United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2014 No. 130

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

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

The attention of our Nation is drawn toward a raging tragedy. We are torn by aversion to a repeat of years of military engagement while compelling narratives unfold in so many places around our world.

Send Your spirit among the Members of this people's House, that they might judiciously balance seemingly irreconcilable interests. Help them to execute their consciences and judgments with clarity and purity of heart, so that all might stand before You honestly and trust that You can bring forth righteous fruits from their labors.

On this anniversary of the 9/11 tragedy, may Your healing presence continue in the lives of all who were immediately impacted by the events of that day, and may we as a nation continue to heal and work toward bringing greater peace and security to our world.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MARKING THE ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 13th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on our Nation.

Thirteen years ago, the Nation was reeling in anger and confusion. We were trying to process the enormity of the loss of life we had suffered from the brutal attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and from the downing of the American passenger plane in the field outside Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Thirteen years ago, we did not yet know the full extent of the losses we had suffered or the identities of those responsible or the story of the heroics on the United Flight 93 that in all likelihood saved this historic building from attack.

Thirteen years ago, at this hour, we could not know how these events would change our country and the world, but one thing we do know, even in the midst of all the anger, pain, and the confusion of that awful day, we know that the United States of America would respond with courage and resolve, that the American spirit would triumph, and it has, Mr. Speaker.

So today, let us remember those who died, over 700 from my own home State of New Jersey and from many States and nations around the world. Let's remember those who have fought from that day and given their lives to protect our country over those past 13 years.

Let us renew our determination to honor forever all those whose memories remain a blessing to us and to the Nation we love so much.

INTRODUCING THE SCAN CONTAINERS ABSOLUTELY NOW ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the victims of September 11 and to introduce legislation to protect Americans from potential attacks against targets that I believe still remain vulnerable 13 years later.

Our airports are more secure, but I live near the Port of Los Angeles, and I know that our Nation's ports are not as secure as they should be.

Top security experts recommend that shipping containers entering our Nation's ports be screened for radiological and nuclear materials and other potentially dangerous cargo. If something happened to disrupt commerce at our ports, it would be catastrophic for our entire Nation and the global economy.

Congress passed laws requiring that 100 percent of all cargo be screened by 2012, but that deadline came and went, and we are nowhere near screening/scanning all our cargo. Only 3 percent of our cargo is screened today.

Today, I am introducing the Scan Containers Absolutely Now Act, the SCAN Act, to finally make port security a reality.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Printed on recycled paper.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 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 11, 2014 at 10:21 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2154.

That the Senate passed S. 2323.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H.J. Res. 120.

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 1233.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3522 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. BROWNLEY of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3522 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. 3 PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

Nothing in this Act shall result in discrimination based on gender, including higher premiums for women or loss of contraception or pregnancy care.

Mr. CASSIDY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3522, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My amendment would ensure that nothing in the underlying act would result in health care discrimination against women. It would prevent insurance companies from charging small businesses that employ women higher premiums, and it would stop insurance companies from selling group plans that deny women contraception or critical maternity care coverage.

I hope that we can all agree that women should never have to pay more for their health care than men would pay simply because of their gender. Being a woman is not and must never be treated as a preexisting condition.

Health care reform has created many new and needed consumer protections, which are helping women live healthier lives and build stronger families. Health care costs are the number one cause of bankruptcy in the United States. Allowing insurance companies to charge women more than men would hurt working women struggling to make ends meet. It would hurt families raising children who are trying to give them the healthy start they deserve.

Before this unfair practice was banned, the National Women's Law Center reported that gender discrimination in premium prices alone cost women approximately $1 billion per year more than men. That is $1 billion that could have prevented many women and their children from living in poverty or being homeless.

That is $1 billion that women and their families could have spent on rent. That is $1 billion that women and their families could have spent on child care. That is $1 billion that women and their families could have used to pay for college. That is $1 billion that women and their families could have used to start a business. That is $1 billion that could have been better used to strengthen the American economy.

In a nation where women earn only 77 cents for every dollar that men earn, charging women more for health care compounds the financial strain on women and their families. Stopping gender-based premium discrimination is just one example of health care reform that works, and it is a new consumer protection that women and their families cannot afford to lose.

My amendment will ensure that insurers continue to cover critical maternity care and contraception coverage. Until recently, many States did not require all health care plans to cover maternity care.

Today, the law requires every new insurance policy to cover maternity care. We must ensure that women continue to have access to this critical coverage and access to contraception coverage that gives many women the economic independence to succeed because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Contraception coverage ensures women can prevent unplanned pregnancies and choose the best time to start a family. When surveyed by the Guttmacher Institute, 63 percent of women said that access to contraception had enabled them to take better care of themselves and their families. Over half said they were better able to support themselves financially or complete their education.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans support these policies. A Kaiser health poll found that Americans support birth control coverage by a 2 to 1 margin and 86 percent of Americans support coverage of maternity care.

A vote for my amendment is a vote to protect women from unfair discrimination. It is a vote promising our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters that they will be treated fairly and equally.

These are the values of my constituents in Ventura County, and they are the values of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit. Vote ''yes'' for equality for women.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill empowers female-owned small businesses and workers to keep the health care policies they prefer and make their own decisions regarding health care.

Women make 95 percent of the decisions regarding health insurance and families across the United States. I don't think we have to be patronizing and assume that they cannot make their own decisions.

In fact, I am asked continually by women who are 50 years and above why are they having to pay for maternity benefits. They are just flabbergasted by that.

This is important economically. The Manhattan Institute reports that the Affordable Care Act, so-called ironically, has increased insurance premiums by 41 percent on average—for women, as much as 62 percent.

Imagine that woman sitting at home, lying awake at night, wondering how she is going to pay her bills, being forced to pay for benefits the opposition doesn't think she is smart enough to know that she doesn't need and unable to afford her house. That has happened in an instance I know of.

Now, today, the House has the opportunity to help Americans keep the health care plan of their choice, and how we vote comes down to two questions: First, do you think control over

someone's health care plan should reside with a Washington politician or bureaucrat? Or do you trust that American woman to make the proper decision for herself, for her family?

I will tell you where I stand: I think we should give power to the patient, not to a Washington bureaucrat.

Secondly, do we think that politicians should keep the promises made to constituents? Four years ago, supporters of the health care law looked Americans in the eye and said, ''If you like your health care plan, you can keep it, period.''

I tell you where I stand. Representatives in the people's House should honor their word and uphold the commitment to those who sent us here, period.

Let's protect the health care choices of America's workers. Let's hold politicians accountable for the promises they made.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit. Vote ''yes'' to protect the health care plans of America's middle class. Vote ''yes'' to keep the promises made.

Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5161; H.R. 5057, if ordered; and S. 276, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 223, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—187

Barber
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
Duncan (TN)
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
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

NAYS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
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)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Calvert
Coble
DesJarlais
Dingell
Gardner
Gibson
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Lipinski
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Rangel
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Southerland
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1305

Messrs. STOCKMAN and JONES changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 494, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COTTON. 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 247, noes 167, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

AYES—247

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm

Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
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)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
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
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Calvert
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fortenberry
Granger
Hastings (WA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz

□ 1312

So 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. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 495 I was inadvertently detained during rollcall No. 495 and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I announced that we were delaying consideration of the continuing resolution so all Members could be briefed on the President's request for additional authorities related to ISIL as part of the continuing resolution.

Members received a bipartisan classified briefing this morning. I know many are still digesting that information and getting their questions answered regarding this threat and our response.

In order to properly consider the President's request and act on the continuing resolution, Members are advised that the House will now meet on Monday at 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes at 6:30 p.m. on suspensions.

Members are advised that the House may consider legislation related to the President's request and the continuing resolution as early as Tuesday.

These are changes from the previously announced House schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman and I have discussed this, and I believe he has taken the appropriate action in this instance, and we certainly support his determination.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for working together on this.

The one thing we know, this is a threat, and this House will act as one as Americans, and I look forward to continuing to work on it.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5161) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
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
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 (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
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)
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 (PA)
Kennedy

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
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
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—29

Barton
Boustany
Calvert
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Dingell
Duncan (SC)
Frankel (FL)
Gowdy
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Kelly (IL)
King (IA)
King (NY)
LaMalfa
Lowey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Quigley
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Scott, David
Shimkus

□ 1322

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. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I missed rollcall vote 496. Had I been present, I would have cast the following vote: rollcall 496—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes."

EPS SERVICE PARTS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing 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 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, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing 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 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.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will convene at 9 a.m. and will welcome the President of Ukraine for a joint meeting at 10 a.m. There will be no morning hour and the House will meet at noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

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

In addition, as I previously announced, the House may consider the President's request and act on the continuing resolution as early as Tuesday.

The House will also consider a package of 14 bills designed to encourage an American energy revolution. This commonsense energy plan will be comprised of previously House-passed bills that received bipartisan support and focus on production, infrastructure, reliability, and efficiency.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that the House will also consider a package of jobs bills that will include 15 House-passed bills. This bipartisan jobs plan fosters an economic recovery and gets Americans back to work in good-paying jobs.

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

Before asking him questions about the schedule for the week to come, I want to commend the gentleman. We had a meeting just a few minutes ago in which almost all the Members of the House rose in a moment of silence, Mr. Speaker, to remember those not only who lost their lives on 9/11 13 years ago, but also those who acted so heroically to save lives.

We certainly remember those brave individuals that knew what was going on and took that plane down in Pennsylvania that we believe was undoubtedly directed towards the dome of the Capitol to decapitate the symbol of the world's greatest democracy.

I want to thank the majority leader for leading us in that time of silence to remember that horrific event and to say, as he said just a few moments ago, we are still threatened by those who would use terror and barbarism to attack their own people and others around the world.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership on that issue, and I also thank him for his comments about the fact that we came together on 9/11 not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. We now are at a similar time where there is a great threat posed to us and to others.

The gentleman's suggestion that we would meet that with the same kind of bipartisanship is welcomed on this side of the aisle as well, so I thank the gentleman for that.

Now, with respect to the schedule, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether or not—and it may not have been decided yet—whether or not the President's request to which the gentleman referred in his announcement and the CR would be considered together or separately?

I yield to my friend.

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

There has been no decisions yet. As you know, the President requested this week, that is why we postponed, and we are continuing to work through. I will notify the gentleman as early as we get a decision.

□ 1330

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me ask further—and I know the answer to this question is that we will have to see, but I have put our own Caucus on notice, Mr. Leader—if we may need to be here for the week after the break for the holy days. Is that consistent with your thought?

I yield to my friend.

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

Currently, we are scheduled to be here that last week. There has been no change to that schedule. As I noted just a little earlier, the only change we made is coming back this Monday. I want to make sure all the Members have enough time to digest and get their questions answered, but currently that schedule continues to hold.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to the Appropriations Committee and the CR, it is our expectation that the CR is scheduled to have a date of December 11. I notice Senator CRUZ has made another suggestion. To clarify, is December 11 still the date that the majority is looking for to run the CR through?

I yield to my friend.

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

Yes, as of this time. We have posted it this week. December 11 is the duration that the continuing resolution would go through.

Mr. HOYER. Lastly, I would say that the majority leader and I have had discussions about this, and so he knows our strong conviction on this side of the aisle that we are still very hopeful that we could have a longer term extension of a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We believe that it is very important to give some stability and competence to the marketplace, to lenders and borrowers and manufacturers, large, medium, and small. I hope the gentleman would continue to consider with his caucus the possibility of having a longer term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which, as the gentleman knows, expires on September 30.

I yield to my friend.

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

We have had many discussions. As the gentleman knows, in the last reauthorization, it was a shorter time period, with many reforms in there. Many feel that those reforms have been ignored. Many feel that the bank provides certain things the private sector is doing.

Knowing that we are in a short-term period, also knowing the threat before America today and the time, we want to make sure that we can have this debate. As for the expiration date, we felt that it was best to extend that out to June in the CR and have that debate later, moving forward, so you are not disrupting any time debating the threat from the terrorists and also doing the work that needs to be done. I do understand the gentleman has talked to me many times about that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, September 15, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2014, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY PETRO POROSHENKO, PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, September 18, 2014, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in Joint Meeting His Excellency Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine.

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

There was no objection.

THANKING OUR VETERANS OF WAYNE TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA

(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 thank our veterans.

This weekend, I will have the great honor to join the 2014 Hometown Heroes Celebration in Wayne Township, which is Clinton County, Pennsylvania. The focus for this year's celebration is honoring those from the Vietnam war, and will also include paying tribute to our veterans from the Korean war and World War II eras. We will honor these local heroes for their service and their brothers in arms, including those who didn't make it home or gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Each day, especially on September 11, we are reminded of the many threats posed to America and its citizens. We are also reminded of how blessed we are to have brave men and women who have, for generations, served their Nation and laid their lives on the line in protection of our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, we owe those who have served and are serving in uniform our unwavering support and thanks, and today I offer my sincere praise for the veterans of Wayne Township and the surrounding areas. You are our hometown heroes, and you deserve as much.

REMEMBERING THE FALLEN HEROES OF 9/11

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today we remember those who lost their lives 13 years ago on a day that changed our Nation forever.

Yesterday Congress bestowed the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, on the fallen heroes of 9/11. One of those was Todd Beamer, a high school friend of mine. Declaring, ''Let's roll,'' he and the other brave Americans on Flight 93 helped prevent further catastrophe while sacrificing their own lives in the process.

This summer I had the privilege of touring the Flight 93 National Memorial and museum in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. There I presented a Wheaton Academy High School yearbook to be included in the museum archives. Construction is still underway on this moving tribute to the 40 heroes.

Looking out over the crash site, I was reminded again that the world is still a dangerous place, and our freedoms are only a generation away from extinction. Freedom isn't inherited. It must be protected against those who destroy it. Honoring the sacrifices of Todd and all who perished on 9/11 requires we forever remain vigilant in defense of our Nation's cherished values.

MOURNING 9/11 VICTIMS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is one American that will forget where they were on 9/11, that crisp morning with the bright sun shining. I was here in the United States Capitol when the unimaginable occurred. We could not have fathomed that the homeland would be attacked.

I rise today to acknowledge the brave men and women who risked their lives and those that lost their lives, along with the families that still mourn. It is particularly important, now that we are in the backdrop of another terrorist act and another President has to rise to defend America. This Congress must also do so.

But we must recognize, as well, that peace is an important value that Americans love. We are peace-loving. We must do that in the name of those who

lost their lives on United Airlines Flight 93, American Airlines Flight 77, American Airlines Flight 11, and United Airlines 175.

We must recognize that we were unsuspecting of this diaster. Therefore, our pledge to those who still mourn—those who have lost their father, mother, husband, wife, child, or friend—as we debate these serious times is we are reminded that there must be no one that terrorizes us and causes us to do the wrong thing.

Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, I ask that on this day we hold a moment of personal silence, one that will reflect our love for those who were lost. Then, to take the words of George W. Bush, the President at that time:

> Whether terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done.

A firm hand, yes; but we must be reminded of the humanitarian aspect of this and realize that, as we stand with the President and debate our further steps, we honor those who are in mourning. Let's remember 9/11 as a tribute to the Americans who sacrificed their lives.

I mourn this day.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 13th anniversary of the attack launched against the United States on September 11, 2001, I rise to remember the victims of that horrific tragedy and those first-responders who risked, and in too many cases, sacrificed their lives to rescue the occupants of the besieged World Trade Center Towers.

The morning of September 11, 2001 is, and will always be, a day like no other. It is a day all living Americans will remember because not since Pearl Harbor had there been such a dastardly and deadly attack on American soil.

As I stand here today, my heart still grieves for those who perished on flights United Airlines 93, American Airlines 77, American Airlines 11, and United Airlines 175.

When the sun rose on the morning of September 11, none of us knew that it would end in an inferno in the magnificent World Trade Center Towers in New York City and the Pentagon and in the grassy fields of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. I stand here remembering those who still suffer, whose hearts still ache over the loss of so many innocent and interrupted lives.

My prayer is that for those who lost a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, or a friend will in the days and years ahead take comfort in the certain knowledge that they have gone on to claim the greatest prize, a place in the Lord's loving arms. And down here on the ground, their memory will never die so long as any of the many of us who loved them lives.

Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is to believe, out of a tragedy so overwhelming and horrific, something good and great emerged in the aftermath of September 11. On that day there were no Republicans or Democrats. There were no Northerners or Southerners or West or East Coasters. We were not Red State or Blue State. We were all simply Americans.

On that day, we were united in our shock and anger and sadness. We were united in our resolve to defend our country and protect the freedoms that has made America the greatest country in the history of the world.

We lit candles, held hands, helped neighbors, and prayed for our country and its leaders. A united America can never be defeated as Operation Enduring Freedom showed.

The brave and valiant armed forces of the United States swiftly toppled the Taliban and liberated Afghanistan.

As President George W. Bush announced to the American people and to the world: "Whether the terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done."

And though he ran and hid for almost ten years, Osama bin Ladin could not hide forever and evade the long arm of American justice, which, under the leadership of President Barack Obama, caught up with him on May 2, 2011.

Mr. Speaker, Americans take care of their own. Americans cherish freedom. Americans cherish liberty. And Americans want peace. Not just for themselves alone, but all persons in every corner of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that America is safe and secure and protected from another attack on American soil is the least we owe to the heroic passengers on Flight 93 and to the brave firefighters of the FDNY and officers of the NYPD and the officers and civilians we lost in the Pentagon who gave faithful service to our nation.

I believe all Americans want their country to remain safe, free, and invulnerable to another cowardly attack like the one we witnessed thirteen years ago today.

We owe that much to the Americans who lost and gave their lives. We owe it to them to ensure that their children and loved ones will never again experience such pain, suffering, and loss.

We can do this. We must do this. After all, we are Americans.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO 9/11 VICTIMS

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the innocent victims who lost their lives on September 11, 2001.

Thirteen years ago today, our homeland was attacked. Evil manifested itself in the form of extremists who murdered 3,000 Americans. Our world and America was forever changed by the tragedy that unfolded in New York; Washington, D.C.; and Pennsylvania.

The evil that came out of the shadows in 2001 still exists today in 2014. If left unchecked, it will continue to grow for the foreseeable future and threaten us once more. Now, more than ever, we must remain vigilant in the defense of our great country and against those who wish America harm. We can no longer afford to be divided into Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals. We must come together today, from this point forward, as Americans.

Today, let us pause and pray in remembrance of those who fell on 9/11 and for all who continue to stand in harm's way at home and abroad.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed in a security briefing on the issues dealing with the terrorist group ISIL and I missed the vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

TERRORISM ACROSS THE GLOBE

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, at this time I yield to my dear friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

HONORING S. TRUETT CATHY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to honor one of Georgia's greatest: Mr. S. Truett Cathy.

Truett Cathy was known across the globe as a successful businessman, author, and the "inventor of the chicken sandwich." Mr. Cathy would also say, "God created chicken; we created the chicken sandwich." But most importantly, he was a beloved great-grandfather, grandfather, father, and husband, above all else. His strong Christian faith could be seen in everything he did. It didn't matter if it was his company, his employees, or his generosity. It was all embodied in the love and good news of Jesus Christ.

Truett's whole life was about giving hope and opportunity to those who had none. His dedication to helping children who have been abused and lost in the foster system reflected how important family values were to him and are only a fraction of what Truett, a man of such great integrity, was able to accomplish.

Having come from nothing himself, he wanted every child to have the same chance at success and happiness as he did. Truett established the WinShape Foundation, which includes 11 long-term foster homes for 95 children. The WinShape Foundation helped not only children in bad circumstances, but for all periods of an individual's life.

Truett also used his foundation as an opportunity to show you that faith in God can help you through your journey by providing opportunities for young adults to reconnect with their faith in the college program, offering retreats for married couples to renew their love in each other and in God, and creating our next generation's leaders through Christian wilderness camps to learn how to be a better leader and a part of a team.

Truett believed building Christian leaders shouldn't be limited to our country's borders and took WinShape International through missionary trips and projects in over 43 countries.

The generous work and humble spirit of Truett Cathy has touched more lives

than we could ever imagine, and many successful individuals today have him to thank.

Even in business, Truett Cathy treated his Chick-fil-A employees like family, endowing a scholarship foundation to help send them to college. Chick-fil-A has actually awarded more than $25 million in the last 35 years, done through $1,000 scholarships to 20 or 30 hardworking and deserving employees every year.

□ 1345

Through all his work, Truett gave the most important gift of all to many underprivileged children and teens, and that is hope.

You can never put a price on having someone believe in you and give you a chance at success by giving you your first job and teaching you the value of respect and hard work, and what the ethics of being employed was all about.

Truett sums up his life mission and his work best himself:

> Nearly every moment of every day, we have the opportunity to give something to someone else, our time, our love, our resources, and I have always found more joy in giving when I did not expect anything in return.

Having the opportunity to know Truett and his wonderful family has been a privilege, and I thank him for all he has done for the people of Georgia and across this Nation, for the hope and confidence that he has given so many young people to continue on and to fight for what they believe.

Joan and I want to send our condolences and prayers to the Cathy family during this time of great sorrow for us all.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman. I do appreciate that tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), my friend, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the complexities of our Nation's health care system on the eve of the first open season since ObamaCare was launched.

I want to offer a hope to the millions of American consumers who still need real solutions to help ensure that their families can obtain necessary and affordable health care.

Today, our health care system in America has two faces. It can provide state-of-the-art care while, at the same time, can be one of the most complex and frustrating systems in the world.

Americans feel the effects of these complexities every single day. They repeatedly put health care near the top of their list of issues that concern them, and they should be concerned.

The system today has so many conflicting incentives, rules, and regulations, that few Americans have the ability to make sound and affordable decisions for themselves and their families. ObamaCare introduced a whole new level of fuzziness to an already opaque system.

Families are increasingly worried that they will pay more and more for health insurance that covers less and less and lowers the quality of care. They search for long-term economic security, but find unsustainable costs instead.

Even with the advent of the President's health care law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, many middle class Americans haven't found their health care to be more affordable, nor have they felt secure with the current system.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the Affordable Care Act today. It is far from what they were promised.

I have heard stories from too many of my constituents who received letters terminating their coverage, like Julia, from Gurnee, Illinois, or of others facing rising health care costs, like another who told me: ''I wonder if the administration ever thought about those of us who have to pay for our health care coverage with no extra help, and how much more we would be paying.''

Or of the employers who have had to eliminate health benefits, or of workers and teachers whose hours have been reduced because employers can't afford the higher premiums, or of families losing access to doctors they have known for decades.

Those doctors also face conflicting rules that result in adverse consequences. They want to continue to provide care, but many are no longer accepting Medicare patients and must now require upfront payments for care just to keep their practice open.

There aren't enough doctors and specialists to go around in the narrow networks. We have tried to address the long and sometimes life-threatening waits for veterans. Now is the time to address those long lines for everyone else.

Surely, this is not the health care system we were promised, nor does it paint a bright future for the health status of Americans. That is why, on August 28, I convened the third Community Leadership Forum in Illinois' 14th Congressional District. Our topic? Health care. Our focus? The consumer.

I assembled three separate panels to discuss issues ranging from the ACA and how it will continue to affect consumers in 2015, to how technology and innovation can improve health care outcomes, to how best to increase consumer access to and quality of health care. It was clear that there was a thirst for the community to come together.

In the weeks preceding the forum, I was excited to hear about the panelists' enthusiasm. The forum included CEOs of local and statewide health care organizations and hospitals, CMOs and executive vice presidents of insurance companies, and, most importantly, my constituents.

I heard about the issues directly affecting every level of our health care system. Most importantly, our focus remained on offering consumer-oriented solutions. Never before had I been confronted with such passion and desire to offer answers for our national health care system and work together to implement solutions.

Today, I want to share just a selection of the great ideas that could help American consumers of health care. Many of these will be available in a full report I plan to release on my Web site, hultgren.house.gov, in the coming days.

During the first panel, one of the primary challenges health care and small business insurance professionals discussed was how to ensure consumer choice and access to the broader market of providers. I heard numerous times about the need to reduce health care costs overall by pursuing a market-based system with less regulation.

Surprisingly, the only sub-industry in health care that is lowering costs and increasing the quality of care is elective procedures, an industry perpetuated by market control.

Insurance providers told me the difficulties they face operating within the ACA's demands and slim margins. Certain insurance regulations, like the medical loss ratio, exacerbate costs. These costs translate directly into higher premiums for constituents and businesses.

Instead of encouraging higher quality of care and lower costs with advancements in technology and economy, we find ourselves moving in the opposite direction. Relieving these ineffective and inefficient mandates could be a first step to opening up more options for insurers and consumers.

In the second and third panels, I heard from hospital executives and university innovators about the biggest challenges facing medical technology and innovation.

With innovators and leaders in the biotechnology and medical technology industry at the table, I learned about the ever-present and insurmountable ''valley of death,'' the period of time between a potentially lifesaving device or product discovery and its introduction to the broader market. This period is encumbered by regulation and bureaucracy.

In Europe, devices and medicines that show promise are approved and brought to market faster and more effectively.

To help with technology transfer and to quicken innovation and its application, I learned about ways to fill the gap between discovery and investment. Legislation like the TRANSFER Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative CHRIS COLLINS from New York, will help reduce the strain caused by the valley of death in the innovation process.

Another method is the preservation of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. One speaker recommended fully funding the

FDA to speed the approval process to bring new devices to market in the United States.

The conversation went so far as to talk about the intersection of education policy and scientific research, highlighting the need to make sure our kids receive the best STEM education our schools can provide. These conversations clarified that medical innovations are a vital component to strengthening treatments and reducing the costs in the health care system.

Throughout the day, it was confirmed again that the current health care landscape is rocky and uncertain, but there are many who are willing and eager to work together to tackle these challenges.

The House is also eager to work hard to help fix our health care system. Numerous times the House has said ''yes'' to fixes and alternatives that address our system's deep challenges. We don't need to wait for our health care system to get worse before it gets better. We can work to fix it now.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the ACA today. It is far from what they were promised. But that should only spur us onward.

We are only months from the start of open enrollment, November 15. The question is, can all of us, in Congress, in health care, and constituents, work together to bring much-needed reform to our health care system? Can we raise the quality of care our country offers while lowering costs for Americans across the country?

I believe we can, and I trust these solutions will help get us there.

I want to thank my good friend from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much at risk right now in this country, and the President gave us a fine address last night, very interesting. I know some people say, you know, in times of trouble, when the United States is threatened, we need to all get together behind our leader.

As someone once said to me about Republicans, he said, I just wish the Republicans would all run the same play together. And I responded, I agree. I wholeheartedly want for the Republicans to all run the same play together at the same time.

But I said, the trouble is, if my leader calls a play running to the wrong end zone, I am not blocking for him. And that is also, I think, applicable with the President of the United States.

I was blasted after statements on FOX News saying that if the President wanted to go to war with ISIS, I would support that. So I was anticipating something last night that would unite us and not divide us.

To relate, one of the problems with the President is, he starts off early in his speech saying, as Commander in Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Well, I have come to know friends, close friends with a number of the family members of Ty Woods, Glen Doherty, Sean Smith, and Ambassador Chris Stevens, and they debate, they don't believe that the highest priority of this President is the security of the American people.

The actions of this President, in saying that he cares so deeply about the security of the American people, don't seem to resonate when you stand by weeping parents who have watched their son's head be cut off by these enemies, and you say it is your highest priority to protect the American people, but they are wondering, that same day that you spend 5 or 6 hours playing golf, do you spend that much time figuring out a way to protect other Foleys?

That is a tough sell.

The President said, now, let's make two things clear. ISIL is not Islamic. No religion condones the killing of innocents.

Well, that has certainly got to be a shock to the radical Islamists who brutally kill, behead, maim innocent people in the name of what they say is their religion.

In fact, the American people don't seem to be sold on what the President said. This story from CNN filed at 8:15 a.m. this morning by Ashley Killough quotes what the President said about ISIL's not Islamic. No religion condones killing of innocents.

Then they have a number of tweets. According to the CNN article, Twitter just lit up with responses to the President saying that. Lots of retweets.

Let's see, from Ron Christie: ''ISIS isn't Islamic? What kindergartner briefs the President on terrorism?''

Another: ''Obama: ISIL is not Islamic? He just countermanded anything he plans to say tonight. Right there is the fatal flaw.''

Another: ''ISIL is not Islamic? Hello? THIS ISIL, 'Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant'?''

Another: ''ISIL is not Islamic and Lois Lerner and the IRS is not corrupt. Obama is such a freaking''— Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't say that word. JOE WILSON said that and it was found not to be appropriate.

Another: ''ISIL is not Islamic? Is he kidding? I suppose those black flags are just for giggles then.''

Another from the CNN article: ''ISIL is not Islamic—POTUS opens a section aimed at motivating Muslims around the world to disown ISIL, aid U.S. fight.''

Another from Mohammed Ansar: ''ISIL is not Islamic, says prime time @BarackObama (and virtually every Muslim and reasonably educated person on the face of our planet).''

□ 1400

Michael Oleaga: Some folks on Twitter didn't understand Obama's ''ISIL is not Islamic'' statement. Study foreign affairs, folks, or religion—all religion.

It is interesting because President Obama's statement is apparently similar to the historic reaction that Thomas Jefferson had before he was President when he was negotiating with the radical Islamist Barbary pirates in northern Africa, who had been capturing American ships—killing, enslaving, holding people for ransom.

Jefferson was rather shocked when he reportedly indicated, ''I don't understand why you keep attacking us. We don't have a navy. We are not a threat to you.''

It was explained to him, ''We believe if we are killed while attacking infidels like you, then we will go instantly to paradise.''

Jefferson is perplexed, and he ends up getting his own copy of the Koran because he couldn't believe that any religion would ever promote going to paradise for being killed while killing innocent people. He read for himself, and history can tell you exactly what his conclusion was.

As President, he ultimately decided that the only way to deal with these radical Islamists was not to keep paying 10 to 20 percent of the American budget for ransom to get people back.

The solution was to send this new group called the United States Marines to the shores of Tripoli to fight the radical Islamists with everything they had until they yelled ''uncle'' or were wiped out, and they ceased to come after Americans.

The President says:

> I have insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government.

That strikes me as strange because if the Commander in Chief's highest priority, as he said at the start of the speech, is the security of the American people, then it begs the question: Why is he so worried about what the Iraq Government does if he knows he has to do something to protect the American people?

Now, I remember Senator Obama repeatedly went after the Bush administration. It seemed that he thought little or nothing of the coalition that President George H. W. Bush put together with 43 countries to go in and liberate Kuwait and that he thought even less of the 49 countries that put people and money on the line to support the effort in Iraq—49 countries.

President Obama thought that was not a real coalition, yet they put people, and they put money. Now, magically, since he is President, he thinks a coalition of nine countries that he won't name or commit what they are going to put into the coalition is somehow better than the 49 countries' coalition that President Bush put together before going into the Middle East.

President Obama said:

> In June, I deployed several hundred American servicemembers to Iraq.

He goes on to say:

> We will send an additional 475 servicemembers to Iraq.

He has made very clear he is not going to put boots on the ground, as he said, in Iraq, so the only conclusion

logically that you can make from the President's saying, on the one hand, we are not going to put boots on the ground in Iraq and that he has already sent several hundred soldiers and is sending 475 more, is that those thousand or so U.S. soldiers will be wearing sneakers.

He said that America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. It is hard to believe that nine people who are a bit timid about being named and committed to what they will do are really that broad of a coalition.

He said ''mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges.''

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard from General Kelly, testifying before the House and the Senate—he is the commander of SOUTHCOM, the Southern Command—he knows what threats are to our south. As he testified, the penetration of our southern border by the criminal networks and radical Islamists, in his words, is an existential threat to the United States.

You have got the man who is supposed to know the most about the southern border and protecting us, telling Congress that the penetration going on of our southern border is a threat to the very existence of the United States of America.

So I would urge the President, Mr. Speaker, when he says he will ''mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges,'' to change that word in his teleprompter to read ''border'' challenges, so that we can protect ourselves from the criminal networks and the potential for radical Islamists who want to destroy us from coming across our southern border.

I truly hope that the late Tom Clancy was not as clairvoyant in one of his last novels as he was in the early nineties, when he wrote about someone who was irritated with the United States flying a jet into the Capitol to wipe out a joint session of Congress.

I love George W. Bush, but when he said ''who would have ever thought somebody would use a plane for a bomb and crash it into a building,'' I was thinking, well, Tom Clancy several years ago, as that was in one of his novels.

In one of his recent novels, one of his last, he wrote about a coalition beginning to form between radical Islamists and drug cartels in Mexico and ultimately a deal where they brought in—I can't remember—10 or 12 radical Islamists with surface-to-air missiles.

They paid tremendously to the drug cartels to smuggle those into the United States, so they could get themselves in vans and, at the appropriate time in areas all across the country, step out and shoot down American passenger planes.

We know that although the radical Islamists are really insane—crazy—when it comes to the killing of innocent people, they are not stupid. When we give them an opening to come after us, they will take it. The President lost further credibility last night at a time when he really needed to be getting the world behind him.

Credibility was lost when he said:

> It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression and in support of the Ukrainian people's right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, people around the world—as I have traveled in west Africa, north Africa, the Middle East, moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Europe—all understand that this President has done virtually nothing to help Ukraine.

They haven't rallied the peoples of the world, and when the people around the world hear that, they have to think: What? Does he think we are crazy ourselves?

You go back and see what this administration did in response to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia, and the response was a Twitter campaign. They actually did try to put restrictions on, as I recall, 10 or 11 bank accounts that the Russians laughed about.

This President needs to do more to rally the world around us—with us—against radical Islam, against imperialism, like we have seen from Putin, and we can all stand together.

After the President seemed to indicate that he wanted to take out ISIS—or he said ''ISIL''—I really felt that when the President had finished last night, that I would be saying that that is something I have got to support, that I am with him. ISIS has said they are a threat to us. We need to take them seriously. They are cutting off American heads. We have got to take that seriously.

Yet when I hear the President, he wants to give support to the moderate, vetted Free Syrian Army; and we read the article from Patrick Poole, where he quotes one of those vetted, moderate Free Syrian Army brigade commanders, saying that his forces were working with the Islamic State and Jabhat al-Nusra, al Qaeda's official Syrian affiliate—both U.S.-designated terrorist organizations:

> We are collaborating with the Islamic State and the Nusra Front by attacking the Syrian Army's gatherings in . . . Qalamoun.

Then a quote from another Free Syrian Army commander—vetted, moderate—that this President is going to help:

> We have reached a point where we have to collaborate with anyone against unfairness and injustice.
>
> Let's face it: the Nusra Front is the biggest power present right now in Qalamoun, and we as FSA would collaborate on any mission they launch as long as it coincides with our values.

I really expected to be standing today and saying we need to get behind the President's activity, just as I said in the last couple of weeks, immediately after the President's speech, that I agree, and let's go to war with ISIS; but with the President's wanting to continue what he has been doing for over a year—giving weapons to the Free Syrian Army which somehow, magically, keep having them taken away by the Islamic State—or ISIS/ISIL—the President finally suspended giving them more arms in December.

This President kept sending arms to the vetted, moderate Free Syrians, and they ended up in the hands of ISIS every time, so it was suspended in December. Then in April, for some reason—they think they can now trust the Free Syrians—he started sending more weapons to the Free Syrians, and magically, they keep ending up in ISIS/ISIL control.

This President does a speech last night, and now, we are supposed to get with him and send more weapons to the people whose leaders are saying publicly, ''We support ISIS. We support al-Nusra. We support the enemies of the United States.''

I yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for doing this Special Order and for giving me an opportunity to come down and not only listen to him, but to share a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we could have learned a lesson from Libya in the fact that we gave air support to the rebel groups that were overthrowing Qadhafi, who wanted Qadhafi gone.

Was Qadhafi a good man? No, but his enemies were the same as our enemies, and he had really turned over his nuclear arms, his chemical weapons. I mean, he had stopped with his nuclear enhancement and had turned over his chemical weapons.

□ 1415

Yet we saw fit that we would help the rebels because of humanitarian reasons and what was going on.

You know, sometimes different sides get blamed for different things by just saying, ''Oh, we didn't do that. Somebody else did that.''

It was interesting that after Qadhafi was gone, all of a sudden, it becomes a wild west in Libya, and as a result of that, we had four brave Americans lose their lives in Benghazi because we were trying to play nice and be friends. Some people don't want to be our friend.

In fact, as the gentleman from Texas was talking about, the real ambition of these jihadists, these radical Islamic groups, is to really have shari'a law control the world.

They want all of us to be under the shari'a law, and that is what their goal is. In fact, if you look at ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, they want to go back in history and put together this caliphate that would include Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, and others. I mean, that is their goal.

For people who might get confused with ISIS, ISIL, Daesh—there are a lot of different names that this group is called. I think ISIL is the best because I think that describes their intent of gaining this area that was once held.

So I think we have to really think about this, as far as who we are going to train and arm. Do we know who these groups really are, as the gentleman from Texas read about the article that Patrick Poole had.

We have had fighters that went to Syria. In fact, we just had our first American fighter that was fighting for ISIL. I believe his name was Mr. McCain. He lived in Minneapolis. He went back to San Diego and finally ended up in Syria. I think Josh Earnest used in one of these press briefings that these moderate forces had killed Mr. McCain and that they were fighting both ISIL and Assad.

Now, the interesting thing about this moderate opposition group that killed Mr. McCain is that they killed other ISIL fighters too. They beheaded six of them. Now, I don't know how moderate that is, but according to American standards, that is not moderate.

So I think we really have to give some close scrutiny to these folks that we are going to arm, that we are going to give different weapons. We really don't have a list of what those weapons would be yet. We are going to let the military train them.

We trained the Iraqi military, their police, their defense force for, what, 7 years, I guess, or longer; and then at the first sight of combat, they left the American equipment that they had been given and fled. So I don't know what kind of training we are going to give these moderate groups, but I know we haven't got 7 years to stop ISIL.

So I agree with my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), that I wish the President had used some different words rather than ''degrade.'' Maybe ''destroy''—maybe ''defeat'' would have been a great word to use, that we want to defeat them.

If you read open source reports, there are 10,000, and then you hear, ''Well, now there are 15,000.'' Then we have got people in the government saying, ''Well, they could be up to 30,000. We don't know how many there are.''

I promise you, whether it was 30,000 or 50,000, we have got the greatest military in the world, and we could have controlled that situation if we just had the fortitude and the guts to do it, but because of the indecisiveness of this President, this thing has festered.

If we had gone into Syria originally—or at least armed the opposition forces then—we actually knew who they were because they were a small group. There is probably over 100 different opposition forces, and as the gentleman said, they are fighting both Assad and ISIL.

Now, to me, it is really confusing over there about who is fighting whom. If you look at Hamas and the Lebanese Army teaming up with them in Arsal to drive out the rebels that Assad had driven into Lebanon, it is very confusing about who is on whose side.

We need to be particularly aware of that and make sure that we have a vetting process—if it is even possible—that we have a vetting process to make sure that these people are worthy of getting assistance from the American taxpayer.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he has time for one, because I am struggling a little bit.

Byron York has a good article out, published last night at 11:46, where he points out that there are some real potential problems. He says ''five things that could go horribly wrong with Obama's action in Iraq.'' One of them, he mentions the lack of a status of forces agreement.

We all know that President Bush had been working on a status of forces agreement. He thought he would leave it to the President to accomplish that great task and have instant international credibility for signing a document immediately like that coming into office, but for whatever reason—we hear a lot of different stories—but it blew up, but the President says that we couldn't leave troops there without a status of forces agreement because you can't have troops in a country where you don't have, for example, an immunity agreement, so that American soldiers, American contractors that are there to help protect Iraq from harm—sometimes, bombs go off in the wrong place. Sometimes, somebody gets killed that wasn't meant to because it becomes a war zone.

As the President pointed out before, we couldn't leave troops there because we have no immunity agreement. Well, I haven't heard that there is any immunity agreement with Iraq, and yet he announced last night that he has already got several hundred American sneakers on the ground over there and is going to add 475 more troops—apparently wearing sneakers because there are not boots on the ground.

So I am needing some help here. Why is it safe to send in American troops now without the promise, the agreement of immunity from Iraq when it was not safe to do so when he took office? I am struggling here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, and you should. People claim it is all Bush's fault or that it was all the prior administration's fault that this happened.

By the withdrawal of our troops—because I am telling you, I think President Bush laid it out pretty clear in 2007, when he made that speech about how a lot of people in Washington were clamoring about getting our troops out, and he said, ''We are not going to get our troops out until our ground commanders in Iraq tell us that we are ready to get our troops out.''

He points out the dangers of that, and that is exactly what happened. I think if this administration had understood that and had actually listened to the former President, who had been involved in all the things that had gone on recently in the Middle East, then they would have been persistent enough to persuade Maliki to allow for some agreement.

Now, you know, I don't understand all the politics that have gone into this, but I think last night he authorized another 475 sneakers on the ground, and I think there was already roughly, what, 900-and-something over there.

So we have a lot of guys over there, but we don't know what they are doing, and I don't know that they know what they are doing.

What are the rules of engagement? Are they carrying weapons? Are they carrying notebooks, iPads? What are they doing? I mean, these are some of the most well-trained people that we have in our military. These are valuable assets to us that are over there, and just from the reports I read, I don't see that they really have any operational plan that they are going with.

So that has got to be really confusing, I would think, if I was over there, as to what the rules of engagement were and, you know, if I was going to be sent out as an adviser or as protection, security forces for the Americans that are there, Erbil or Baghdad or wherever they are, so I think it is confusing to them too.

I think that that is the reason, as you mentioned in one of your speeches today that I heard, about the resolution, so we can actually define what we think and what our committees think would be a good military plan for going in and what the expectation was of any forces that we have over there, whether it is air or some of these boots on the ground.

Let's clarify that and make that a separate vote.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it is worth pointing out what concerns many others in the world, and that is the judgment of this administration.

As we travel around the world, we have allies who talk to us privately, leaders in countries in the Middle East, moderate Muslims, people in Israel, and they keep asking about the judgment of this country, of the national leaders.

Everybody knows that this President agreed to release five Taliban terrorists complicit with murder, and the statement has come out on August 27—this is after the release of five Taliban murderers by this administration. This statement has gone out, and it is in their language. The translation says, in part, ''We consider ISIS and every other Mujahedin group as our brothers.''

That is kind of important to understand when he released the Taliban Five—who don't have a problem with cutting people's heads off or friends cutting people's heads off, they support ISIS—and the President did so in violation of the law.

It required that there not be one dime of American money spent to release somebody from Guantanamo unless the law was complied with, and the law required a notice of 30 days to people in Congress, and that didn't happen.

He broke the law in order to help the lawbreakers. So people around the world see that, and they are puzzled, and I happened to be standing here on the House floor with one of the two other people that went to the FBI disclosure. They classified it, which I thought was ridiculous.

We wanted to see the documents that the FBI and their advisers on Islam had purged from the FBI training materials. Now, these are the materials that train FBI agents—the kind of people that have to go talk to Tsarnaev and his mother and people at the mosque and friends—who have to know the questions and what to look for that might indicate that this person has been radicalized.

□ 1430

Now, since they classified those materials they purged, we went through them, but we don't get to disclose what is in them. But I can say I was shocked at how ridiculous some of the purging was. Some things were purely from—well, some of them were so clearly important, that people trying to learn about radical Islam, it is important that they know and understand.

So, once you understand that there has been that kind of purging of material, then you begin to understand how this administration could get two—not one, two—heads-up from a country like Russia that Tsarnaev was radicalized, he could kill people, you better watch him, you better check on him, he is dangerous, he is going to hurt people, and they do nothing meaningful about it.

As we found out through a hearing in Judiciary, at first Mueller said, We did go to those mosques. But it turns out he said it was on their outreach program. They never went out there to see whether they were radicalized.

And then, we knew at the time—Mr. Speaker, I hold here the articles from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, articles of organization for the Islamic Society of Boston, and the Islamic Society of Boston is the one that organized the two mosques. And the organizing official is a man named al-Amoudi, which was familiar to the FBI Director because, on his watch, although he had helped the Clinton administration hire what were thought to be moderate Muslims in the Clinton administration and he had originally had an agreement to be of assistance to the Bush administration, the Bush administration ultimately finds out he is supporting terrorism. They have him arrested out here at Dulles Airport, and he's now doing 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism. He's the one that organized the Islamic Society of Boston that created the two mosques where the Tsarnaevs went. The FBI didn't even know that a guy they helped convict of supporting terrorism started the mosque that has created terrorists out of more than one person.

There are others that we find out that have had relations with that mosque that may be a threat. One other thing I want to mention before I yield to my friend. We have a chart—I have had a blowup of this used before, but it points out how many times, as this points out, terminology is important in defining our goals. The 9/11 Commission identifies Islamist terrorism as the threat. The Muslim Public Affairs Council recommends that the U.S. Government find other terminology.

So, in the 9/11 Commission Report, bipartisan, bicameral people trying to take an objective look, they used the term 322 times in the 9/11 Commission Report. However, the last FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon does not include the word ''Islam.'' The National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 does not include the word ''Islam.'' In the 9/11 Commission Report, it used the word ''Muslim'' 145 times, but since then, under this administration, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon doesn't use the word ''Muslim.'' It doesn't use the word ''jihad.'' It doesn't use the word ''enemy.'' Now, it does use the words ''violent extremism'' 29 times. In the 9/11 Commission Report, it uses the word ''religious,'' and it is normally referencing these radical Islamists. It uses that word ''religious'' 65 times; whereas, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon only uses it three times.

Then the President, basically the only time he used it last night was to say that people that called themselves Islamists are not religious. The people who have had their heads cut off by these people in the name of Islam are looking at what we are doing, I believe, and wondering: How can you say that was not, in their minds, a religious act to cut off my head?

I think, as a Christian, there are references in the Bible. I think people know what goes on here. We know from Scripture that there is rejoicing in Heaven over one soul being saved. Well, how could they rejoice unless they know what is going on? So I think people that have had their heads cut off would have to be wondering about the President's assessment.

''Al Qaeda'' was used 36 times in the 9/11 Commission Report, but in the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon, not used at all. In the National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 under this administration, it is used once. ''Caliph,'' that is not used at all by this administration in their FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon; National Intelligence Strategy of 2009, the 9/11 Commission Report used it seven times. And it is a little more understandable, too, when you find out that one of the advisers on the Homeland Security Advisory Council that Janet Napolitano put there and gave a secret clearance is named Mohamed Elibiary.

There is an article from Adam Kredo, and he quotes a tweet sent out by the Homeland Security Advisory Council member, and the tweet says:

> The caliphate will return; that is inevitable.

Well, we know now that the Homeland Security Advisory Council member's tweet has been used by ISIS in recruiting, that even this President's close adviser on Homeland Security that he has secret access to our databases given by this administration, that he is out there saying the caliphate is inevitable. So it is being used to recruit people to kill Americans. The Homeland Security Advisory Council has people helping with recruiting for terrorists to kill Americans.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, when the five of us went in that 12-by-12 room——

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it was three Members of Congress, you, me, and MICHELE, but then there were two FBI agents sitting there, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, there was one more Member, I know, Trent.

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, that's right. Trent came, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So there were four of us in a 12-by-12 and two FBI agents and several boxes of paperwork, and they were nice enough to bring one copy so we could share.

The FBI is the greatest. I mean, they are great crime fighters. They do great investigative work. I think it was probably under great political pressure that they purged these documents to take those words out of it. Like you said, even the 9/11 Commission did that.

I want to go back to what you said about our allies and indecisiveness, if I could.

LOUIE, we look at what is going on in the country and we all talk to small business people every day, and they go: You know what? We are not going to expand our business. We are not going to grow because we don't know what our health insurance is going to be; we don't know what our energy cost is going to be; we don't know what the regulations are going to be. So it is kind of a stalemate. I think that is the way our allies look at us. They don't know what our next move is. So, with all this uncertainty, there are different elements that are coming in and filling that void in us being the world leader—Russia being one of them, coming in to fill that void.

People like to know that there is a leader somewhere that they can follow. I just don't think our allies in this world have seen that. Now we have actually got Germany and France and others leading different parts of these charges where America should have been out in front of it.

I know our time is just about up. I want to thank my friend from Texas for allowing me to share with him. I look forward to doing some more of the Special Orders with him and making sure we can get the truth out.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have another article that accentuates what my friend from Georgia was saying about our allies not being sure what we are going to do. Unfortunately, our enemies seem to know very well what we

are going to do. It is an article published by Al Bawaba, published today. It says—we've identified Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. Well, the deputy leader of Hezbollah, Sheikh Naim Qassem, has said:

''The flurry of international activity, which is sponsored by the U.S., is not serious in ending the takfiri threat . . . He said Obama spoke of 'containing' the threat and not 'stopping' it.''

I am quoting from him.

''Comments made by Barack Obama are clear. The word 'contain' means to identify risks and disable some of its objectives while maintaining this terrorist organization's role to frighten certain countries in this region and to keep this risk as a scarecrow in appropriate places to make political gains, particularly in Iraq and Syria.''

Our enemies know that this President's speech last night indicated he's not serious. We have got to get serious.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today, because on Monday a very important hearing, the first of its kind in two decades, a hearing on statehood for the District of Columbia will take place in the Senate of the United States.

The hearing is called by Senator CARPER, the Chair of the Jurisdictional Committee. This hearing takes place at a time and in a season when we have seen unusual progress for statehood for the District of Columbia.

□ 1445

In the Senate, the majority leader himself became a cosponsor of the bill and indeed announced it with great energy, which is very unusual because the majority leader of the Senate cosponsors very few bills. The top Democratic leaders are sponsors of the bill. The bill has more House and Senate sponsors than is has ever had. Together this is normally seen as momentum, Mr. Speaker.

Now, when I say we are having the first Senate hearing in two decades, it is not because we haven't tried to get a Senate hearing or because a Senate or House hearing on statehood was what was on the agenda for each immediate period. The District of Columbia residents have tried many ways to get their equal rights to other American citizens. There has been a House Voting Rights Act. I would have the vote on the House floor as I speak had an amendment not passed that sought to wipe away all the gun laws of the District of Columbia. There have been bills for House and Senate votes. There have been bills for budget autonomy, and we are still seeking budget autonomy.

Through all of this, we have always sought statehood for the District of Columbia because, Mr. Speaker, there is no way for the District to get the same rights that every other American has without statehood. I will go into that a little later.

The Senate hearing is entitled: ''Equality for the District of Columbia: Discussing the Implications of S. 132, the New Columbia Admissions Act.'' That is the companion bill to my bill here in the House, H.R. 292.

I want to take a moment to thank Senator TOM CARPER, who is the new chair of the committee of jurisdiction, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. As you might expect, that committee has a lot on its plate, and, yet, in only his first term as chair, Senator CARPER has made many strides forward and always has been very helpful to the District of Columbia, and now culminates the work that he and I have done in the Senate with a hearing. It is a hearing that we, of course, requested, but it is a hearing that he had to be willing to do and find time for on a very busy agenda. I cannot thank Senator CARPER enough in the name of the people of the District of Columbia for affording us the opportunity to be heard.

We do not pretend that statehood is around the corner. We do know this: that if we do not continue to use vehicles like hearings to put the matter before the House and the Senate, and before the people of the United States, we cannot build to the point where we can achieve what we will achieve, statehood for the 650,000 people who live in the Nation's Capital.

When I say this is the first hearing, I do want to say that Senator Joe Lieberman, who was the prior chairman of the Senate Homeland and Governmental Affairs Committee, was also a great champion for statehood. And while he didn't have a hearing, he introduced a bill for statehood that achieved the majority of committee votes. And indeed there was a hearing for statehood when my first bill, the bill when I first came to Congress in the early 1990s, came to the floor and we got the first and only vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. There was a Senate hearing. It was not a jurisdictional hearing. And that is what this hearing is, and therefore it is a landmark hearing. It is a historic hearing. And that is why I felt it merited my coming to the House floor today.

On top of the momentum that we have now seen in the Senate, I shouldn't leave the subject without mentioning the momentum that has been here in the House. We have Republican and Democratic support for budget autonomy for the District of Columbia, for example. That is a very essential element of statehood, that is, your own budget, your own local funds, and nobody gets to look at it but you, your own jurisdiction. That is not what the District has now. That is what some Republicans and most Democrats believe we should, indeed have.

There is not yet the kind of support for statehood that I expect to see in the House of Representatives, but we will be glad to work with the Senate and the House when it lives up to its own principles that every American is entitled to be treated equally in the Congress and in our country.

Quite aside from the progress we have seen in the House and the Senate on statehood and on the particular elements of statehood, we now have the formal endorsement of the President of the United States for statehood.

I would like to quote what he said when he endorsed the bill:

> I have long believed that folks in D.C. pay taxes like everybody else, they contribute to the overall well-being of the country like everybody else, they should be represented like everybody else. It is not as if Washington is not big enough compared with other States. It is absolutely the right thing to do.

I will have something to say about the population of the District of Columbia as compared with other States in a few minutes.

Now, of course, I wasn't surprised that the President of the United States supported statehood. The reason I wasn't surprised is because he has long supported and been on record as supporting all of the elements of statehood: budget autonomy, the right of the people of the District of Columbia, who raise $7 billion, to spend their own money without coming to this Chamber, which has raised not one penny of it. He has long supported that and has put budget autonomy in his own budget. Legislative autonomy so that the Congress doesn't have some say over the District of Columbia's laws, the President has put that in his own budget. And the President, going back to the time that he was in the Senate of the United States, supported voting rights for the District of Columbia.

So there you have it, voting rights, legislative autonomy, and budget autonomy, the elements of statehood. We have Members of this House and of the Senate who have long supported all of them. We want to bring it all together with support of statehood for the District of Columbia. So there will be then a historic hearing at, I believe it is 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon with witnesses who are particularly able to speak to the issues.

Professor Viet Dinh of Georgetown Law School, a professor of constitutional law, a former U.S. assistant attorney for legal policy in the Bush administration. That made him the highest legal policy official in the Bush Justice Department. He has previously testified here in the House about the constitutionality of the D.C. House

Voting Rights Act. He will testify as to the constitutionality of our statehood bill.

Alice Rivlin, who, of course, was the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve Board and Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget, and, finally, as a D.C. resident, was called upon by the President to chair the Financial Control Board of the District of Columbia, will testify at that hearing. Now, of course, Dr. Rivlin is an expert on the Nation's economy and on the finances of the District of Columbia. We are very pleased that Wade Henderson of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights will also testify, a longtime champion of statehood and equal rights for the District of Columbia.

The elected officials of the District of Columbia will testify, of course, the mayor, the chair of the City Council and I, and also the statehood delegation.

At the same time that we have been pressing on what amounts to two tracks for statehood, we have been making the progress I have indicated on the elements of statehood, such as budget and legislative autonomy.

In this House, we have got to work on what we need to work on all at the same time. There is no sequential matter when it comes to the many rights that the residents of the District of Columbia are denied. However, with the many issues on which we have struggled for equality one at a time, sometimes two or three at a time, statehood has always been what the residents—the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia—have needed and wanted. And it is during this Congress that statehood has gotten great footing.

I do want to thank the growing statehood movement and coalition, the many residents who struggle for statehood and have helped us in so many ways, including many in the statehood coalition who went around asking for cosponsors.

I think among the reasons that statehood has gotten so much momentum this year is that the residents of the District of Columbia are fed up with paying such high Federal taxes without equal representation in the Congress of the United States. They have simply had it on second-class citizenship.

As if to dramatize what it means to be a second-class citizen, there were several violations of the rights of the people who live in the District of Columbia as American citizens this year which highlighted the need for statehood. The House actually passed two provisions that would overturn laws passed by the Council of the District of Columbia, laws that were entirely local in their nature. Imagine what would happen if the Congress tried to pass a law to overturn some law in Maryland, Virginia, Oklahoma, Utah, California, or New Hampshire. People would think the Congress had lost its mind.

Because of the anomaly of the status of the District of Columbia as a district and not a State, the Congress can meddle in—if you will forgive me—the local business of the District of Columbia. Two Members decided to and, in fact, got passed in this House bills that overturned our local laws. I am pleased to say that as of now those bills have and will not be passed in the continuing resolution that is pending in the House or the Senate.

Thus far, we have been successful despite the passage of these two bills. One of them was passed by Representative THOMAS MASSIE, a Republican who lives in Kentucky. He lives in a county of 11,000 people, but has sought and absolutely got passed in the House—a bill that would keep the District of Columbia—which has 650,000 people—from having any local gun laws. None. All the local gun laws would be gone. This is a big city, people. The reason big cities have gun laws of the kind that you will not find in Kentucky is because of the difference—the differences we all respect in our country. Moreover, public safety—think about it—is the quintessential local concern. You depend upon your own local officials who know you best, and whom you have elected to deal first and foremost with public safety. Nobody would try to tell somebody what to do about public safety in her own district.

□ 1500

Yet that is what Representative MASSIE tried to do. This is in spite of the fact that in 1973, though not yet for statehood, the Congress of the United States, recognizing how un-American it was to try to pass laws or to interfere with the laws of a local jurisdiction, devolved local lawmaking authority to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Until this year, most Members on both sides of the aisle had respected that. To be sure, we have had to fight them off in prior years, but we had a long run where nobody tried to interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia.

Thus, it was surprising to us that Representative MASSIE, who is a Tea Party Republican, who stands first and foremost for localism, would leave those principles when it came to the District of Columbia and try to interfere with local matters in this city.

We had the same thing happen to another colleague, a Republican from Maryland, who should have known better, who has a particular distaste for the decriminalization of marijuana laws that is happening all over the United States—18 States so far, plus legalization in two States—so he tried to get a law and passed a bill, that we now have kept from getting through the Senate, that would block the District's recently passed marijuana decriminalization law. Our law would require that it be a fine rather than a conviction for possessing marijuana.

The District didn't do this for the reason that some States, the 18 States, perhaps some of them did—although some of them may have done it for the same reason we did it. Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate in the United States and in D.C.

Yet in the District, 90 percent of those who had criminal convictions for possessing small amounts of marijuana were Black. Half the population is Black; half is White. These laws have had an obvious racial effect.

I am not for smoking anything, but I must tell you I also don't believe that people ought to have a criminal conviction because they possessed marijuana any more than they ought to have a criminal conviction for possessing alcohol. In any case, whatever you think, that is not your business, it is a local matter, and the District ought to have the same right when it comes to local matters as they have.

This was Representative ANDY HARRIS. What was ironic about his trying to block the District's marijuana decriminalization laws is that he couldn't block it in his own State of Maryland, which has decriminalized marijuana.

Perhaps what pointed most to the need for statehood this year was what the District went through this past appropriation period when it almost got shut down, not because of anything the city had done, but because this House and this Senate shut down.

The District was an innocent bystander, but because the Congress still requires that the District's local budget pass through this House and Senate—the budget was here a budget of $7 billion, raised by the people and the businesses I represent, not one dime of it Federal money, a balanced budget, the likes of which the Federal Government has not seen since the Clinton administration, $1.5 billion in reserves, and there is virtually no State in the Union that has that kind of reserves—and yet when the Federal Government shut down, the District of Columbia was in jeopardy of shutting down—this despite the fact that I have a shutdown avoidance bill, that shutdown avoidance was in the President's budget, but not passed.

The mayor did the right thing, for the first time in American history. He refused to shut down. What are you going to do to him?

What he did instead was to keep the District open, but pay for our employees and our services out of contingency funds. Those funds were almost exhausted before the Federal Government finally opened up, and the District finally didn't have to worry about spending its contingency funds and got its local budget.

If you face our citizens with that kind of challenge over time, obviously, they begin to feel that they have to find a remedy. Yes, residents have been trying to find a remedy for more than 200 years, and there are interesting historical reasons why it hasn't happened, but whatever those reasons are, the time is at hand when it is impossible to call yourself the United States of America, which stands for equality for

citizens throughout the world, and not begin to apply that same principle to the people who live in your own Nation's Capital.

We have been preparing for this hearing for some time. We took particular pains on what is called D.C. Emancipation Day. D.C. celebrates this day, April 16, every year because it is the day that Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in the District of Columbia before the slaves were freed in other parts of the country.

DC Emancipation Day, the District's way of saying there is an absence of freedom that still exists in your own Nation's Capital.

As Emancipation Day came—by chance, the U.N. Human Rights Committee issued a report indicating that the denial of voting rights in the House and Senate to the residents of the District of Columbia was a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a treaty which the United States signed in 1992.

So let's be clear: by not granting equal citizenship rights to the people who live in the Nation's Capital, the United States, this Congress, is in violation of international law.

On Emancipation Day, I did not come to the floor to speak about the slaves. That was then; this is now. It has always been interesting to me because my great-grandfather was a runaway slave from Virginia and was in the District of Columbia on Emancipation Day, but Emancipation Day cannot be about nostalgia.

The residents of the District of Columbia put it to good use. I thought what I ought to do was, in preparation for what I knew Senator CARPER wanted to do, to come to the floor to speak about why we should have statehood—what is it about the residents of the District of Columbia that merited statehood?

Well, first, let's start with the most elementary of qualifications, and that is the population. Yes, this is a city. Yes, it is called a district. It is the District of Columbia. Yes, we have a population equal to, but in this case, larger than the population of two States that have two Senators and, by the way, a Member, one Member, to represent the entire State, just like I represent the residents of the District of Columbia—the states are Vermont and Wyoming, one in the West and one in the East.

What does that say to you? It says the Framers believed in equality. They wanted everybody to have representation in the House and the Senate. When there was a dispute between the large and the small States, they made a compromise and gave the small States equal representation in the Senate and what amounts to per capita representation here.

There is no question that there are enough people here for statehood. I mention Vermont and Wyoming because we are larger than those States, but there are half a dozen States which have a population about equal to that of the District of Columbia. That is the first qualification.

Let's take a look at the one that will probably get the attention of more Americans than any others, and that is taxes paid. On our license plate, you will see the words ''taxation without representation.'' Let's put that in dollars and cents.

We are not just talking about paying taxes without representation. I am talking about paying more taxes per capita than any other jurisdiction without representation, almost $12,000 per resident of the District of Columbia in taxes paid to support the Federal Government, which does not reciprocate with voting representation in the House and the Senate.

I have the vote in committee. As the representative of the District of Columbia, I have the same rights to come to this floor and to do everything else that other Members do, except that which is emblematic of my citizenship and the citizenship of the people I represent, and that, of course, is the final vote on the House floor.

This poster is simply a graph to show you the vast differences in taxes per capita paid throughout the United States. It goes from $12,000 down to Mississippi, which pays—Mississippi citizens pay $4,000 per capita to the Federal Government, with the same rights that those who pay more, as should be the case, and it should also be the case that those of us who live in the Nation's Capital, who pay more and more than all others, should have the same rights as all others.

Just to dig down further into what this means, Vermont, which I indicated is a State somewhat smaller than the District, pays about half the taxes, $6,000 per resident. Wyoming pays $8,000 per resident. These are both compared to our $12,000.

California, if you look at the large States of the Union, pays $8,000 per person compared to the District of Columbia's $12,000 per person.

Perhaps of all of the qualifications for statehood, none is more worthy of mention than the sacrifices District of Columbia residents have made throughout the more than 200 years of our existence as the Nation's Capital for our country in the wars of the United States, often suffering casualties above and beyond those of States that are considerably larger in population than the District of Columbia.

□ 1515

So let's look at some of the major wars of the 20th century.

In World War I, there were more D.C. casualties than in three States of the Union. In World War II, there were more D.C. casualties than in four States of the Union. In the Korean war, there were more D.C. casualties than eight States of the Union. In the Vietnam war, there were more casualties than 10 States of the Union. There is a memorial for the 635 D.C. residents who died in World War I on The Mall.

It is in that sacrifice that we feel most dishonored as a jurisdiction. How could our country continue to send our residents to war without granting those who go to war, often to get rights for others, the same rights that we afford every citizen of our own country?

All of the essential elements, even the one that is hardest to endure without full equality, all of the elements of citizenship have long been made by the residents of the District of Columbia, as well as all of the elements of statehood.

So why not statehood? That is a fair question.

What was wrong with the Framers? Why didn't they make the District of Columbia a State in the first place?

Well, nothing was wrong with the Framers. The District of Columbia is a historic anomaly. It is a figment of history and an incident in history that could not happen today.

The reason the District of Columbia is not a State is an accident that must be corrected. The accident came out of the meeting of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1783. There were some angry Revolutionary War soldiers. They did what citizens do. I must say, though, that they went not only to petition the Continental Congress, but they took their guns with them. And while it is not said that a shot was fired, they did point their guns at the windows where the Continental Congress was meeting.

Well, the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia authorities didn't know what to do. They didn't want to go out after the Revolutionary War heroes, so the Continental Congress said: We better get out of here. So they fled Philadelphia.

Well, that stuck in the Framers' minds. They said: My goodness, States are not going to protect us, so I guess we must have a District that is controlled entirely by the Federal Government.

Well, when I say that it is an accident of history, do understand that that history is long gone. The way in which we protect the Nation's Capital today is the same way it would be protected in the event of statehood. The Federal Government, and the District of Columbia government—after all, it is the same area of land—get together to protect the District, whether it is from 9/11 or from any other threat.

You can't rest, then, on any notion that the Framers intended to have any residents who did not have equal rights. The existence of a jurisdiction that did not have full and equal rights was not in the capacity of the Framers to envision. Those who fought the Revolutionary War lived in the Nation's Capital, those parts of Maryland and Virginia which became the Nation's Capital.

The brilliant Framers realized that they did not have all the answers. They had every reason to think that this would be fixed. And one reason we know that they understood that things

could get fixed—shame on us that for over 200 years we haven't fixed this moral outrage—one reason we know that they understood it could be fixed is what they did to make the residents of the Nation's Capital equal in the first place.

During the 10-year transition from the territory in Maryland and Virginia to form the Nation's Capital, the Framers did not want those residents to be left without their equal rights for even one second. So while they had jurisdiction, they saw to it that during that transition period when they weren't really a part of Maryland and Virginia and weren't really a part of the new Capital, they would retain their rights.

Those people who lived in Maryland and Virginia who were on their way to becoming the Nation's Capital still voted in those two States and had every single right preserved until jurisdiction passed to the United States Congress. And that is when tyranny set in—the tyranny of not having that representation carried over under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

In 1801, when we became the Nation's Capital, the people of the District of Columbia went into the streets to demand their rights. They have been in the streets demanding their full rights ever since, as any red-blooded Americans would be.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried every route, some of it more gradual than others, to pursue and to obtain our full rights as American citizens. We have tried voting rights for the House, voting rights for the House and Senate, all other ways—budget autonomy, legislative autonomy. Even if we had gotten those, they would have been insufficient, but it says everything about the shortcomings of the Congress that even those insufficient routes to statehood are not yet a part of our law.

On September 15, there will be a full jurisdictional Senate hearing. That hearing will take place next Monday. That hearing will set an important guidepost. It will educate many in the Senate and House and many in our country about what the people of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, do not now have and what they are entitled to.

There can be no doubt that no American would believe that those who pay taxes as they do should not have the same representation in the House and Senate that they do. There isn't any American who would say that the funds that are locally raised in your local jurisdiction should come to the Congress of the United States for any reason.

I do not believe that our problem lies with the people of our country. I do believe that many of them are not fully aware that their own Capital is less free than any part of our country.

So what we will hear on next Monday is not all about the moral reasons; some of them, of course, but also the reasons that go to our creed as Americans and go to practical matters such as whether the Federal government should be able to close down the District of Columbia when they have a disagreement among themselves at the Federal level. We will hear not only the moral reasons, but the practical reasons for statehood.

So, Mr. Speaker, we seek statehood in the name of the people I represent, perhaps even more so in the name of the thousands of American citizens who happened to live in the District of Columbia and went to war for their country in Germany, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq but never came home, and in the name of those who will once again protect our country now that the President has indicated that we ourselves must take on the fight against ISIS.

On this 9/11, as we remember those innocent people who died simply because they happened to be in New York and Pennsylvania, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress remember the 650,000 people who live in the Nation's Capital, who are proud of their residency in the District of Columbia, many of whom, like me, a third-generation Washingtonian, are proud of their lineage in the Nation's Capital.

In the name of all those I represent, I ask for statehood for the District of Columbia so that our residents may have equal citizenship, those same rights which led the Founders of our country to create the United States of America.

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

□ 1530

EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST WITH ISIS

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the events in the Middle East and with ISIS, and I want to address three separate areas. The first is what should be the role of Congress in deciding American policy on these horrific events.

Second is to respond to the unjustified attacks on the President of the United States by those who claim he doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a detailed enough plan, doesn't have a perfect plan, or whatever.

And the third is to discuss what should be our policy in the Middle East and what dangers there are, no matter which policy we pursue.

As we try to protect our Nation, we should also protect our Constitution. Article I of the Constitution vests in Congress the exclusive duty to decide when we declare war, when we go to war.

Article II makes the President of the United States Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

These two provisions need to be reconciled so that both the Congress and the President can make the decisions that the Constitution charges to them in our foreign and military policy.

This is not a new issue. President Jefferson sent our Marines, in the words of the song, ''to the shores of Tripoli'' in 1801. This was our first foreign military deployment. This was our first fighting and involvement in the Middle East. And most relevant today, it was the first use of our military abroad in the absence of a formal declaration of war.

Well, what did Thomas Jefferson think was the appropriate congressional role?

Thomas Jefferson sought and obtained advance authorization to put our Marines ashore in North Africa.

We still face the same constitutional provisions, but several decades ago, we passed the War Powers Act, a reasonable statute that harmonizes the two provisions of the Constitution that I have discussed.

The War Powers Act makes it clear that the President can act for 60 or 90 days without the authorization of Congress, but that is it. Beyond those time limits, deployments require congressional authorization.

Now, we have heard from the President that he respects Congress, likes us, consults with us, and would welcome our support. But the President, I am sure, consults with many academics and think tanks and foreign officials, not as a constitutional duty, but just because it makes sense to consult with them. And the President would welcome the support of The Heritage Foundation or The New York Times editorial board for his policies.

Saying that you welcome the support of Congress, or that you consult with Congress, has nothing to do with the legal rights of Congress and the American people.

Now, the President has taken a very unusual legal stance. He asserted broadly last night that he has the authority to conduct the bombing campaign, but he needs Congress to approve training Syrians and providing arms. This stands the Constitution on its head.

The main decision to be made here is whether we put our pilots and/or soldiers in harm's way, whether we wage war and cause casualties, and perhaps incur casualties. The far less important decision is whether we train a few hundred or a few thousand Syrians and provide them with weapons.

Keep in mind, this training and arming of Syrians has occurred for well over a year without congressional authorization.

What is happening here is the President wants us to vote in favor of his plan, or to take a vote of Congress and claim it is a vote in favor of his plan, when, in fact, we would only be voting on the smallest part of that plan, and that is, whether, without any risk of casualties to ourselves, without any risk that we would be directly causing casualties in the Middle East, to provide training to Syrian rebels. This is hardly what the Constitution requires.

Today, in response to my questions, the President's Deputy National Security Adviser explained, for the first time from this administration, why they think they have authorization to bomb Iraq and Syria without any further action from Congress. He cited the authorization to use military force passed in this House 13 years ago, in response to the tragic events which occurred 13 years ago to this day.

When Congress authorized going after al Qaeda, we never envisioned that that authority would be used in this manner.

Just as important, the President's plan is to go after ISIS, which has been repudiated by al Qaeda, which broke from al Qaeda, and which wages war against the al-Nusra Front, which is part of al Qaeda.

It is difficult to say that an authorization to use force against al Qaeda is an authorization to use force against those who are fighting al Qaeda, but it is a technical argument.

On the President's side, you can say that al Qaeda splintered, and that all the splinters constitute part of the organization that attacked us 13 years ago to this day.

That is why Congress needs to revise the authorization to use military force of 2001. We passed it for one purpose. Is it going to be there for 100 years?

Is it going to authorize things we never imagined?

Or shouldn't Congress define what it is we are authorizing under today's circumstance?

The other argument raised by the President's Deputy National Security Adviser is that the authorization to go to war against Saddam Hussein somehow applies to this situation. A reading of that resolution clearly shows that it is confined to Iraq, and would not justify that portion of the President's plan, a necessary portion, that involves bombing Syria.

So, again, Congress should vote on our authorization to use military force that is crafted to this situation at this time. But it is unlikely that we will do so because there is almost a silent conspiracy here in Washington.

Presidents want more power to act as they decide in the national interest, without having to ask Congress for authority. Members of Congress sometimes just want to avoid a tough vote.

So, the desire of the President to have all power, and the desire of some Members of this House to avoid responsibility, coincide with the idea of the President just boldly saying he has the authority to enter a new conflict and to enter it for far more than 60 or 90 days, and Congress never has to vote on the matter.

The President, of course, would like to say that he has a vote of Congress in favor of his plan. So we are going to end up with the sneakiest of all maneuvers.

What is likely to occur, and I hope it doesn't, is that we will vote next week on whether to continue government operations, whether to fund the government for the next several months, whether to prevent our national parks from closing, and buried in there will be a provision authorizing and funding the training of Syrian dissidents, and we will pass that package.

The President will claim that since we funded and authorized the training of Syrian dissidents, we voted for his entire plan, including the bombing. And Members of Congress can say they had no choice but to vote for the Syrian provision, but didn't actually like it, never really voted for it. They just voted to keep the national parks open. A silent conspiracy of empowerment and shirking responsibility.

What we should do next week is have three separate votes: one vote on whether to fund and authorize the arming of Syrians, because the President has asked for that vote; second, a vote on whether to authorize military force limited exclusively to air forces and not authorizing ground operations; and the third would be a vote to go further and authorize ground operations.

The exact contours of these resolutions should be subject to amendment and open amendment in this House. We would have to deal with the duration and the exact limitations. But then we would be performing our constitutional duty. Then we would be protecting the American Constitution.

I fear that, instead, we will cleverly avoid responsibility and the President will be able to say, ah, but you voted for my plan.

Now, in defense of the President, I want to respond to the constant harping that the President doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a detailed enough plan, doesn't have a strategy.

Well, first the President put forward a plan last evening. While Republicans have blasted it as insufficiently detailed, it is just as detailed as the plans put forward by the former President to invade Afghanistan and to invade Iraq.

Now, keep in mind, as we learned from those wars, whatever plan is put forward is going to be dramatically changed because once you engage in hostilities, things change.

Second, if the President were to provide as much detail as some hyperpartisan Republicans are demanding, he would then be attacked for revealing our strategy, our tactics, and classified information.

The only thing that holds together, creates consistency among certain extremist partisan Republicans, is that whatever the President does, it is wrong.

Then I have got to ask, where is the Republican plan?

Have Republicans coalesced around any plan?

Has any prominent Republican even put forward a plan?

Where is your plan?

Vice President Dick Cheney has not put forward a plan, just an expression of anger and partisanship. Speaker BOEHNER has not put forward a plan. The Republican-controlled House Armed Services Committee majority has not put forward a plan.

There are a host of think tanks here in Washington that could aid Republicans in drafting a plan, yet, the Republicans have yet to even discuss their own plan, let alone coalesce around the Republican plan.

It seems like the Republicans do have a plan. Their plan is to reap political advantage from this crisis in the Middle East, while avoiding any responsibility for making decisions.

The Republicans are politically clever. And when I say Republicans in this speech, I am referring only to the hyperpartisan Republicans who have engaged in the activities that I described.

These Republicans understand that no one can draft the plan the American people really want. Americans want a plan that guarantees the immediate and total destruction of ISIS, without significant American casualties.

So hyperpartisan Republicans can constantly berate the President because he doesn't have a guarantee. He isn't offering immediate total destruction. He does have a plan designed to avoid American casualties.

Instead, we get a suggestion that somehow this guaranteed, no-cost, immediate total victory would be achieved if only we had a different President.

I think it is time for Congress to stop harping about whether the President has a plan. He has put forth a plan.

Now Congress must exercise its constitutional role in defining what authorizations the President is going to be granted and what portions of his plan are going to be authorized.

I look forward to—I hope, though doubt—a serious debate on the floor of this House, where we will discuss and vote on and amend and vote on the amendments of a resolution dealing with whether to arm Syrians and train them, with a resolution as to whether to have a long-term, multiyear, perhaps, bombing campaign against ISIS, and whether the President is authorized to use ground forces.

□ 1545

Finally, I want to focus on the Middle East, itself, and how complicated the situation is, and I want to praise the President not only for his decisive action but also for his wise caution, because the situation we face in the Middle East is far more complicated than the President's detractors would let on.

The natural reaction upon seeing those horrific videos is to say ISIS is the embodiment of all evil, and its total and immediate destruction is all that we need to do, that it should be our entire focus, but let's look at the situation. We look not only on the entity we want to destroy but also at who will be empowered by its destruction. Who is on the ground in Syria and in the Sunni areas of Iraq that is fighting ISIS and stands to gain if ISIS is destroyed? If we make the list, we see entities that are nearly as evil as ISIS

and are, if anything, more capable of hitting our homeland, of hitting Europe, of hitting targets outside the Middle East, than is ISIS itself.

First, we see that ISIS is engaged in war with the al-Nusra Front. Al-Nusra is a dedicated branch of al Qaeda, one of its more capable branches. So the destruction of ISIS will, to some degree, empower al Qaeda and al-Nusra, since they are both rivals in fighting for support among extremist Sunnis.

Second, on the list of ISIS' foes is the Assad regime. Now, the very people who are attacking the President for not acting precipitously today were attacking the President last year for not bombing the Assad regime. So they attacked him last year for not bombing Assad and this year for not bombing Assad's number one enemy. The only consistency here is you are attacking the President for not bombing somebody. The fact is that Assad has the blood of many tens of thousands of people on his hands, and his empowerment, his success in removing the ISIS problem that he has, will be one of the disadvantages of destroying ISIS.

Third is Iran and Hezbollah. Iran and Hezbollah are waging war against ISIS today, and embody a greater long-term threat to the United States than ISIS. Keep in mind that Hezbollah killed hundreds of marines during the Reagan administration in Lebanon. Hezbollah and Iran, in working together, have conducted operations on a variety of different continents. There is all this talk about how there are numbers of people fighting with ISIS who have American passports, and they might come back and conduct an operation. There are those who are fighting with ISIS who have European passports who could go to Europe and conduct an operation. That is ''might.'' Iran and Hezbollah have been conducting operations in South America, Europe, Asia for decades, and Iran came close to effectuating an assassination right here in Washington, D.C., just within the last decade.

So, yes, it would be good to destroy ISIS, but let's not kid ourselves. Those who would be empowered by that destruction include entities nearly as evil and probably more dangerous than ISIS itself.

I bring up this complexity to argue against those who wonder why we didn't just lash out immediately. Why do we need caution? We need caution because the situation is not as simple as an old Western movie where you have the good guy in a white hat and the bad guy in a black hat, and if the bad guy gets killed, there is peace and unity, and life is wonderful and restored, and the good cowboy in the white hat rides off into the sunset with the schoolmarm. Al-Nusra is not a schoolmarm. Hezbollah is not a schoolmarm. Iran is developing nuclear weapons. The Middle East is not nearly as simple as the President's detractors pretend.

I look forward to doing something that Members of Congress don't necessarily look forward to doing, and that is taking responsibility and casting tough votes, but if we are going to be true to the Constitution, we will not allow to stay on the books in its present form a 2001 resolution that was adopted in the immediate aftermath of the terrible events that occurred 13 years ago today. We will not allow that statement to be twisted and stretched and applied to situations well beyond its description. We will, instead, do what the Constitution requires of us, and that is to define:

What is the President authorized to do, under these circumstances, for the goals that we have this decade and at this time?

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. 2323. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 15, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7024. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2014 report on the efforts of the Radiation Source Protection and Security Task Force, in accordance with Section 651(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7025. A letter from the President, Arab Parliament, transmitting a statement of the emergency meeting of the Arab Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs related to the repercussions of the Israeli aggression on the Palestinian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7026. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Action Under Section 5(a)(6) of the Iran Sanctions Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7027. A letter from the Speaker, Kuwait National Assembly, transmitting a letter calling attention to the continuous aggression by the Israeli forces on the Palestinian People; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7028. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter informing the Congress that approximately 50 U.S. Armed Forces personnel were deployed to the Central African Republic to support the resumption of the activities of the U.S. Embassy in Bangui; (H. Doc. No. 113–154); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7029. 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.

7030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting eighteen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7031. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled, ''Veteran Hiring in the Civil Service: Practices and Perceptions''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7032. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Phased Retirement (RIN: 3206-AM71) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7033. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Patapsco River; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0201] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7034. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0005; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-17890; AD 2014-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7035. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0004; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-17900; AD 2014-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7036. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0206; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-17507; AD 2013-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7037. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0432; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-17898; AD 2014-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7038. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0863; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-17883; AD 2014-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7039. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International, Inc. (Type Certificate previously held by AlliedSignal Inc., Garrett Turbine Engine Company) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0386; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-17897; AD 2014-12-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7040. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1059; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-17896; AD 2014-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7041. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AERMACCHI S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0939; Directorate Identifier 2013- CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-17881; AD 2013-22-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7042. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0341; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-17874; AD 2014-12-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7043. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0953; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17877; AD 2014-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7044. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0241; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-17880; AD 2014-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7045. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Airbus Helicopters) (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0395; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-016-AD; Amendment 39-17876; AD 2014-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7046. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters) (AHD) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0440; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-075-AD; Amendment 39-17885; AD 2014-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7047. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1025; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-17894; AD 2014-13-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7048. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1070; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-17892; AD 2014-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7049. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0296; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-17861; AD 2014-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7050. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS CASA (Type Certificate Previously Held by Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0980; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-17891; AD 2014-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7051. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0010; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-17882; AD 2014-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7052. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0867; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-17853; AD 2014-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7053. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0009; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-17887; AD 2014-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7054. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1027; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-17886; AD 2014-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7055. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0973; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-17893; AD 2014-13-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7056. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1009; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-17855; AD 2014-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7057. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0226; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-17884; AD 2014-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7058. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE GMBH & CO KG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0292; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-17904; AD 2014-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7059. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0308; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-17903; AD 2014-15-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7060. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corporation Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0159; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-17905; AD 2014-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7061. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0055; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-17907; AD 2014-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7062. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1024; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-17909; AD 2014-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7063. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0177; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-17912; AD 2014-15-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7064. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V.

Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0007; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-038-AD; Amendment 39-17889; AD 2014-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Gwen Moore (Rept. 113–585). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5448. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DENHAM, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5449. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5450. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5451. A bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to use consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5453. A bill 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; 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5454. A bill to amend the African Elephant Conservation Act to provide for trade sanctions against countries involved in illegal ivory trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5455. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (''SAFE Port Act'') to administer a pilot program for 100 percent scanning of cargo containers at domestic ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5456. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to create an electronic database of research and information on the causes of, and corrective actions being taken with regard to, algal blooms in the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and other surface fresh waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 5457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for zero carbon emissions refueling property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5458. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 5459. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5460. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such 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. CASSIDY:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require any Member whose Members' Representational Allowance is used to pay for a flight on a private aircraft to report information on the flight not later than 30 days after the flight, and requiring any Senator whose official funds are used to pay for a flight on a private aircraft to report information on the flight not later than 30 days after the flight; to the Committee on Ethics, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution urging Congress to debate and vote on a statutory authorization for any sustained United States combat role in Iraq or Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CHU, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring civil rights workers Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, and the ''Freedom Summer'' of 1964, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 721. A resolution encouraging greater public-private sector collaboration to promote financial literacy for students and young adults; to the Committee on Financial Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

311. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 memorializing the President and the Congress to enact the Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

312. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 1 urging the Congress to take action to support, establish, or construct a national museum recognizing atrocities against American Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

313. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 notifying that the Senate and the House of Representatives of South Dakota have ratified the 26th Amendment of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 408 ratifying Amendment 17 of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 402 ratifying Amendment 17 of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 123 memorializing the Congress to make any murder of a police officer or corrections officer while in the line of duty a federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution 412 urging the state's delegation to pursue all efforts to have Rhode Island declared a ''Promise Zone''; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

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. BARLETTA:

H.R. 5448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 5449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5451.

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. DUFFY:

H.R. 5452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 5454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: 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. LATTA:

H.R. 5456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which provides that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 29: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 36: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 318: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 482: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 679: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 690: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 713: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 725: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 792: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 942: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1041: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1070: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1127: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1201: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1212: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1318: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1339: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1343: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1429: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1437: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1731: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1750: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1783: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1801: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1830: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1843: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1878: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2042: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2224: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2229: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2305: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2329: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2384: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2414; Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2415: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2452: Ms. ESTY and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2453: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2480: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2509: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2523: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2529: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 2647: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2673: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2794: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2852: Mr. HOLT and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2856: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2870: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2918: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2994: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3043: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3399: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3400: Mr. HANNA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3531: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3544: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3662: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3680: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3708: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 3723: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3742: Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3877: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3902: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3992: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4060: Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 4128: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4136: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4137: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4142: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 4170: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4172: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4190: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 4223: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4504: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4515: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4526: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4608: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4612: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 4659: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4693: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4717: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4727: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 4755: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4852: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4858: Mr. HOLT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4885: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 4920: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4930: Mr. Polis, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4978: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 4985: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 5001: Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5024: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 5033: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5059: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5060: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 5071: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 5083: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 5098: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5126: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5182: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5190: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 5194: Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 5212: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 5213: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5226: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 5227: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5228: Ms. CHU and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5235: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5239: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5259: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5267: Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5269: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5279: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5280: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 5285: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 5320: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5328: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 5354: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5364: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5403: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5408: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5432: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 109: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 231: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H. Res. 456: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 522: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 552: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H. Res. 688: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Res. 697: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 707: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 716: Mr. HIGGINS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Mine Hill, New Jersey, relative to Resolution 102-14 urging the President to utilize the full powers and authorities of his office to immediately secure the release of Marine Sgt. Andrew Tahmooressi from Mexican custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

97. Also, a petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Cape May, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 613-14 urging the President to utilize the full powers and authorities of his office to immediately secure the release of Marine Sergeant Andrew Tahmooressi from Mexican custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, a petition of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution, Louisville, Kentucky, relative to a resolution requesting that the National Society Sons of the American Revolution should be granted a leadership position on any U.S. Congressional Commission to celebrate the Quarter-Millennial (250th) Anniversary of the Boston Massacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, a petition of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No. 13-175 urging the House of Representatives to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.