverstone Group regarding ACA and how it will affect our company in 2015.1 have to be honest, I don't fully understand the requirements or implications but we currently have 15 full-time, internal employees. We also employ temporary/contract employees and depending on the season we could have 150 to 450 contractors working for us at a time. Some might work one week, some might work twelve months and some might work for us 3 times in a year at a variety of our clients with months off between assignments.

It is my understanding that ''PEO'' (employee leasing services) are exempt from Obamacare. We W–2 all of our contractors (versus 1099) as many are required to be by Nebraska state law. Therefore we have the same obligations to offer a temporary/contract employee healthcare as if they are hired to work in a long-term permanent position.

We are not against offering benefits to our contract employees, especially if they work more than 90 days on a project. Our concern is that much of our temp/contract workforce is paid $10–$13/hour. If the individuals out of pocket healthcare costs can not exceed 9.5% of their income, we will be forced to pay the majority of their healthcare monthly. In our business, we may only make $2–$3/hour on each of these employees so they might have to work weeks before we make a profit especially after we pay taxes, background checks and payroll expenses. This has the potential to be a huge blow to our company profits and

it could have an adverse effect if we are forced to decide if it is even ''worth'' employing someone who is willing to work because the risk is too great on our end.

ACA is going to put a major strain on our industry. Omaha is home to many staffing firms including several large nationally focused firms. Is there anything more we can be doing to amend or exempt recruiting/staffing agencies from the standard requirements of ACA?

Thank you for your consideration and any suggestions,

BRAD JONES,
Vice President of Operations,
Cornerstone Staffing Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3522 is postponed.

□ 1700

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PITTS. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. And I will be joined by some other members of the Progressive Caucus to talk about issues that are important to this country and issues that are important to have a debate about in public.

This is our first week back. After 5 weeks of being in our home districts, we have a lot to get done in this Congress. And so far this week, we have not exactly risen to the occasion. We have important things to do regarding the continuing resolution. We have important things to do regarding situations overseas. We have important legislation that this Congress simply has not gotten done. And, instead, another week has gone by without addressing some of the most important issues of the day.

One of those issues that, I think, is front and center in people's minds is what is going on overseas, what is going on with ISIL in Iraq, perhaps in Syria, and what does that mean for the American people.

And I am here today asking many of the questions that I get from people in the district. The President is going to address the Nation this evening, and he is going to give us his vision for where he thinks this country should go. And I am asking the President to please come to Congress before military action is taken against ISIL because it is so important that we are a part of this debate. We are the closest to the people in this country, and Congress needs to be involved. And I have some questions that I would like to see Members of Congress debate and the President help us address as we decide this extremely important issue.

I want to give props to Rachel Maddow who, last night, I thought did an excellent job on her program in looking at some of the questions that we should be debating in this body to make sure that we are doing the right thing by getting involved and that we have got the thought ahead of time going into it, unlike I think what we have done previously when we have gone into Iraq, as a country.

So these are some of the questions that we would like to have answered and we would like to have assistance with. One, why should the President seek congressional authorization and debate for military action against ISIL? Well, for one, it is in the Constitution. The Constitution, article I, section 8: ''The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.''

Directly in our United States Constitution is the power that this body, Congress, has to be involved if we are going to get involved in what would essentially be seen as war. And I think the debate that we have to have is, what are we looking at as we look at the situation in Iraq and perhaps in Syria.

John Nichols from The Nation magazine wrote: ''It is a healthy respect for the complex geopolitics of the region, combined with a regard for the wisdom of the system of checks and balances and the principles of advice and consent outlined in the US Constitution'' that we have a say. Those are the words of John Nichols.

This Congress, in July, before we left to go back to our districts, voted 370–40 for H. Con. Res. 105. We don't get many 370–40 votes in this House. It was a bipartisan resolution. It had overwhelming support and said: ''The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.''

That is the resolution that was passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan way by this body just weeks ago. We are facing these questions today. And the President is going to present to the Nation this evening exactly what he would like to see us do and hopefully will let the Congress have a say in it because, clearly, the situation has escalated. It needs a debate.

The beheadings have certainly caught the attention of the country, but we want to make sure that attention is on our behalf, not the attention of someone who did that to try to provoke a reaction, and that we don't fall into the hands of doing the reaction that some people would hope that we would do to engage in a region that could be very complex.

And after this country has had so many unfortunate failures in Iraq—twice in my adult lifetime we have gone into this region, with very limited success, and we have gone into Afghanistan—we owe it to the American people, to our veterans, our servicemen and -women and their families, those who have gone in and put their lives at risk following 9/11, to have this rigorous debate in this very body before us.

This is a complex situation. But given the failures that we have had previously in going into Iraq—whether it be the lack of debate, the lack of buy-in from other nations and other partners specifically in the region and, quite honestly, the faulty intelligence that we had or that were told at the time—it has put us in a bad situation in the past in this region.

In fact, one of the reasons we have to have this debate is there are a number of Members who are right now writing authorizations for us to go in. In fact, there is one from the gentleman from Virginia, Representative FRANK WOLF, that would essentially be an Authorization for Use of Military Force that could authorize force virtually anywhere, with no expiration date and no specific targets.

And I can tell you, when I talk to people across Wisconsin, when I talk to my colleagues in this room and they talk to their constituents, I think people want better answers than that. I know a year ago, when we had the debate about whether or not we would get involved in Syria, within 2 weeks in my district, I received 2,200 responses, 97 percent to 3 percent who were leery of us getting involved in Syria. And while the situation is different from a year ago and is even a situation different from a month ago, I think the public still has questions, certainly questions that we need to debate in this body. So we need to have that debate in Congress.

What do we want from the President in a new authorization? Well, I think there are three things that should be in that. One is that Congress has a say. Again, we have the ability to have a vote. We are elected and accountable to our districts, and these decisions are not just made behind closed doors without the advice and consent of Congress. We will have a stronger effort if we have that public debate. So that is one. Two, that we have a narrow scope. We simply can't bomb our way into success.

And let me just go over a little bit of the timeline just in the very few months since ISIL has been out there.

Let me just talk a little bit about that timeline. Back on June 16 of this year, the administration announced it was sending 275 military personnel to protect the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Three days later, they announced that 300 military advisers would collaborate and train Iraqi forces—3 days later. On June 30, the administration announced the deployment of 200 more troops to Iraq. On August 7, the President authorized airstrikes in Iraq. On the 12th of August, the administration announced 130 additional U.S. military personnel to assess the scope of the humanitarian mission. On the 26th of August, the President authorized surveillance flights over Syria. On September 2, the administration announced the deployment of 350 additional military personnel to Iraq, bringing our total to 1,100 U.S. troops now deployed in Iraq. And in the last month alone, there have been 153 airstrikes in Iraq. Just in the little bit of time that has passed, that is what we have seen happen. And I think we need to be very specific in the limited scope of what that is going to be so we don't have mission creep leading us into perhaps more involvement than we thought was going to happen in the beginning.

And third, I think—and others that I talk to think—it is important that we go in with a coalition, that we are not doing this either alone or largely alone and that we are doing this with partners from the region. Right now, there are 10 other countries that I know of that are involved in saying that they will commit to help work with us. But we need to build a moderate Sunni support and buy-in from some of the Arab States specifically to help us in this region because right now, this is a regional situation, and we need to have partners within that region to make sure that we can accomplish any goals.

There are many questions that we continue to have, and I think there are many about what that strike would look like, what exactly does it mean to have that involvement.

I just mentioned who are some of the allies that we are going to have. But what are some of our short-term goals? What do we expect to accomplish when we decide that we are going in? What would we carry out in military action? It is one thing to say that we are not going to have boots on the ground, but clearly, we are having pilots in the sky.

Right now, we are using U.S. attack aircraft, fighter aircraft, and drone aircraft to do attacks within that region. So you already have a presence that—I don't like the term ''boots on the ground,'' because these are people with families, sons and daughters, nephews and nieces, brothers and sisters that we have who are overseas, and we need to know exactly what that means.

There has been potentially a request to aid some of the moderate Syrian rebels that may come out of the conversations. And, once again, I think there are questions that this body has to have a debate on. Steven Sotloff, the journalist, who was the second person that was beheaded, that we have followed very closely, as an American citizen, his family recently said that it was moderate Syrian rebels who essentially sold access to ISIL to get Steve Sotloff. And who is it that we are going to provide assistance to? And what does that assistance mean? And who are the people that we can potentially be doing that for?

What is our long-term commitment to military action? Now, if we would have asked this question years ago when we first looked at Iraq and Afghanistan, I don't think anyone would have expected to hear a 13-year commitment to Afghanistan. More than 2,000 Americans have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 4,000 in Iraq. The cost has been estimated to be 4 to $6 trillion in that region just since that last action was called years ago. And, as I mentioned, there have been 153 airstrikes just in the last month. How many more airstrikes will it take to say that that is enough? So we need to have more meat put onto this to have an idea of what that involvement is if we are going to be authorizing something.

And finally, the question I would ask is: How do we define mission accomplished? What is the end goal that we are going to have? And where does that end happen? I certainly hope the end goal is not flying in military gear on an aircraft carrier with a banner behind it that says ''Mission Accomplished.'' Because we all know, there was no mission accomplished at that time. We need to have clear and definite goals of what it means to defeat ISIL and to make sure that that region can have some stability after the instability of so long that it has had.

So, in conclusion, the President has a constitutional obligation, I feel, to work with Congress before engaging in extended military operations. The public is still very war-weary. And while right now, polls may say people think we should get involved in Iraq and Syria with limited airstrikes, we have to have that much longer debate.

Clearly, the public beheadings of two American citizens has raised the ire of the American people and I think many in Congress. It is a different situation than it was a year ago. It is a different situation than it was a month ago. But at the same time, we have got to be sure that we are not falling into doing something that could be counterproductive because, clearly, ISIL did that to provoke a reaction, and I think that needs to be a part of the debate we have.

After being entangled in a global conflict for 13 years, we owe it to the American people and to the servicemen and -women and their families and the veterans who have already made tremendous sacrifices and the support of our country that we have a transparent and thorough debate on any action that would happen with ISIL in Syria or Iraq.

So those are my hopes. Those are my questions. I am looking forward to hearing the President tonight, and I am hoping that this body will be able to have that full debate so we know everything that we can possibly have for information prior to continuing and perhaps enhancing any actions there.

□ 1715

Now, I am very proud to be joined by other members of the Progressive Caucus. We have one of the most senior Members of this body, who has become a mentor and a friend to me, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you sincerely.

It looks like it is going to be pretty lonesome in this House. I have been looking since I have returned from the recess to see how a nation that is about to embark on another intrusion, military intrusion, what concerns we would have to have and to explain when we go home and tell our constituents that we have done this because of you, that your Nation's security was threatened.

Now, I agree with the gentleman that when we see these atrocities committed something should be done, but by us? Haven't we suffered enough? Haven't we sacrificed enough?

So few Members of Congress have to attend the funerals of those dedicated men and women. Less than 1 percent are making this sacrifice. There is no financial sacrifice being made, no tax put on the war, and people think that people are volunteering to put themselves in danger. Well, the families don't always feel the same way about it. And I have been involved in being a part of getting citizenship for people who have come to this country and enlisted and fought and died for this country, and I give the family a little flag.

Now, it wasn't too long ago that America was under the impression that enough is enough. We have lost. We have sacrificed enough. We have got to get Iraq on its feet, help stabilize the government, and then we will get on and deal with Syria.

Now, in the old days, when I was in the Army, we knew who the enemy was. They had uniforms. They had flags. But as I understand, the fluid situation that came to our intelligence during the recent recess, it seems as though ISIS is worse than al Qaeda and all the other evil terrorists that we have been involved with and that now some of them have acquired weapons that we have given to some of the Arab cults that were our friends, but somehow the weapons have been taken and are in the hands of people that I am not certain which ones are our friends.

Now, I know the President has said no boots on the ground. I don't know what that really means, that we don't expect to lose any American lives. I don't know whether that means that only drones will be used and that we can rest assured that no American in

uniform is going to be fighting anybody in that part of the world.

But since the threat to our national security appears to be so uncertain, and since the President believes he already has the power constitutionally to enter into this stage of engagement with this threat to our national security, and since I know that, polls notwithstanding, very few Americans are going to have a problem going to sleep tonight thinking about ISIS, it would seem to me that one of the ways that we could discuss and debate this is a part of what I was saying when I introduced the draft bill.

I don't want to see our young people having to serve in the military. I think it is good to have some type of public national service, but I don't think people should be trained to kill. But I know one thing. If the security of this great Nation is at risk, it shouldn't be less than 1 percent of America that has to be placed in harm's way.

So, even though most of the lives we lost started off with not troops going in initially, but consultants, advisors, and those that are going to instruct our friends to defend themselves, but ultimately the number gets larger and larger and larger. So I am going to submit some kind of way that one criteria that Members can use when going back home when their voters ask, ''Well, what was it that impressed you so much after all our country has suffered in getting involved, all the trillions of dollars, the 6,000 lives, what did they say that caused you to believe that our Nation was threatened?'' you might say that we had attached to that a draft bill, and we said that if it appeared as though our Nation was going to embark on a military excursion in another country, every American must be registered between certain ages, men and women, if they are able, to say our security has been threatened, and we should be proud as Americans to say that that is the reason why we have done that.

I bet you one thing. If that is what we were talking about this recess, neither party would be anxious not to have a vote on this, and we wouldn't be getting out of here tomorrow or the next day or the day after if we have to explain why someone's son, husband, or brother or sister may have to be involved in Selective Service because we felt in our hearts that our Nation's security was threatened.

So I, like you, want to hear what the President has to say. When Republicans come to the floor and say they are going to join with Democrats to support the President, that is something I haven't heard of in years. So I do hope that the President is able to bring us together with a better understanding as to we as Members of Congress and Representatives of the Nation's citizens and noncitizens, that we can come together, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of the House of Representatives where the people govern. And all of us would feel better in knowing it is not an easy choice, but we are convinced that it was the best choice.

So thank you so much for taking the time out, and I only hope that 435 of our Members would be doing the same thing so I can leave more secure in knowing that I have done the right thing. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

Mr. POCAN. Representative RANGEL, you have been an outspoken advocate for equality within the draft, making sure that everyone understands that there is an expense when we go into war. As someone who has had several nephews personally get involved and plenty of constituents, those decisions are something that are mighty, and this body has to have that as part of that debate, and that is why we should have that debate. Thank you so much for your time and your efforts.

One of the other issues that is extremely important that this body get done before we leave is addressing income inequality and addressing how we can best help those who need help the most, those who are aspiring to be in the middle class and helping the middle class. One of the very best ways and one of the priorities of the Democrats in this House is to give America a raise, to raise the minimum wage, through a bill that we have, to $10.10, to make sure that people have more money in their pockets. When that money is in their pockets, they will spend it in the community, and that will lift the economy and help create more jobs. It is exactly what we need right now.

For too long, we have not raised the minimum wage. If the minimum wage were the same and kept up with inflation from 1967, it would be well over $10.60 an hour. And we are not. We are at a much lower rate, and we need to have that.

One of my colleagues from California has been an outspoken advocate for raising the minimum wage, and I would love to, on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, yield to my colleague from the great State of California, Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about working families, and I will be talking about the minimum wage.

I just want to preface that it was an honor to listen to Congressman RANGEL really talk about what is probably the most important issue before us in terms of how we as a deliberative body deal with issues of war and peace and where our Nation is going. I, too, hope that we have, as this goes on, a really thoughtful discussion as you have laid out for us tonight. And I hope that we follow up with what the President says later on tonight and that, when we reconvene, we do talk about this in a very, very thoughtful, thoughtful way.

But I am also concerned about how working families and individuals are struggling to make a living on our current minimum wage of $7.25. That is why I think Congressman POCAN and my colleagues and I are discussing this issue. It is a key component of raising this minimum wage, of closing the opportunity gap and building an economy that works for our working families.

We spend a lot of time in this body talking about building the economy. We spend time discussing tax breaks for large corporations. But really what we should be about is: How do we rebuild the middle class? How do we give people an opportunity to join the middle class? Raising the minimum wage is a critical component.

By raising it from $7.25 to $10.10 an hour, we would lift 900,000 Americans out of poverty. Do we raise it into wealth? No. We just take the first step. And this is a minimum step. It would raise it for 28 million people, including more than—in my home State, 2.7 million Californians live below the poverty level, working Californians, we are talking about, live below.

Who are they? Seventy percent of them are women. The average age is not as it is often told to us, young people, 18 to 25. We are talking about the average age of a person on minimum wage is 35 years of age. That is a significant year.

I think I meant to say 1.3 million Californians in my State. It is going to raise it for 2.7 million, and of those, almost a million and a half are women who would be impacted by an increase.

This is a bill we are talking about that is a bill that was put forth by Senator TOM HARKIN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER, and it is going to go have a tremendous impact upon job growth. Sometimes we hear, well, if you raise the minimum wage, we are going to lose jobs. But if we really get through the scare tactics, we will listen to what people who are experts and who have studied the issue have said, that a recent analysis by the Economic Policy Institute has calculated that a higher minimum wage within 3 years creates 85,000 new jobs and it has a boost of almost $22 billion into the economy.

So, when we raise the minimum wage, we are talking about protecting families, protecting individuals. We as a Congress have, I think, a responsibility to support those families who are the foundation of our workforce. And now is not time to turn our backs on the people who are raising the next generation. We are talking about working families. We need to help the men, women, and children who provide the foundation for our economy and our country, who are raising the next generation.

If we cannot provide an adequate wage for Americans who are living in poverty and working, why are we here? What is our role? Our role, I think, is to listen to those working Americans who are desperately trying to make ends meet, who work two and three jobs, and say: We hear you; it makes economic sense for the Nation; we will support you. And we should not leave this Congress until we take the first

step, and that is to raise the minimum wage to at least $10.10 an hour.

□ 1730

It is a minimum raise of the minimum wage.

So with that, I thank you for providing me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. POCAN. If I could just ask you, gentlemen, one question—and I will go to Mr. RANGEL again for a comment.

Let me ask you a question. The leadership in this House, the Republican leadership, has refused to schedule a bill to raise the minimum wage, and we have one other device to do that called the discharge petition.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes.

Mr. POCAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if you signed the discharge petition so that we can force a vote in this House to raise the minimum wage in the remaining weeks we have before we finish the session for the year.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Absolutely would I sign a discharge petition, one of the most important things that we can do.

Mr. POCAN. And we have done that.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. All we are asking for is a right to vote.

I still remember when the President came, in his State of the Union speech, and it was really just after—in my first year here in the Congress and he was talking about the horrible episode that happened at Sandy Hook and said, ''Give the people the vote. Just give us a vote.''

That is all we are asking our Republican colleagues. Let us vote on raising the minimum wage. That is all. That is the democratic way and ''democratic'' with a small D. That is the American way. Give the people a vote.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Because that is the problem—we have been told the Speaker won't schedule the vote, but there are other ways. Every single Member of this body can sign a discharge petition, and if we get a majority of us, 218 of us, to sign that, it will come to this body. So there are no excuses not to get this done.

I would like to yield to my good friend from New York, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. We were talking about war and peace. To me, we are still talking about a moral issue.

Here in this great Nation, the richest in the world, we are asking people to work 40 hours, many without sick leave, many without vacations or vacation pay, and—at the end of the day—end up in poverty. There is something terribly wrong with that picture.

It seems to me that it goes beyond just doing the right and the moral thing. Even churches and synagogues and mosques should recognize that their membership is going down because you can't pay the rent, buy the food, and still give your money to the religious institutions.

Beyond that, what are they going to do with the money? I will tell you: they are going to be able to get nutritional diets for their kids. They will be able to buy clothes for their kids. They can aspire that their kids get a better education and be able to get higher jobs and have higher ambitions.

They can make America more productive because they have more self-esteem because being poor is not the worst thing in the world, if you feel that you can come out of that poverty and you have an opportunity to do it.

There is something worse going on in this country today. I was privileged years ago to sponsor a bill that we all know is the earned income tax credit, and the earned income tax credit says this shouldn't happen. If you have got a family and, after you follow the Federal formula, you are still poor, why, we will give you a check. You won't owe taxes; we will give you a refundable check.

Guess what? Some of the people that are hiring these people at very low wages also hire accountants that advise the potential applicant how to become eligible for the earned income tax credit. So they give a little bit, the government gives a little bit, and the people still end up poor.

It just seems to me this is not a Democratic issue; it is not a Republican issue. It is an issue of: What does America stand for? Where is the equity involved if we are not going to allow our country to be pumped up by the middle class people who made this country great?

We are not a country of rich and poor folks. It is the middle class that have demands, that want to go to the local store, so that they can sell and hire people and have communities that feel proud about themselves.

I know one thing: with the rents that are going up in communities all over this country and people who used to consider themselves middle class, you miss one or two payments of your rent—and Judge Judy doesn't want to ask you what were the circumstances.

If you didn't pay your rent, you are going to get evicted. If you don't have resources, if you have no place to go, you can go from a plateau that you thought was middle class into a homeless shelter.

Getting out of that situation and seeking employment is almost impossible. How much does it cost? Hundreds of billions of dollars in social costs because you wouldn't give Americans an opportunity to earn a living wage.

So it is lonely down here with you guys, but I do hope before we leave that we can have not just Democrats, but all of the Members be able to go back home and say, ''I was late getting this started, but we do have the issues, and we are going to make you proud.''

Thank you so much for taking the time to allow us to express what we know most people believe, but politically, they can't support.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL.

One of the things I look at—it is pretty simple math to someone like me, coming from America's heartland, when productivity is going up and wages are flat, the money is going somewhere.

In 1988, the average CEO made 40 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, it is 354 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, if you put extra money in the pockets through raising the minimum wage of someone who is in the middle class or aspiring to be in the middle class, it is going to go back into the economy. If they can afford a long weekend vacation to the Wisconsin Dells in my area, that helps boost the economy, helps create jobs—but you know what? That CEO can't take 354 vacations to make up for it.

Clearly, when the money goes into the pockets of those who need it the most, it is going to go instantly into the economy, help create jobs, and help do everything that we need to, to stimulate the economy to the point that we can be as great as we possibly can be.

To me, it is a no-brainer. I think to many of the constituents I talk to it is a no-brainer.

You are very articulate in talking about the troubles that people go through in trying to just get by. It is another thing this body simply has to take up before we leave.

If we don't take this up before November, quite honestly, those who didn't try to take it up shouldn't come back because we need people who will take it up because it is the will of the people. Democrats, Independents, and even Republicans are looking at this as an issue that is important and has to happen.

Again, thank you so much for all your work on this for so many years. ALAN LOWENTHAL and I are freshman here. We are the newbies. We are taking up the fight, but you have been doing it for so many years and been a mentor to so many of us. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL, and thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. LOWENTHAL went through all the numbers for the State of California. It has the same effect in my State of Wisconsin. When you look at it, if you raise that minimum wage to $10.10, as the bill from Senator HARKIN does and the one that Representative GEORGE MILLER from California has introduced in this body, not only is it 28 million people in this country that will get a raise, but it is half a million people just in my home State of Wisconsin, a half million people.

One of the things that I have heard sometimes when you talk to people, they say, ''If you raise the minimum wage, all you are doing is giving extra pocket money to teenagers who are living with their parents.''

Well, that is one of the great myths that is out there because here is the reality: the average age of a minimum wage worker is 35 years old. When you look at the exact breakout of who it is, 90 percent are over 20 years old, and

more than half of them are older than 25 years old.

You are not talking about a teenager living at home. You are talking about people who are living independently in the community, trying to get by on $7.35 an hour or close to $15,000 a year, in a job that often has no benefits—health benefits, pension, et cetera.

Fifty-five percent of the people on minimum wage are working full time. Forty-four percent have some type of college education, an associate degree or bachelor's degree or other higher education. That is the reality of the minimum wage worker in this country. It is not the myth of a teenager living at home, looking for some pocket money.

These are hardworking people trying to get by, often on two or three jobs, without the benefits. Without that ability, if they miss their rent, they get evicted, and then they are homeless. As Mr. RANGEL said, these are some of the same people that then show up on our health plans that States provide for being low-income.

So you know who then is subsidizing their salaries? We all are. Every single individual who is a taxpayer pays into those programs. While that employer may not offer a wage that they can live on, we all subsidize it, so that they can actually get something as basic as health care.

So there is a real need to pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act that is proposed. We have tried and tried in this body to get a vote on it. We have signed a discharge petition. Virtually every Democrat in the House of Representatives has signed that.

We need those Republicans, especially those Republicans who are on record supporting a minimum wage, to also sign that, so we can get a vote before we leave in a few weeks, before the November elections, before the end of the year—because I think a question that I would want to ask my Representative when I see them in the community in the coming weeks before the election is: What have they done to help make the middle class stronger? What have they done to help people who are aspiring to be in the minimum class? What have we got done in Congress?

There was a Congress in 1948 that was called the do-nothing Congress because they got so little done. The first year of that session, they passed 350 bills. Last year, this body passed 88.

Here we are sitting another week back in Congress, and we haven't raised the minimum wage, we haven't passed equal pay for equal work so that women make just as much as men do, and we haven't done anything about the affordability of higher education, allowing students to refinance their loans.

These are simple issues that aren't partisan issues. They are not Democratic/Republican. They are not liberal/conservative. They are about whether or not you are fighting for the middle class and those who aspire to be in the middle class or whether you are here trying to help out the special interests and the lobbyists who represent the special interests. It is really that simple.

So we need to pass a raise for the American people. That means you pass an increase in the minimum wage. As other Members have said, it will lift so many people out of poverty and give a raise to so many people to help stimulate the economy.

So the Progressive Caucus is fighting each and every single day while we are here for a variety of issues: raising the minimum wage, trying to stop wage theft in this country, trying to extend unemployment insurance so that everyone who is out of work can still get some benefits while they are looking for work so that they can get that job. We all know the best social program is a job, and we want to make sure that everyone can get that job.

We need to continue to do the things that Congress needs to get done and we have not gotten done. So the minimum wage is one issue that we wanted to talk about today.

As we have the President speaking to us this evening, we want to make sure that this body has a very full and rich debate. As we passed in a bipartisan way, 370–40, we need to have a real debate and have real questions answered before we get involved, so that we never again have what happened the last time we got involved in Iraq because we are back again. There was no ''mission accomplished.'' A banner and a fly-in in military gear is not a successful end to an involvement.

We need to make sure whatever we do this time is thoughtful, done with consultation of Congress, with narrow scope, and with a partnership with other nations specifically in the region to make sure that we are doing this not alone or not largely alone.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus appreciates this time this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

ISSUES FACING THE NATION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleagues across the aisle talking about the economy and pushing for a raise in minimum wage because that is what a party does after their party has totally devastated the economy. It is what you do after your party's President, with help from the majority in the Senate led by HARRY REID, are able to just wreak havoc with an economy that should be doing really well.

This economy is ready to take off. ObamaCare, as we have said for over 4 years, is going to harm the economy. It is going to knock people out of work. It is going to put people from full time to part time. Republicans have been explaining this ever since not one of us voted for that bill. We also explained there were $716 billion in cuts to Medicare.

A lot of seniors that vote Democrat voted for this President, voted for a Democratic majority in the Senate. They have now been shocked this year as they are not getting the health care they once did. Why? Because of ObamaCare—seniors are getting mistreated.

When we want to talk about the economy, the most staggering numbers I can imagine have come out in the last year, and the President has even acknowledged it was true. He complains we are not doing enough for the middle class.

Well, we agree with that. We certainly agree with that. We need to help those that are not making enough money. Then quit knocking them out of their jobs, Mr. President, HARRY REID. We have got over 360 bills down at the Senate. Passage of just 10 of them would help this economy, but they won't bring them up.

So the devastating, most incredible numbers are these: since Barack Obama has been President of the United States, for the first time in our Nation's history—it has never ever happened before in any President's tenure, whether it was 4 years or 8 years or shortened by tragedy, no President before Barack Obama has ever presided over an economy in the United States in which 95 percent of all the income in the United States went to the top 1 percent, never ever.

Only under the leadership of President Barack Obama, of all the Presidents, only this President has brought us to the place where 95 percent of all of the income in America goes to the top 1 percent.

People wonder why there is so much money that flooded into the Obama campaign in 2008. Not as much flooded into his campaign in 2012 because there was some people losing money. The economy wasn't doing as well as expected.

Is there anything more devastating than a President acknowledging the fact that 95 percent of all income has gone to the top 1 percent? Then he gives speeches and talks to people like he can't understand how the Republicans could allow this big growth between the poor and the rich. Well, we need the President to tell us how he has done it, but the trouble is we know how he has done it.

He talks about fat cats and then makes sure that they are the ones that get rewarded. He talks about going after Big Oil and proposes a bill that would do nothing to hurt Big Oil, but would absolutely have devastated independent oil producers who actually drill and produce around 95 percent or so of the United States' oil and gas wells.

Because of this President's ObamaCare, because of his overregulation, because of his top-down demands from the EPA wanting to usurp all authority for people that couldn't find their rears with both hands, they are the ones that are telling industry how to run their industries.

This President has created a mess. He demonizes companies for trying to survive by moving to a country that has a corporate income tax rate that is a fraction of the rate we have.

We now have the largest—the highest corporate tax in the world, and this President thinks the answer is more taxes. He has never been educated by people who know how an economy really works, people like Arthur Laffer that helped Ronald Reagan get the economy going after President Carter nearly killed it.

He has never sat down at the feet of people really who understand economies and what makes them work, what makes them fail. So he doesn't understand that when government uses its heavy, heavy hand, they hurt economies.

When the President pronounces laws out of his mouth that have never passed Congress and makes that the newly-enforced law, then it creates havoc in the economy because capital goes where it feels safest.

When you have a President, like a dictator, that just pronounces new laws because he doesn't like what Congress has passed and prior Presidents have signed, then companies are not going to be able to survive very well in that environment, so they move on and go somewhere where they can survive better.

The answer to getting people better jobs and higher wages is not to mandate further regulation. The answer is to lower the corporate tax, draw more companies back here, so that people can have better jobs, people can have more jobs.

I know at some point—because there is so much intelligence in the African American community, I know at some point a majority are going to figure out that the Democrats have done massive damage to the African American communities and that the answer is not making them more dependent on the Federal Government, but in pushing them to reach their potential, to reach for the sky, not with Federal handouts, but with good-paying jobs.

I was in Marshall, Texas, just in the last few weeks. There was a young African American who has been out of school for a while. He was so excited because he had been able to go through the 5-week truck driving school there, was getting his commercial driver's license, and for the first time in his life, he was going to get a good job paying $40,000 to $42,000. It excited me seeing him so excited. He is just a huggable guy that was so thrilled.

So now that he had a job promise that was coming up in a couple of weeks when he finished and he knew how much he was going to make and that, in 3 years, he had the chance of making $100,000, that he has now gotten engaged—because he wanted to wait until he had a job and he could take care of his wife and they could take care of each other.

He didn't want to be on the Federal dole. He wanted to provide for himself. This man had all kinds of capability, and now, he is going to be able to meet it, not because of this President or the overregulation, but because he took a 5-week training program and was going to get a good job.

That is where you help people, not in the handouts, but in the hand helping to rise up to the potential that God has given them.

Some have claimed Republicans have a war on women, that women only make 70 percent of what the men have. There are so many false statistics that are quoted. We know it is very unfortunate. We are very sorry that the White House penalizes women and rewards men because the men make a lot more in the same top positions than the women do. So apparently, that does happen some places, and we hope the President will address it in his own White House lawn, in his own house and yard.

The fact is if across the country everybody was paying women only 70 percent of what they paid men for the same job—people are smarter than the President realizes—they would be hiring nothing but women because they work for so much cheaper.

That is one of the problems that the African American community has. When huge businesses combined with the Democratic Party to bring in and lure as many illegal aliens into this country as they can and start giving massive numbers of amnesty, then they are not going to have as many job opportunities, and they are not going to make as much money.

People are beginning to see that in the African American community. That is why their unemployment rate is so much higher than that in other ethnic communities and the overall unemployment rate—such damage to such wonderful people.

Just like that young man in Marshall, Texas, another—he was a much older guy, big guy, African American, just thrilled for the man because he is graduating, he has got a job coming up, he has been out of work so long.

You don't help people by saying, ''We are going to pay you for a year not to work.'' You help create an environment where there are jobs where you can reach your potential.

Mr. Speaker, the question that my friends ought to be asking is, ''Why is one job no longer enough for so many Americans?'' If we get to the bottom of it, you will find out. ObamaCare is a problem, overregulation is a problem, stifling America becoming energy independent by propping up forms of energy that do not create a profit unless they are propped up by taxpayer dollars—let this economy run. Let people reach their potential.

One other thing: I know the President is going to be making a speech on Syria. I literally thank God that the President was not able to do a bombing campaign like he wanted to do a year ago, in which he literally would have done so much damage to—not a good man, but the leader in Syria, Assad, that it would have allowed ISIS to be in charge now. People across America have figured out ISIS is a threat to all of us.

I will wait to see what the President has to say, but when you know that the President was wrong about Egypt, about the Muslim Brotherhood taking over in Egypt, was wrong when he was pushing to keep the Muslim Brotherhood and a tyrant like Morsi in charge in Egypt, when over a third of the population in Egypt came to the streets and said, ''We don't want radical Islam; and you, America, under Barack Obama, you helped us with a constitution that doesn't even include impeachment, it is shari'a law''—and they have now passed a constitution that requires the Christian churches and Jewish synagogues be rebuilt with government money, and this administration continues to be heavy-handed against them because they didn't want radical Islamists in charge.

□ 1800

In Libya, as moderate Muslims in the Middle East have told me in visits over there: None of us really liked Qadhafi, but he was helping you and helping us against terrorism and you helped al Qaeda-backed rebels take him out.

But for America's bombing, the radical Islamists would not have control of Libya, Algeria, or Tunisia today. Thank God for the Egyptians rising up and saying, as moderate Muslims, as secularists: We stand with the Jews and the Christians, and we don't want radical Islamists running our country.

I hope this country—our country's leadership, at least, under the President—will wake up. Stop hurting the freedom-loving Egyptians that don't want the radical Islamists you supported in Egypt back in charge of Egypt. Don't help ISIS in Syria. Don't help them in Iraq. And if he had just signed the Status of Forces Agreement that President Bush had all but had ready to sign, getting cute with that so it fell apart, then we wouldn't be having all these problems today in Iraq and Syria that we are.

He is getting horrible advice, and it is time the President took a hard look at who he really gets advice from, because the moderate Muslims in the world don't want radical Islam taking over and they don't, as they have told me privately, like the people that this President has advising him.

The economy is ready to take off, if this President will get out of the way, and people can make money and get back to where one job is enough for a person to make it and do well. And if

we cut down on the massive expenses ObamaCare is causing, we can get rid of that and get back to real health care reform. Because even if you save $100, $200 a month, that would get you a vacation that people have not gotten this year.

There is so much we can do for America if the government of this country, the people at the top of the government, will just finally realize the American people have more answers than we do, and then they will show us.

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

U.S. ECONOMY

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to talk about the United States economy. I want to talk about the number one thing that politicians talk about when they ask you to support them when they are on the campaign trail, and that is that we want to put America to work.

I know what it is like to put America to work because I am very proud to say that, before I got elected to office, my full-time job was to put Americans to work. I owned a business, and there were dozens of families who depended on me as the leader of that business, as the owner of that business, to make sure that we were successful. So I had to do my job so that dozens of people could go to work and do their job.

Every year, millions of Americans go to the polls and hope and pray and think and expect that their elected people are going to focus on putting America to work. But unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, the leadership of this House under Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has been delinquent in doing one simple thing, and that is to focus on bills that create jobs. In some cases, it is bills that move government out of the way to make sure that people can put people to work in private industry. In some cases, it is about changing laws that are broken and old and just don't work for today's economy, changing those laws to make sure that Americans can go to work.

Democrats have made jump-starting our economy a priority, and I believe in that priority. Since I have been elected to Congress, I have been fighting for that priority to try to get bills heard in our committees that will create jobs, that will move America forward, and that will move Americans who are hard-pressed and want to get off of the unemployment lines back into work. I have been trying to get them through committee and eventually to the floor of this House so we can have the debates and we can cast our votes for America. Unfortunately, those bills just languish, sitting somewhere in the corner, and don't see the light of day.

For example, the biggest bill to ever pass either the House or the United States Senate since this 113th Congress has come into session was a bill that was passed by the United States Senate with bipartisan support. There are 100 United States Senators, ladies and gentlemen, and 68—Democrats and Republicans—voted ''aye,'' voted ''yes,'' voted affirmatively for that bill. If this House would have taken up that bill, or H.R. 15, a bill that looks just like it, that would have boosted our economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, you hear people all the time right now today on the campaign trail saying, ''Reelect me,'' or, ''Elect me,'' and they are talking about the economy and talking about deficit reduction. That one bill was analyzed by a third party. It was not analyzed by the Democrats, not analyzed by the Republicans, not even analyzed by the Independents. It was analyzed by a third party whose job is just to call it like it is. That bill, if passed by Congress and put on the President's desk, would give us an opportunity to have a deficit reduction of at least $900 billion. But that bill doesn't see the light of day—not in this House.

That bill has not been taken up in this House. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has said over and over: I'm not going to take up that bill. I'm not going to take up that issue. I'm not going to support the American economy with that bill. I'm not going to do the right thing by America and give the economy of the United States of America the biggest boost we could ever see coming out of the actions of the United States Senate and this House of Congress.

It has been sitting here in this House in the corner collecting dust while too many Americans are having their unemployment run out, while too many Americans are losing their homes, while too many Americans are telling their children: I'm sorry, son, we can't afford to continue to send you to college. We don't have any money because we don't have a job.

The United States economy can do better, but unfortunately, it is because this Congress chooses not to do the right thing that the United States economy moves along slowly, picking up just a little bit. That is not good enough. That is not right.

What I am doing here at this moment tonight and the reason why I came to this floor, the reason why I asked the Speaker to give me some time to speak on an important issue—the economy of the United States of America—is because it tears me apart to know that the lack of leadership in this House and the lack of leadership of Speaker BOEHNER is crippling our economy.

We have $900 billion of deficit reduction wrapped up in one bill, and that bill has sat in this House and has not heard a debate in any committee. It has not heard a debate on the floor of this House. The people that you elected have not had an opportunity. The 435 Members of the United States Congress have not had an opportunity to stake a claim on whether or not they believe that we ought to put Americans to work, that we ought to get out of the way and fix a law that is broken, a law that does not work, a law that should have been changed a long time ago; but we can change it at any moment on any given day in this House, and this Speaker refuses to allow that to happen.

What is going on right now in the United States Congress is just like what happens in your home or sometimes in a workplace. Let's say you have a family and everybody in the family has been assigned their chores, their responsibilities. Let's say you have a workplace where everybody has their job duties and their titles.

In the United States Congress, we have our chores and we have our responsibilities. Our job is to pass laws to help America move forward and to make sure that all the different dynamics of the number one economy in the world can flourish. That is our job. But the United States Congress, this House, has refused to do its job.

What is going on is just like that example I gave you. Let's say in your home one member of your family chooses not to do their part. You know what happens? Something good eventually happens. Somebody in that house, somebody in that home, somebody in that workplace sees that that job is not getting done, even if it is not their primary responsibility, and they think of the bigger picture. They think of the whole family, the whole house, the whole home. That person in the workplace thinks of the whole body of workers there and says: Somebody ought to take that job and get it done, even though so-and-so isn't doing their part—and that is their job.

Congress is not doing its job. It is not passing this law. But you know what happens eventually? Somebody walks over there and does it themselves, even though it is not their primary responsibility. But we ought to be grateful that there are people like that in every community, in every household, in every business, in every work environment. But not in this House, not as long as JOHN BOEHNER, our Speaker, chooses not to allow us to have a debate, to do our job, to have a vote. Maybe it passes, maybe it fails, but our job as Members of Congress is to legislate, put ideas, good, bad, and otherwise, before the Members of this House and vote up or down, ''yea'' or ''nay'', ''yes'' or ''no,'' to move America forward and let the votes fall where they may.

There is a bill that has been languishing in this House for close to a year and a half, and the bottom line is we have not taken up our duties and our responsibilities. As a result of that, in another branch of government there is that one person—not 435, not 100—that says: I want to move the economy of the United States of America forward. I want to fix a broken system. I want to see it fixed. I want Congress to

put this on my desk so that I can do my job and sign it and watch Americans go back to work. All of a sudden, the one person who says: Since you won't do your job, I will go over there and to the best of my ability, to the extent that I legally can, I am just going to have to do as much as I can, lift as much as I can and do the heavy lifting because Congress won't, and he gets criticized.

□ 1815

That is a shame, ladies and gentlemen. That is a shame.

When, in the workplace, or somebody's household, somebody decides to step over and say, you know what, since you won't do it, and it is the right thing to do, I am going to do it. And then they criticize that person. He is the bad guy.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. The bad guy, the bad person is the one that says, I know I have duties, I know I have responsibilities, I just don't want to do it because I can say I don't want to. And if I don't want to, it doesn't get done, at least not in this House.

That is what is going on, ladies and gentlemen. The United States Congress is sitting on a bill that will supercharge the economy of the United States of America, to the tune of deficit reduction of as much as $900 billion with one bill, one vote of this House. And our current speaker, the Republican leader, does not want to let that happen.

The President of the United States is another branch of government. The President of the United States is part of that balance of power. But when one branch of government is delinquent, is derelict in their duties, there comes a time where that person has to say, hey, what can I legally do? I want to step up. I want to put America to work and, as a result of that, has to take action.

Now, to me, that is a duty bestowed upon every single one of us elected officials, and I am so disappointed that I got elected to a Congress that has been labeled as a do-nothing Congress. I got elected to a Congress that the statistics, not just opinions, but the facts show that this Congress has passed so few laws that people can actually legitimately say that we are do-nothing Congress.

That is a shame. We have responsibilities to this country. When we act responsibly, we make our country what it is, the best country on the planet, and when that happens, the whole world is a better place. But that has not been this 113th Congress, not under this Speaker, not now.

But the most important thing that I want to get across today, that could change. That could change tomorrow morning. We could have that bill on the floor of this Congress tomorrow. We could have it on this floor next week, and we can unleash what Americans go to vote for, and that is action.

Let the votes fall where they may, ladies and gentlemen. Our duty, as Congress, is to hear bills on this floor, have the debate from the left and from the right, from the center and all, come one, come all, Members of Congress, and then the Speaker says, open the roll, and there go the votes, green ones, red ones, ''yea,'' ''nay.''

But just on that one bill, ladies and gentlemen, more Americans will go to work as a result of one piece of legislation than any other thing that this Congress has been poised to do in this 113th Congress.

So right now, as the clock ticks, as Congress might adjourn in just a couple of weeks or so, it is going to be left for another branch of government to decide to move this economy forward, to put Americans to work.

That is a shame. That is not the way it should be. That is not the way it was designed to be.

But the Constitution of the United States, you have all heard it, everybody who has taken government class, it is called the balance of powers: executive branch, judicial branch, the legislative branch.

But when one of those branches is derelict in their duties, as this House has been derelict in their duty to put Americans to work, it takes a committed American, it takes a brave American, to step up and say, ''I will do it''; to be careful about how it is done, to be doing it in a way that is legal and does follow the Constitution of the United States of America.

But more importantly, ladies and gentlemen, to get the job done, to put America to work, to break a broken system, to break a set of laws and renew that into a law, into action that will actually put America to work and allow us to continue to be the great Nation that we have become.

But, unfortunately, there is a piece of our government, this House, that is not living up to that greatness. It is not living up to its responsibilities. It is not living up to its duties, this House, this do-nothing Congress.

When I say do-nothing Congress, that is so painful to me. I am the son of parents who used to wake me up, sometimes before the sun came up, to go to work in my father's business. And what my father used to tell me—I was 5, 6 years old when he had me working with him—he used to say, son, the work is not done. We have got to keep working.

Sometimes, so much that my hands would bleed, and I would put on my best crying game and I would say, Dad, look, my hands are bleeding. Can I sit in the truck?

My father was a handyman. We used to clean fields and clear out houses or whatever odd job that people had for us. He would take me to work with him. And I remember the first time I thought I was going to be able to sit it out and not do my part because my hands were bleeding. I had blisters, they turned into—they busted, and then they turned into blood, and I showed them to my dad and I tried to give him my best sob story.

And he told me, son, the work is not done. We have got to get back to work. Now get back to work.

Oh, I hated him for it.

That is a leader, someone who can look someone in the eye and say, you need to be what you need to be right now. And that is someone who gets the job done, not someone who looks for excuses, not someone who tells stories, not someone who tries to get off the hook. You need to be the person that gets the job done.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, this House is not the House that gets the job done. It hurts for me to say that. I hate saying it. But sometimes the truth hurts. That is not my opinion, ladies and gentlemen. I am just restating the facts.

I hated my father when he taught me that lesson. But it wasn't until I grew up, and it wasn't until I had to put food on the table for my family, it wasn't until I grew up and ran my own business, that I realized that it is not about the easy way out. It is not about quitting. It is not about being derelict in your duties. It is about accepting your responsibilities, acting out on those responsibilities, working through your responsibilities, not making up stories, not holding press conferences and hoodwinking the American public into thinking that it can't be done.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. We can take care of business on this floor from today to tomorrow and get a bill to the other House, or take a bill from the Senate, take it through this House and get it to the President overnight.

So any time some Congressman or U.S. Senator tells you, no, no, no, there is not enough time, as long as there is at least 1 day, 1 day of legislation left—oh, as a matter of fact, both Houses have the authority to call back their entire House and say, our business is not done. We can get it done tomorrow. Call every Member of Congress, call every Member of the United States Senate to their Chamber, and say, we have got work to do.

There is no time off for us. There is no time away from these Chambers, we are going to get the work done.

But this House chooses not to do its job.

Some people might think, well, this Congressman, this Congressman CÁRDENAS, he is kind of talking a little strong about this House. You better believe it. We are the Congress of the United States of America.

There have been moments in this House where we have been applauded by America for the kind of bravery and the kind of work that gets done in this House. That hasn't happened much lately, not in the 113th Congress.

One bill, ladies and gentlemen, one bill has been sitting in this House, languishing, collecting dust, while millions of Americans are out of work. That is a shame. That is a shame.

I wish there were more Members of this Congress like my father, who knew how to get the job done, who knew how

to focus on the people that depended on him, who had a ''don't quit'' attitude.

My father was a man of few words. Few words. But when he spoke, he was serious, he was forthright, and he got the job done. And he had the guts, he had the fortitude, he had the character to know that sometimes, when it meant him getting the job done, it meant that maybe he wasn't going to be too popular, even with his own son.

I am so glad, so proud to be the son of a man and a woman, Maria and Andres Cárdenas, who taught me how to go to work every single day, and whatever my duties were, whatever my responsibilities were, it wasn't about me, it was about the work that I committed to do and to get it done.

Every week I leave my family in my district in California, in the San Fernando Valley, and I kiss them goodbye, and I hope and pray that they put me to work, that I get to do the work that I was elected to do. But that hasn't been happening in this House.

And I am not alone, ladies and gentlemen. I talk to a lot of Members of this House and they feel the same. They want to move America forward. They want to get this economy up and running the way it should be, the way America deserves to be.

□ 1830

This House refuses to help make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I really do hope and pray that we can put America to work, that we can pass a bill that will create $900 billion of deficit reduction opportunity. I hope and pray that we can do that. Unfortunately, it is not up to me. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. It is not up to me. I do not have the authority or the ability to put a bill in the House of Congress.

I have introduced bills. That is my right—I can introduce bills, and I do do that—but the only person who has the authority to decide if a bill will be heard by this House is the Speaker of this House, and he is elected Republican JOHN BOEHNER. He is the man. He is the person who refuses to put a bill on the floor of this House, so that every Member of Congress can have the opportunity to do his job and help put America to work.

I am a proud American, and I am so honored and privileged to be a Member of the United States Congress, to represent the 29th District in California, the place that I was born and raised in and the community that I love. It is just a microcosm of what this great Nation is about, what it is, and my hands are tied. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. I am just telling you the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, please, please put that bill on this floor. Put it in motion. Do your job, so that we can do our jobs, so that Americans can have jobs, so that we, as Members of this Congress, can put America to work.

We have a broken immigration system, and one bill can fix that. We have a broken system in this country, and that one bill will put $900 billion toward deficit reduction for America. That one bill will unleash our economy and create hundreds of thousands of opportunities for Americans to go back to work.

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

REAUTHORIZE THE ZADROGA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the 13th anniversary of the terrorist attack of 9/11. It is a day for us to remember and mourn those we lost, to comfort those who suffer still, and to honor those who responded on that day with courage and determination.

In New York on those dark days, there were thousands of anonymous civilians and first responders who, without a second's thought, gave their aid. They ran into burning buildings to save the lives of others. It is a day on which we lost 3,000 people, and thousands more lost their health in the wake of 9/11.

In response to the health crisis that the responders and others faced, this Congress came together in a bipartisan way and introduced the Zadroga Act. The Zadroga Act would provide health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others.

Whenever we talk about 9/11, we have to acknowledge the heroes and heroines of 9/11, some who lost their lives that day and those who are still sick and dying from the injuries and illnesses related to 9/11. As a Congress, we came together in groups all over America to comfort one another, and we stood together in our Nation's capital and vowed that we would never forget.

Never forget means that we don't forget next year or today, but we are always there to honor and to provide the health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others that day.

We came together this week in New York with a determination to put forward a reauthorization of the Zadroga Act for 25 years, which would continue this program, so that the certainty would be there, so that the services and health care would be there for the first responders, the victims, the residents, and others who became ill.

That vow of never forget comes with an obligation on the part of Congress, which is to ensure that we as a country remember, honor, and care for those who are now sick and for those who may still become sick from exposure to the deadly toxin mixes down at 9/11, mixes of fuel and glass and toxins and all kinds of chemicals that they breathed that day.

A major piece of that promise was the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. This legislation established the World Trade Center Health Program to provide medical monitoring and treatment for 9/11-related illnesses and reopened the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide for economic losses and harm incurred from the aftermath of the attacks.

We know that there are thousands of individuals with at least one 9/11-related illness or injury. That includes over 2,900 people in the World Trade Center Health Program who have been diagnosed with cancer.

We know that more than 800 New York Fire Department members and more than 550 New York Police Department personnel are struggling with serious 9/11-related illnesses.

We know that we have already lost over 70 firefighters and 60 New York Police Department officers who have died from their 9/11-related illnesses since 9/11. These are people who got sick while working at the pile, and they have died because of their exposure.

We must continue to provide the specialized medical monitoring and care these heroes received through the World Trade Center Health Program and continue to provide economic compensation for the terrible costs they have borne by caring for those who cared so much for us.

As it stands, the Zadroga Act is set to expire in October 2015, yet the medical and economic crises of sick 9/11 responders and suffering survivors will not end in 2 years. They will only get worse over time. Research shows significantly higher rates of cancer among the 9/11 population, a disease with a long latency period. Diseases can take decades to manifest themselves.

That is why I plan to introduce, along with PETER KING, JERRY NADLER, the New York delegation, and many others, legislation that would reauthorize the Zadroga Act's program for 25 years.

Named after Detective Zadroga, who was the first to die from 9/11-related injuries, many others have been helped through this important program. It would continue the specialized Centers of Excellence, the national health program, the research into new medical conditions, and the victims compensation fund for those who may develop 9/11 illnesses later and suffer related economic damages.

This is not just a New York issue, and I would like to share this map with my colleagues to demonstrate how widespread it is. This map shows that there were first responders and volunteers who came from every corner of America.

They returned to their hometowns, and that is why we have Centers of Excellence across this country to serve the responders and the volunteers who came to 9/11. Many of them are now sick from the toxins that they were exposed to at Ground Zero.

Some from the tristate area have since moved to other parts of the country. The map demonstrates the health programs participating, and participants are in 429 of the 435 congressional districts. This means that in almost every Member's district, there are constituents who are accessing or who are being treated under the Zadroga health program.

These are your constituents who are being monitored and who may be receiving treatment for 9/11-related diseases.

These Zadroga Act programs are vital to the sick and dying. They are vital to those to whom we said we will never forget. If we do not continue this program, then we are forgetting, so it is critical that we keep this promise and renew this program.

Together, we can affirm what we said 13 years ago, that we will never forget what happened here, that we will never forget what was endured, and that we will never forget what we promised.

As I said, this map illustrates that the populations in most of the congressional districts are being served by this.

Today, there was a Gold Medal given to the museum in New York City for 9/11, to the museum at the Pentagon for 9/11, and to the museum in Pennsylvania for 9/11. I urge my colleagues to visit all of these museums and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum which, so far, has had more than 14 million visitors since opening in September of 2011.

The museum serves as the focal point to examining the implications of the events of 9/11, documenting the impact of these events, and exploring the continuing significance of September 11, 2001. The 12,000 artifacts, 23,000 images, and almost 2,000 oral stories displayed at the museum remind all of us of that tragedy and what befell and happened that day.

I want to tell the story of the man with the red bandana. He has since been identified as an equities trader who stayed behind and tied a red bandana around his face and helped many, many people get rescued, yet he fell when the towers fell.

It tells the brave stories of many heroes and heroines—of first responders and participants—who helped others in the burning buildings that day.

Now the museum has a new exhibit, one that marks an important event in our Nation's response to 9/11. It now displays at the museum a uniform worn by one of the members of SEAL Team Six.

This is the courageous team that raided Pakistan, where Osama bin Laden was found and killed. It is a magnificent exhibit. I am proud to have had a role in helping to secure this artifact, and I hope people will have the opportunity to visit this new exhibit.

The story of 9/11 is not just of the suffering and of the tragedy of that day, but also of the response—how we came together, united and determined, as a Congress. We came together to fight back, and I have never seen us work so strongly towards a common goal.

In 2002, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security, which brought together 22 separate agencies and offices into a single Cabinet-level department in order to secure our country from threats such as border security and cybersecurity, as well as coordinating efforts to respond to emergencies.

We also created the bipartisan 9/11 Congressional Caucus, which eventually led to the creation of the 9/11 Commission to investigate what exactly went wrong with our security and to make recommendations to protect our Nation against a terrorist attack.

The Commission and its staff reviewed over 2.5 million pages of documents; interviewed over 1,200 individuals in 12 countries, including every relevant senior official of both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations; and held 19 days of public hearings across the country, with over 160 witnesses testifying.

This independent bipartisan Commission produced a book, the ''9/11 Commission Report,'' which is a well-informed report that served as a blueprint for improving our security. The book sold more copies than Harry Potter, and it came out with suggestions of what we needed to do to make our country safer.

□ 1845

Released in August of 2004, the Commission's report diagnosed the national security failures that led to 9/11 and offered steps that we needed to take to avoid future attacks. We worked together in the Congress—Chris Shays and myself and other Members of Congress—to support all of the 9/11 Commission Caucus' recommendations and the Commission recommendations.

This led to the biggest reorganization of our country's security system, the biggest reorganization of our government, since 1948, after World War II, and it created the Department of Homeland Security and forced all of the independent intelligence agencies to share information, not only on the national level but on the local level, with people who were working in the intelligence area for our protection.

Since 9/11, former Police Commissioner Kelly has informed us that well over 14 attacks on the city of New York were stopped because of the improved intelligence and police work that came out of this reorganization that we passed and put in place in Congress.

Congress established a whole Civil Liberties Oversight Board in 2004 and later strengthened it in 2007. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board was there to ensure that privacy and civil liberties concerns are fully considered when implementing antiterrorism laws, regulations, and executive branch policies.

So the story of 9/11 is not only the suffering, the health challenges, but also the story of how this Congress came together to address the challenges to reorganize, rebuild, change our government, our intelligence system, and put in place many safety measures that have served us well and have built our country into a stronger country and one that is better able to address terrorist attacks.

I am pleased to have with me now JERROLD NADLER from New York. He represents the 9/11 site. It is in the district that he is privileged to represent. He has worked long and hard not only on the 9/11 Caucus, on the 9/11 Commission Report, the laws that we have worked hard to put into law, but also the Zadroga Act, which together we worked on for over a decade, and yet it is now nearing a time when it will expire.

We have to make sure that this bill is reauthorized and that never forget means just that, that we will never forget, and that means continuing the health care and compensation for those who sacrificed so much to help others. They were there for us. We need to be there for them.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York, JERRY NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, Osama bin Laden orchestrated the deadliest terrorist attack in American history, killing almost 3,000 people immediately and wounding thousands more. The attacks also created an environmental nightmare. Hundreds of tons of contaminants poured onto the streets and canyons of Manhattan and Brooklyn and other areas, northern New Jersey, covering responders and survivors in toxic dust.

In the days following the attack, the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States Government, contrary to ample evidence, insisted that the air in lower Manhattan and Brooklyn was safe to breathe. Thousands of responders remained on the site for search, rescue, and cleanup efforts; and thousands of survivors returned to their homes, but the air was not safe to breathe. The EPA was not telling the truth.

Now, I don't get angry at the government for the first few days, maybe even a week or two, encouraging people to help with the rescue operation when we still thought it might be a rescue operation, but after that 2 weeks, when people were working at the site for weeks and months without proper respiratory protection because the Federal Government was telling them that no protection was necessary because the air was safe to breathe, that was no longer a rescue operation. It was a cleanup operation. There was no one alive to be saved at that point, and people whose lives and health were put in danger at that point were put in danger in vain because the air was not safe to breathe, despite the assurances of the EPA.

Today, more than 30,000 first responders and survivors are sick and in need of special care because of that. It was for those tens of thousands of brave, selfless, and innocent responders and survivors that Congress came together in 2010, after many years of struggle and negotiation, to pass the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act in order to fulfill a moral obligation to, as Lincoln said, ''care for him who shall have borne the battle.''

Today, the programs are working. Residents of all 50 States and 431 of the 435 congressional districts receive health care through the 9/11 health program. More than 7,800 individuals have been found eligible for compensation from the victim compensation fund. More than $490 million has so far been awarded, and new applications are processed every day.

But the Federal Government's duty to support those who have become ill in the aftermath of 9/11 and those whose illnesses have yet to manifest themselves—because we know that many of the illnesses and many of the cancers take years to show themselves, that duty is not done, even as the programs we authorized in 2010 are set to expire.

We must continue to provide health care coverage to the tens of thousands currently enrolled in the 9/11 health program and ensure that no eligible individuals are denied access to the victims compensation fund. Our obligation will carry us far into the future.

Thousands of individuals exposed to the toxic air on 9/11 and in the weeks and days following that—even those who are healthy today we know will face major health issues in the years to come, as latent cancers and other illnesses emerge. For that reason, I am proud to work with Representatives MALONEY and KING and Senators GILLIBRAND and SCHUMER to try to reauthorize these critical programs.

I urge all of our colleagues to work with us in support of a reauthorization and to move this bill through Congress and onto the President's desk as soon as possible.

Just as we stood together, as a Nation, in the days following September 11, 2001, just as we stood strong together in 2010 to create these vital programs, we must join forces again to ensure that the heroes of 9/11 are not abandoned when they need us most. We must pass a new reauthorization to sustain these programs. We must protect the heroes and survivors of 9/11.

There are really two separate moral imperatives here that we must meet. The first is that we must show that the United States takes care of its own. We take care of those who fall in our battles, who are wounded in our struggles. And the attack on 9/11 was not an attack on New York City. It was not an attack on the World Trade Center. It was not against the Port Authority of New York. It was an attack on America, an attack on the United States. The particular victims happened to be located in New York. And we must show that we do not leave people behind on the battlefield, that we take care of those who are wounded on our behalf.

The second moral imperative is that much of the injuries that continue to be felt, much of the illnesses with which people suffer, much of the illnesses which we don't know about but which people will suffer from in the years to come are the direct fault of the Federal Government because of its assurances, contrary to known facts at the time, that the air was safe to breathe, that people should go back to work, stay working on the pile, and go back to school. We knew better. Many of us said, don't believe the EPA. Don't go back to work. Don't go back to school. This is poison. And it was clear.

And at first, when the EPA was saying this, there was no data to support their safety assurances, and they kept saying it when there was plenty of data to say that the air was not safe to breathe. So because of the false assurances by the Federal Government, many thousands of people relying on those assurances worked without the proper respiratory protection to clean up the site, worked in the area, and helped revive the economy at the expense of their health. And we must, to the extent possible, make them whole today. That is a second moral imperative.

And finally, it must never be said that the United States remembers its heroes and honors its wounded for 13 years and then forgets about them. It has been 13 years. In 2 years, the 9/11 health bill will expire. Let it not be said that we remember for 13 years and take care of people for 15, and that is it. That would be a heck of an epitaph on a moral country.

As we are involved in a war—which it is, unfortunately—against many terrorists across the world, and the President is going to address us on some aspects of that tonight, let us not abandon those who fell, who gave up their health, who continue to suffer on our behalf. It would be wrong. It would be immoral. It would not be worthy of the United States. This is a great and moral Nation. This Congress must show it by reauthorizing the 9/11 bill in a timely fashion.

It is one of the things we must do in response to 9/11. There are many other things we must do, many other things that we have done. But taking care of our own wounded is one of them and one of the attributes of a civilized today.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and so many other important issues.

I would now like to recognize a leader on this issue from New York, Representative of Staten Island and Brooklyn, Congressman GRIMM.

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the gentlewoman from New York. And I echo the sentiments of my colleagues with the need to reauthorize the Zadroga bill in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise alongside my colleagues in the New York delegation also to honor and commemorate the nearly 3,000 innocent Americans whose lives were cut short in the unspeakable attacks on our Nation 13 years ago. Like so many of my constituents in Staten Island and in Brooklyn, I have images of the most horrific sight that I have ever seen burned into my memory forever.

I will never forget what it was like searching for the survivors in the rubble after both towers of the World Trade Center disintegrated into ash. I will never forget the look in the eyes of the firemen, the police, the construction workers as we worked side-by-side. It was a look of overwhelming despair.

And though our hearts broke at the loss of those taken from us, I am very proud of the fact that Americans soon rallied together. We united around an unshakable truth that the servants of hatred and terror did not strike the greatest Nation on Earth at random but because we embodied the very freedom and liberty that they so despise.

As Senator MCCAIN said on the floor of the Senate the day after the attacks, ''Those who unleashed these attacks and those who support them are not our enemies alone. They are the enemies of freedom and independence, of justice and peace. And they wage war on the United States because we are and will remain the principal guarantors of freedom.''

Mr. Speaker, in the Arrochar neighborhood of Staten Island lies a beautiful memorial dedicated to some of the 274 Staten Islanders murdered on 9/11, many of whom were first responders and fallen heroes of our beloved FDNY and NYPD, all of whom went above and beyond the call of duty to bring their fellow New Yorkers to safety.

Amidst the pictures and devotions to the fallen lies an inscription: ''On September 11, 2001, the World Trade Center was attacked by terrorists. From that hatred, a little piece of heaven evolved here called Angel's Circle.''

It reminds us, Mr. Speaker, that from the horror and despair our Nation endured on 9/11 and endures in all of our hearts until this day comes the constant reminder of strength, our pride, and the unwavering heroism at the heart of the American spirit.

May God eternally bless the victims of 9/11. May he bring peace to their loved ones. And may we never, ever forget the sacrifice they bore for our freedom.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for joining us tonight on this Special Order.

Tonight is a time to remember how just 13 years ago, this entire country and even this fractious Congress came together. We were united and determined as I have ever seen this Congress before, strong in our resolve and ready,

without question, to put country before self.

□ 1900

We worked together to bring comfort to the afflicted and justice to the terrorists behind this attack. With bipartisan cooperation, we rebuilt Lower Manhattan, the Pentagon, and put in place a memorial in Pennsylvania honoring the heroes on United Flight 93 that was headed towards our Nation's Capitol.

There is still much more left to do, and we need to have that same spirit to approach the challenges, such as the crucial Anti-Terrorism Risk Insurance Plan, the TRIA bill, has not been reauthorized yet, and the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010 needs to be reauthorized. This and still much more needs to be done, not some day, but now.

Around 9/11, there is a great deal of rhetoric, but actions speak more than words. Let us come together, and let us get these two important bills and other bills done in a bipartisan way.

We shall never forget.

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

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. 1934. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal courthouse to Teton County, Wyoming; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 11, 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:

6976. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Kevin J. Kovacich, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6977. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral Sean S. Buck, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6978. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; City of Newport News, Virginia [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6979. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Harrison County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0004] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6980. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Cass County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6981. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Montgomery County, Texas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6982. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Oceana County, Michigan [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6983. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6984. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection--IDEA Data Management Center [CFDA Number: 84.373M.] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6985. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection--IDEA Fiscal Data Center [CDFA Number: 84.373F.] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities, pursuant to Section 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6987. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a declaration that circumstance exist justifying an authorization pursuant to Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. Section 360bbb-3(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6988. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D3 [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-0138] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6989. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Early Warning Reporting, Foreign Defect Reporting, and Motor Vehicle and Equipment Recall Regulations [Docket No.: NHTSA-2012-0068] (RIN: 2127-AK72) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6990. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6991. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6992. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded by the American Institute and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Understandings Reached at the 2005, 2012, and 2013 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings and a 2009 NSG Intersessional Decision; Additions to the List of NSG Participating Countries [Docket No.: 090130094-3271-01] (RIN: 0694-AD58) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice of a Determination on Imposition and Waiver of Sanctions under Sections 603 and 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6995. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Corrections, Clarifications, and Movement of Definitions (RIN: 1400-AD64) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6996. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the April 16, 2014 — June 14, 2014 reporting period, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a waiver determination pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6998. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-14-3948); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act for the use of funds to provide non-lethal assistance to the Syrian Opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a Drawdown under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to Provide Airlift and Refueling Services to France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7001. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7002. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7003. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of the Navy, transmitting six reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7004. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7005. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7006. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Sufficiency Certification for Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operation and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7007. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Loggerhead Sea Turtle Distinct Population Segment (DPS) and Determination Regarding Critical Habitat for the North Pacific Ocean Loggerhead DPS [Docket No.: 130513467-4401-20] (RIN: 0648-BD27) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7008. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section Criminal Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Resources, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. at the covered facility in Fort Wayne, Indiana, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7010. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Activities of the Review Panel on Prison Rape in Calendar Year 2013 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Data Collection Activities for 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7011. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2015-2019, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7012. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debris Removal: Eligibility of Force Account Labor Straight-Time Costs Under the Public Assistance Program for Hurricane Sandy [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0004] (RIN: 1660-AA75) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7013. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 49.0 to 50.0, West of Harvey Locks, Bank to Bank, Bayou Blue Pontoon Bridge, Lafourche Parish, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0411] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7014. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Treasure Island, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7015. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mantua Creek, Paulsboro, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0710] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7016. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Triathlon, North Coast Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0427] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7017. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Annual Events on the Maumee River, Toledo, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0714] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7018. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Raccoon Creek, Bridgeport, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0711] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7019. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Open Water Swim, Lake Erie, Edgewater Park, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0635] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7020. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0807; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-17888; AD 2014-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7021. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0478; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17902; AD 2014-07-51](RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7022. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Specially Adapted Housing Eligibility for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Beneficiaries (RIN: 2900-AO84) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7023. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2014 annual report; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of September 9, 2014]

The Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4067 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5431. A bill to impose sanctions on foreign financial institutions that engage in certain transactions with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 5432. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5433. A bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434. A bill to suspend the visa waiver program in order for the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the national security risks posed by the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide research, training, and navigator services to youth and young adults on the verge of aging out of the secondary educational system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437. A bill to expand the Pajarita Wilderness and designate the Tumacacori Highlands Wilderness in Coronado National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the Transportation Security Administration from accepting as valid identification an I-862 Notice to Appear form; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441. A bill to amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of total corporate tax paid by a corporation in each annual report required to be filed under such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end tax deferrals on profits accumulated offshore and to terminate the deferral of active income of controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the interest deduction for excessive interest of members of financial reporting groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 5445. A bill to impose a temporary moratorium on the closure or consolidation of any mail processing facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5446. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to exempt certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to increase the availability of pesticides for the management of parasitic pests that adversely impact the health of managed pollinator bees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 719. A resolution recognizing the 20th Anniversary of AmeriCorps on September 12, 2014; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of section 8, of article 1.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 5438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sixteenth Amendment

Congress shall have power to levy, or repeal, taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440.

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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442.

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.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443.

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.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444.

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.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to law 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;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 259: Mr. PERRY and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 292: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 640: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 647: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 842: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1030: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1263: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1278: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1314: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1507: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1563: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1652: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1653: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr MEEHAN, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1699: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1801: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1812: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1827: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1852: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1915: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2130: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2350: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2355: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2364: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2450: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2500: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2502: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2504: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2536: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2607: Mr. TERRY and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2651: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2664: Mr. GRIMM and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2770: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2835: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2955: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2981: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 3150: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3279: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3374: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3482: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 3486: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3489: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3560: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3673: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3712: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3833: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3877: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3899: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3912: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3988: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4013: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 4056: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4119: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 4128: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4136: Mr. COSTA and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4149: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4161: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4190: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4223: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4256: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4259: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4351: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4395: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4432: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4462: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4504: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4510: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 4551: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4552: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4567: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4580: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4629: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4675: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4679: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4682: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 4716: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4717: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4727: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4790: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4793: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4814: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. VELA, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4818: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4837: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4852: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4854: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4857: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4885: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4920: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4957: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4963: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4969: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4977: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4981: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4998: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5065: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5083: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 5087: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5088: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5110: Mr. HARPER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 5156: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5159: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5168: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5182: Mr. HOLT and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 5213: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5217: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VELA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5219: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5226: Mr. POLIS, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5227: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5228: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 5256: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 5268: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 5314: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 5334: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5364: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5370: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5384: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 5392: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 5403: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LANCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5406: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5407: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5409: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 5415: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 5425: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 5430: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.J. Res. 119: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 109: Mr. PETRI.
H. Res. 281: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 428: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 456: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Res. 522: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 543: Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Res. 558: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 596: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 620: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H. Res. 668: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 684: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 711: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.