United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015 No. 44

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM EMMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

CHRISTIAN PERSECUTION

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the sobering but extremely consequential topic of Christian persecution.

Last week, I had the honor of visiting with more than 100 parishioners of St. Alphonsus Liguori Catholic Church in Zionsville, Indiana, including many interested high school students who shared with me their passionate concerns about the senseless persecution of their Christian brethren.

Through the church's Social Action Committee, they wanted to know how a small, faithful community could make a difference in bringing attention to this commonly overlooked matter. However, they wondered if their cries for mercy were falling on deaf ears in Washington. They felt helpless in bringing to light the barbarity, torture, and living conditions that Christians in places like Iran endure.

The parishioners at St. Alphonsus felt that too often horrendous massacres are met with isolationism and arguments that it is not America's job to promote human rights beyond our shores.

Today I want to let the people of St. Alphonsus and all those who seek to give a voice to the silenced victims of religious persecution know I hear you, and others in Washington, D.C., do as well.

I believe that America must reassume its leadership role in protecting those most destitute and downtrodden, that American leadership in the world should advance not only our national interests but also the interests of those who yearn for freedom across the globe, that Christians who have to shield their faith for fear of crucifixion or beheading have an ally in America, an ally who will fight for the dignity of all mankind.

Incidents of persecution of Christians more than doubled in 2014 alone. I wish I could say I was surprised by this increase, but I am not. I think this is part of the larger trend around the globe.

The world we live in is remarkably unstable right now. People lack security. Too many regions of our world are fending off the rise of groups that espouse extremely radical ideologies, groups that hate this Nation, groups that often hate all other religions, groups that feed off of destruction and poverty, groups that value violence over peace, groups that are clearly not a true or worthy representation of the religions they claim as their own.

The parishioners at St. Alphonsus Church asked me: What can we do?

I told them America first needs a smart and decisive plan because the threat Christians face is significant, and it is not going away.

The United States must work with free nations across the globe to reaffirm a simple but important message: human rights are not negotiable. Countries don't get to pick and choose which rights they allow and which ones they deny. We also need to work more locally to raise awareness of the specific issue of Christian persecution. There must be a strong grassroots element to this effort.

Each month, approximately 180 Christians are killed across the globe because of their faith. That is a startling number. In America, a country where it is so easy to take our freedoms for granted, it is easy not to notice the pain and suffering of others, but we must. And I know we are a truly generous and kind people.

When Japanese communities were torn apart by a massive tsunami in 2009, Americans mobilized to donate more than $700 million in charitable relief.

Americans always answer the call when people are suffering. Well, today there is clearly a tsunami of hatred sweeping parts of the world, and there are people who need our help. So churches and other groups with a concern for their fellow Christians and all global citizens need to take a stand.

Like those at St. Alphonsus have, Christians and people of all faiths across this Nation need to reach out to their elected officials and let them know of the tragic persecution of Christians and that it deserves attention, that religious freedom is a value we must defend and promote. Only then will everyone in this body know what was foretold in Matthew, that

Printed on recycled paper.

blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven. Let us now work to bring that kingdom of Heaven closer to Earth.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. In this Chamber where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people that, through the difficulties of these days, we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in the world.

A week after many Members of this assembly traveled to Selma to remember historic and heroic actions 50 years ago, may the House be energized to guarantee the very rights so many suffered to obtain back then and which still elude so many of their American descendants today.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE 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.

ANOTHER OBAMACARE DEBACLE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Obama administration admitted that it sent inaccurate tax forms to 820,000 Americans who receive health insurance through ObamaCare. Individuals who received subsidies must fill out the 1095–A form to document what they have received for the past year.

The government is advising people not to file their tax returns until they have the correct forms, but just last week Kevin Counihan, the man responsible and accountable for leading healthcare.gov, declined to say when ObamaCare participants will get the correct tax forms and if all of the new forms have been created.

Since its implementation, the President's health care law has proved to be a hindrance, not a help, to the health care market. This debacle is yet another example of why we must continue to work towards repealing this ill-conceived law and replacing it with policies that empower patients and promote access to affordable health care options.

JOBS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just got back from spending a week at home in Michigan talking with the people that I work for and meeting with small business owners. I heard a lot of frustration—frustration about the priorities of the Republican leadership in the House and of Congress in general.

Instead of legislation to create jobs here in America to make it easier for hardworking families to buy their own home, to afford to send their kids to school, and to save for retirement, this Congress has bounced from one manufactured political crisis to the next and has not taken on the big challenges that the people sent us here to take on.

Let's put away this dysfunction and this paralysis. Let's get back to the work of the American people.

As we now are set to consider our Nation's budget, let's make sure that the priorities of the American people—good paying jobs, affordable college, homeownership, and the ability to save for a decent retirement—that those priorities are the priorities that we include in this important budget document. This is what the American people expect of us, and this is what we should take on.

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, March 16, 2015.

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 March 16, 2015 at 10:38 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 7.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

IMPROVING REGULATORY TRANSPARENCY FOR NEW MEDICAL THERAPIES ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 639) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 639

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act''.

SEC. 2. SCHEDULING OF SUBSTANCES INCLUDED IN NEW FDA-APPROVED DRUGS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE OF DRUG APPROVAL.—Section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(x) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (b) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

''(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), the term 'date of approval' shall mean the later of—

''(A) the date an application under subsection (b) is approved under subsection (c); or

''(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL OF BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.—Section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (a) with respect to a biological product for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the biological product is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

''(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), references to the date of approval of such application, or licensure of the product subject to such application, shall mean the later of—

''(A) the date an application is approved under subsection (a); or

''(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the biological product.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL OF ANIMAL DRUGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (b) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

''(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), the term 'date of approval' shall mean the later of—

''(A) the date an application under subsection (b) is approved under subsection (c); or

''(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.''.

(B) CONDITIONAL APPROVAL.—Section 571(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) In the case of an application under subsection (a) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, conditional approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

''(B) For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in subparagraph (A), the term 'date of approval' shall mean the later of—

''(i) the date an application under subsection (a) is conditionally approved under subsection (b); or

''(ii) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.''.

(C) INDEXING OF LEGALLY MARKETED UNAPPROVED NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—Section 572 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) In the case of a request under subsection (d) to add a drug to the index under subsection (a) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the person filing the request that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, a determination to grant the request to add such drug to the index shall not take effect, and the Secretary shall not list the drug on such index, until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.''.

(4) DATE OF APPROVAL FOR DESIGNATED NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—Section 573(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc–2(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) For purposes of determining the 7-year period of exclusivity under paragraph (1) for a drug for which the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, the drug shall not be considered approved or conditionally approved until the date that the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.''.

(b) SCHEDULING OF NEWLY APPROVED DRUGS.—Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

''(j)(1) With respect to a drug referred to in subsection (f), if the Secretary of Health and Human Services recommends that the Attorney General add the drug to schedule II, III, IV, or V pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), the Attorney General shall, not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (2), issue an interim final rule controlling the drug in accordance with such subsections and section 202(b) using the procedures described in paragraph (3).

''(2) The date described in this paragraph shall be the later of—

''(A) the date on which the Attorney General receives the scientific and medical evaluation and recommendations from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with subsection (b); or

''(B) the date on which the Attorney General receives notification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Secretary has approved an application under section 505(c), 512, 571, or 572 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the drug described in paragraph (1).

''(3) A rule issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) shall be in accordance with the procedures provided in subsection (a), except that the rule shall become immediately effective as an interim final rule without requiring the Attorney General to demonstrate good cause therefor. After publication of the interim final rule, the Attorney General shall issue a final rule in accordance with the procedures provided in subsection (a).''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—Section 156 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', or in the case of a drug product described in subsection (i) within the sixty-day period beginning on the covered date (as defined in subsection (i))'' after ''marketing or use''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(i)(1) For purposes of this section, if the Secretary of Health and Human Services provides notice to the sponsor of an application or request for approval, conditional approval, or indexing of a drug product for which the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, beginning on the covered date, the drug product shall be considered to—

''(A) have been approved under the relevant provision of the Public Health Service Act or Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and

''(B) have permission for commercial marketing or use.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'covered date' means the later of—

''(A) the date an application is approved—

''(i) under section 351(a)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act; or

''(ii) under section 505(b) or 512(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

''(B) the date an application is conditionally approved under section 571(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

''(C) the date a request for indexing is granted under section 572(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

''(D) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug under section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.''.

SEC. 3. ENHANCING NEW DRUG DEVELOPMENT.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i)(1) For purposes of registration to manufacture a controlled substance under subsection (d) for use only in a clinical trial, the Attorney General shall register the applicant, or serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c), not later than 180 days after the date on which the application is accepted for filing.

''(2) For purposes of registration to manufacture a controlled substance under subsection (a) for use only in a clinical trial, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General, issue a notice of application not later than 90 days after the application is accepted for filing. Not later than 90 days after the date on which the period for comment pursuant to such notice ends, the Attorney General shall register the applicant, or serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c), unless the Attorney General has granted a hearing on the application under section 1008(i) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I will include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 639 seeks to improve the transparency and consistency of the Drug Enforcement Administration's first scheduling of new FDA-approved drugs under the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, and, secondly, its registration process for the manufacture of controlled substances for use in clinical trials. Ultimately, this will allow new and innovative treatments to get to patients who desperately need them.

Due to the cost and uncertainty of the drug development process, there is broad agreement that a predictable timeline for approval decisions is a necessary component to successful drug development.

Industry, the FDA, and Congress have taken steps to provide more transparency and consistency in the drug approval process through the negotiation and authorization of the Prescription Drug User Fee program and a commitment to review goals embedded in the PDUFA agreements.

However, drugs that contain substances that have not been previously marketed in the U.S. and that have abuse potential must also be scheduled under the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, by the DEA before they can reach patients.

Under the CSA, there is no deadline for the DEA to make a scheduling decision, and the delays in DEA decisions have increased significantly. Between 1997 and 1999 and 2009 and 2013, the average time between FDA approval and DEA's final scheduling increased from an average of 49.3 days to an average of 237.6 days. Recently, a company had to wait over 13 months after FDA approval to receive a final scheduling recommendation from the DEA.

The lack of predictability in the timing of DEA scheduling decisions leads to unnecessary uncertainty in the drug development process and needless delays in patient access to new therapies.

Section 2 of H.R. 639, as amended by the full committee, would require DEA to issue an interim final rule, scheduling the new drug no later than 90 days after it is approved or when it receives the FDA's scheduling recommendation, whichever comes later. After receiving the FDA's recommendation, the DEA would continue to conduct its own analysis prior to scheduling the drug, but patients would now have peace of mind in knowing this will no longer be an open-ended process. Of note: since 1996, the DEA has not made any scheduling decision for a new drug that was contrary to the FDA recommendation.

Further, section 3 of this bill would bring much-needed certainty to another open-ended DEA process. Manufacturers of controlled substances are required to be registered with the DEA. The requirement to register extends to manufacturers of controlled substances intended to be used in clinical trials for products not yet approved by the FDA. There is no timetable for the DEA to grant approval of registration applications, and there is not a process for the applicant to determine the reasons for delay in the application. The lack of transparency, predictability, and timeliness in the registration process leaves companies unable to properly plan clinical trial schedules for prospective new therapies.

For registration applications related to schedule III, IV, and V drugs that will only be used in clinical trials, section 3, as amended by the full committee, would require the DEA to register the applicant or serve an order to show cause on why the applicant shall not be registered within 180 days of the filing of the application.

For drugs in schedule I and II that will only be used in a clinical trial, the DEA would be required to issue a notice of application not later than 90 days after an application is accepted for filing. Ninety days after the end of the comment period, pursuant to the notice, the DEA would be required to register the applicant or serve an order to show cause on why the registrant should not be registered.

Such a solution does not force the DEA to make a particular decision but will provide transparency to the process so companies can better plan when regulatory decisions will be made.

I would urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
March 16, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing with respect to H.R. 639, the ''Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act.'' As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 639 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 639 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 639, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 639.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODTETTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 639, the ''Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act.'' As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 639, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be consulted appropriately and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 639 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 639, the Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act. This legislation was introduced by the chair of our Health Subcommittee, JOE PITTS of Pennsylvania; the ranking member of the full committee, FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey; and myself to provide a solution to delays experienced by patients in need.

Currently, new drugs and substances that previously have not been marketed in the United States and that have abuse potential must be scheduled by the Drug Enforcement Administration prior to being marketed.

The amount of time the DEA has taken before acting on FDA recommendations has significantly lengthened in recent years, which delays the availability of new therapies.

This legislation will improve patient access by bringing clarity and transparency to the process of scheduling a new FDA-approved therapy.

I was pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) in supporting this legislation to continue the great work they started last Congress. I thank them and their staff for working on this important access issue.

I want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON and the work of the committee's minority and majority staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee. I

support this bipartisan bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office for H.R. 639.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 639, the Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Julia Christensen.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE ON FEBRUARY 12, 2015

H.R. 639 would modify the administrative procedures followed by the Department of Justice in regulating new drugs that are already approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and in authorizing drugs to be used in clinical trials. The legislation would aim to streamline the current review and approval process. CBO estimates that implementing the bill would have no significant effect on spending subject to appropriation. Enacting the legislation would affect direct spending and revenues related to federal health care costs; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. CBO estimates that that those effects would also not be significant over the 2015–2025 period.

The legislation would change the effective date of FDA approval for certain new drugs that undergo review by the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) to determine if the drug should be marketed with restrictions as a controlled substance. Such a change could extend certain regulatory periods during which FDA will not accept marketing applications or permit another manufacturer to market a version of an affected drug and could also result in the extension of patent terms for certain products. Extending such periods of marketing exclusivity could delay the entry of lower-priced generic drugs on the market, and such a delay would increase the average cost for prescription drugs. Any increase in health care costs resulting from delaying the market entry of generic drugs would affect direct spending and revenues by increasing the cost of prescription drugs for federal health programs and private health insurance.

CBO expects that the bill's provisions would apply to a limited number of drugs subject to DEA classification after enactment. Because most drugs generally retain patent protections after FDA approval for more than 10 years, CBO anticipates that the likelihood that drugs affected by the bill will face generic competition before 2025 under current law would be small. As a result, we estimate that enacting the bill would not significantly affect direct spending or revenues over the 2015–2025 period. Beyond 2025, however, the potential for the legislation to delay the market entry of generic drugs would be greater, and the effect on direct spending and revenues would increase in later years.

H.R. 639 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. The bill would impose a private-sector mandate, as defined under UMRA, on manufacturers of generic drugs by delaying the entry of those products in the market. The cost of the mandate would be the net loss of income, which could be significant depending on the drug. Based on information from industry sources, CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate would probably fall below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($154 million in 2015, adjusted annually for inflation).

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Julia Christensen and Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs) and Amy Petz (for private sector costs). The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to H.R. 639, the Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act. This important public health bill aims to bring better reliability and transparency to medical therapies, while continuing to ensure that they reach patients in need quickly, but most importantly safely and effectively.

When a new drug is approved by the FDA, a company can begin marketing the product upon its approval. However, for a subset of drugs, FDA recommends to the DEA they be included in the Controlled Substance Act—or "scheduled," if there is abuse potential. Until DEA makes a final decision, a drug cannot be released to the public.

Unfortunately, there is no deadline for the DEA to make a decision. As a result, the process has lengthened over time, in some instances lasting years before a decision is made. So even if a drug is considered safe and effective, patients and physicians are being forced to wait to access these therapies. This bill would continue to allow DEA to conduct its own analysis, but would remove much of the uncertainty from the process. It also would speed up the DEA registration process allowing the manufacture and distribution of controlled substances for use only in clinical trials.

I want to thank Chairman PITTS for working with me on this bill last Congress, and committing to move forward early this Congress. Thank you to Mr. GREEN as well for joining us on this important bill.

I am glad that we have been able to work with both DEA and FDA, our Senate counterparts and the bill sponsors, to ensure that the goals of this bill is met.

I urge members to support H.R 639 and I look forward to its swift passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 639, 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.

ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING TRAUMA CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 647) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 647

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF TRAUMA AND EMERGENCY CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) TRAUMA CENTER CARE GRANTS.—Section 1245 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–45) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking "2009, and such" and inserting "2009, such"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020".

(b) TRAUMA SERVICE AVAILABILITY GRANTS.—Section 1282 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–82) is amended by striking "2015" and inserting "2020".

SEC. 3. ALIGNMENT OF PROGRAMS UNDER ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

Section 2811(c)(2)(F) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10(c)(2)(F)) is amended by striking "trauma care under parts A through C of title XII" and inserting "trauma care under parts A through D of title XII and part H of such title".

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS.

(a) CLARIFICATION ON ELIGIBLE TRAUMA CENTERS.—Section 1241(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–41(a)) is amended by striking "qualified public, nonprofit Indian Health Service, Indian tribal, and urban Indian trauma centers" and inserting "qualified public trauma centers, qualified nonprofit trauma centers, and qualified Indian Health Service, Indian tribal, and urban Indian trauma centers".

(b) TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS QUALIFICATIONS FOR SUBSTANTIAL UNCOMPENSATED CARE COSTS.—Section 1241(b)(3)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–41(b)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "35" and inserting "30"; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking "50" and inserting "40".

(c) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS.—The heading for part D of title XII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–41 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART D—TRAUMA CENTERS".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House today will consider two bills relating to Federal support for trauma care. These bills have both passed the Energy and Commerce Committee at the subcommittee and full committee levels on voice votes.

Trauma is the leading cause of death under the age of 65. It is expensive, costing over $400 billion per year, third only to heart disease and cancer. It affects individuals of all ages—35 million Americans annually, or one person every 15 minutes.

Over many years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and I have worked closely on this issue to update the law and ensure the reauthorization of crucial trauma grant programs occurs. As a result of this coordination, today we will be voting on two bills that continue our long bipartisan record of support for efforts to shore up the Nation's trauma systems and centers.

The Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, H.R. 647, will authorize two grant programs, which will expire this year, that provide critically needed Federal funding to help cover uncompensated costs in trauma centers, support core mission trauma services, provide emergency funding to trauma centers, and address trauma center physician shortages in order to ensure the future availability of trauma care for all our citizens.

Trauma can happen at any time to anyone. It can happen to a family in a highway crash or a gunshot victim or a construction worker who is injured at the worksite. Trauma centers must be available for all victims of traumatic injury. Getting a trauma victim to a trauma center right away is the first step in saving that person's life.

These bills draw support from the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, the American Association of Orthopedic Surgeons, the American Burn Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, the American Trauma Society, the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, the Association of Critical Care Transport, the American Heart Association, the American Stroke Association, Emergency Nurses Association, Society of Trauma Nurses, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma, National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, the Orthopedic Trauma Association, and the Trauma Center Association of America.

I strongly urge the House to support both of these bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 647, the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act. My colleague and fellow Texan, Dr. MIKE BURGESS, and I have introduced this legislation. I thank him for his leadership and partnership on this issue.

The bill would reauthorize vital programs to prevent more trauma center closures and improve access to trauma care.

The trauma center care grants were created to prevent trauma center closures by supporting their core missions, covering a portion of the losses from uncompensated care, and providing emergency awards to centers at risk of closing.

The trauma service availability grants are awarded through the States to address shortfalls in trauma services and improve access and availability of trauma care in underserved areas.

□ 1545

Despite our best prevention efforts, trauma injury will continue to occur. Unfortunately, access to trauma care is threatened by losses associated with the high cost of treating severely injured patients, including those unable to pay for their care, and a growing shortage of trauma-related physicians.

The public expects that appropriate trauma care will always be available to them wherever they reside or travel, yet this is not a reality. Profound challenges face our Nation's trauma centers, trauma systems, and the physicians who treat the most vulnerable patients. Thus, I urge swift passage of this important legislation.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me, and his staff, J.P. Paluskiewicz, for their hard work. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I support this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out the gentleman's name is J.P. Paluskiewicz, and we do, indeed, thank him for his efforts on the bill.

I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out many people nowadays are familiar with what is called the golden hour, that first hour that occurs after a traumatic injury where the ability to save life and limb is vastly increased if a person can be delivered to a center within that golden hour's time. It is imperative to reauthorize these programs. They are critically needed for our citizens. Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 647.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 648) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 648

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1232(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32(a)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2020''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR REGIONALIZED SYSTEMS FOR EMERGENCY CARE RESPONSE.—Section 1232(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–31(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015, not more than 50 percent of such amounts remaining for such fiscal year after application of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be allocated for the purpose of carrying out section 1204.''.

(b) CLARIFICATIONS UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS FORMULA GRANTS REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN BURN ASSOCIATION.—Section 1213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting ''and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015) contains national standards and requirements of the American Burn Association for the designation of verified burn centers,'' after ''such entity,'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics,'' and inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015) the American Burn Association,''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and not later than 1 year

after the date of the enactment of the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act'' after ''Act of 2007''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics'' and inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (with respect to the update pursuant to the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act) the American Burn Association''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part B of title XII of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) in section 1218(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300d–18(c)(2)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''1232(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 1232(b)''; and

(2) in section 1222 (42 U.S.C. 300d–22), by striking ''October 1, 2008'' and inserting ''October 1, 2017''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, H.R. 648, is identical to H.R. 4080 that passed the House last year unanimously. This legislation has also passed both the subcommittee and the full committee. This support extends back to 1990 when the grant was created and authorized.

This reauthorization allows funding for trauma systems development and the regionalization of emergency care. These programs are designed to improve patient outcomes, and they are designed to save lives and cut costs, objectives where I believe there is bipartisan agreement.

Trauma systems are organized efforts in a defined geographic area that deliver the full range of care to injured patients. Many members of the subcommittee have trauma systems in their districts or ones nearby that are able to serve their constituents.

Regionalizing emergency care allows States to coordinate their resources and helps first responders act faster, leading to lower costs and better outcomes. A study released last year found that patients living near a recently closed trauma facility were 20 percent more likely to die from their injuries. Two years after closure, the likelihood of death increased to 29 percent, emphasizing the importance of these grants.

This legislation is broadly supported by medicine, sharing the list of supporting organizations that I previously read on H.R. 647. It is bipartisan. I would stress it has gone through regular order.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS, as well as Ranking Member PALLONE and Ranking Member GREEN, for their help and support on this legislation. I want to thank the Energy and Commerce staff on both sides of the dais: Clay Alspach, Katie Novaria, as well as Hannah Green, and a special thanks to Adrianna Simonelli, who championed both of these bills as my legislative fellow and who is now working on the committee.

Mr. GREEN and I have worked on these issues literally for years, and I appreciate his continued partnership on this bill. I want to thank his staff, Kristen O'Neill. Finally, I do want to thank J.P. Paluskiewicz, who shepherded this bill through the entire process.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 648, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act. I am proud to be the lead sponsor of this bill, along with my colleague, Dr. BURGESS, and I want to thank him for his leadership and commitment to this issue.

The bill reauthorizes the programs that provide grants to States for planning, implementing, and developing trauma care systems and establishing pilot projects to design innovative models of emergency care systems.

Ideally, trauma and emergency care systems respond quickly and efficiently to ensure that seriously injured individuals receive the care they need within the golden hour, the time period in which medical intervention is most effective at saving lives. However, unintentional injury remains the leading cause of death for Americans ages 44 years and younger, and access to trauma centers is inconsistent throughout the country. In fact, 45 million Americans lack access to a trauma center within the first hour after injury.

Emergency departments and trauma centers are overcrowded. The emergency care system is splintered, and surgical specialists are often unavailable to patients when they need them. This legislation helps establish a system that saves lives and improves the functioning of our trauma care systems.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me and his staff for their efforts. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by strongly urging all Members of the House to vote in favor of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 648.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write today to resign from the House Small Business Committee. While I appreciate the honor of being appointed, in order to best serve the constituent of Texas' 23rd congressional district, I believe I must focus on my existing committee assignments.

With my background in the intelligence community, cybersecurity, and representing the district with the largest length of U.S.-Mexico Border, my ability to focus on my Information Technology Subcommittee Chairmanship and Border and Maritime Subcommittee Vice-Chairmanship is where I believe I can be of most value to my constituents and colleagues in the House.

I appreciate your timely consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

WILL HURD,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

NOTICE OF OBSERVATION TREATMENT AND IMPLICATION FOR CARE ELIGIBILITY ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 876) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 876

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act'' or the ''NOTICE Act''.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE REQUIREMENT FOR HOSPITAL NOTIFICATIONS OF OBSERVATION STATUS.

Section 1866(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (V), by striking at the end ''and'';

(2) in the first subparagraph (W), by striking at the end the period and inserting a comma;

(3) in the second subparagraph (W)—

(A) by redesignating such subparagraph as subparagraph (X); and

(B) by striking at the end the period and inserting '', and''; and

(4) by inserting after such subparagraph (X) the following new subparagraph:

''(Y) beginning 12 months after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, in the case of a hospital or critical access hospital, with respect to each individual who receives observation services as an outpatient at such hospital or critical access hospital for more than 24 hours, to provide to such individual not later than 36 hours after the time such individual begins receiving such services (or, if sooner, upon release)—

''(i) such oral explanation of the written notification described in clause (ii), and such documentation of the provision of such explanation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

''(ii) a written notification (as specified by the Secretary pursuant to rulemaking and containing such language as the Secretary prescribes consistent with this paragraph) which—

''(I) explains the status of the individual as an outpatient receiving observation services and not as an inpatient of the hospital or critical access hospital and the reasons for such status of such individual;

''(II) explains the implications of such status on services furnished by the hospital or critical access hospital (including services furnished on an inpatient basis), such as implications for cost-sharing requirements under this title and for subsequent eligibility for coverage under this title for services furnished by a skilled nursing facility;

''(III) includes such additional information as the Secretary determines appropriate;

''(IV) either—

''(aa) is signed by such individual or a person acting on such individual's behalf to acknowledge receipt of such notification; or

''(bb) if such individual or person refuses to provide the signature described in item (aa), is signed by the staff member of the hospital or critical access hospital who presented the written notification and includes the name and title of such staff member, a certification that the notification was presented, and the date and time the notification was presented; and

''(V) is written and formatted using plain language and is made available in appropriate languages as determined by the Secretary.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 876, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation dealing with the Medicare program that is bipartisan that the Committee on Ways and Means marked up a couple of weeks ago.

I want to just commend my colleagues Congressman YOUNG from Indiana and Congressman DOGGETT from Texas for their work on this.

This is common sense. This tells patients what the rules are so that they know what is going to happen when they are in the hospital, so they know what kind of billing they are going to have.

I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the coauthor of this legislation, for the purpose of describing this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for taking up this important piece of legislation today. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for his leadership on this issue.

When seniors require a hospital stay, they are rightfully more concerned with their recovery than with understanding how the hospital classifies their status as a patient; but when that classification can impact future coverage of health care services related to their recovery, they deserve to be made aware of the potential ramifications.

This act, the NOTICE Act, would require hospitals to provide meaningful written and oral notification to patients who are in the hospital under observation for more than 24 hours. This notice would alert the beneficiary or person acting on their behalf of the Medicare patient's admission status and the financial implications of that classification so he or she can advocate on their own behalf while in the hospital.

No one should be caught off guard by a large medical bill just because they weren't aware of the status codes or the billing procedures. In a time of sickness and stress, families should focus on the recovery of their loved ones instead of dealing with the hidden costs due to lack of notice.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and yield myself such time as I might consume.

The NOTICE Act, as the name suggests, is about giving notice. In this case, it gives notice to patients when they are about to be billed personally, perhaps for many thousands of dollars, because they were characterized as under observation rather than regular inpatient status without them even knowing.

I am pleased to have worked on this legislation since last summer with Mr. YOUNG when we originally filed the bill, and I am appreciative of Chairman RYAN's prompt consideration of it in our committee.

This is a consumer protection bill designed to provide at least limited protection to health care consumers. Currently, a hospital may either admit a patient as an inpatient or keep them under observation. This categorization might apply to heart murmur, irregular heartbeat, indigestion, or other symptoms that would cause a senior or an individual with a disability who is covered by Medicare to go into the hospital.

It probably makes little or no difference in the way the hospital treats the physical condition, but it can make a very big difference in terms of how the patient's pocketbook is cared for. Indeed, the effect of being under observation is that the patient gets stuck with the bill for any skilled nursing home care that is required for rehabilitative services after the stay at the hospital.

Medicare will pay for that needed care if a Medicare recipient patient is hospitalized for more than 3 days as an inpatient, but Medicare will not pay for skilled nursing home care if someone is simply under observation. Since Medicare has paid nothing, there is also no gap to be covered by Medigap; and instead of being in a gap, folks like this are really left in just a giant black hole. A Medicare patient that is sucked into this hole will be billed for the entire cost of rehabilitation at the nursing home, which can run into tens of thousands of dollars.

This practice is happening more and more across America, though it is largely unknown to most people until they get caught up in it. In 2012, Medicare patients had more than 600,000 observation stays that lasted 3 days or more. According to one study, over a 6-year span, the number of stays under observation has increased by 88 percent. Many Medicare patients are being put under observation for a length of time that exceeds the guidelines that have been set by Medicare.

Last year on the NBC Nightly News, Kate Snow profiled Ms. Kelley-Nelum, who discovered that this costly classification had a big impact on her hospitalized husband. After repeated questioning and demanding to know why

her husband was under observation, she got the hospital to reclassify him. She later learned that had that not occurred, had she not been persistent in standing up for her ill husband, that they would have faced about $22,000 in out-of-pocket rehabilitation bills.

Last year, with so many patients facing insurmountable out-of-pocket costs for skilled nursing care after unknowingly being placed under observation, The New York Times actually ran a piece that was designed to provide guidance to health care consumers about how to get out of this observation category. The first step is knowing you are in it, and this bill provides for that meaningful disclosure.

This legislation is endorsed by AARP, by the Alliance for Retired Americans, the Center for Medicare Advocacy, the National Association of Professional Geriatric Care Managers, LeadingAge, American Health Care Association, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

I include in the RECORD letters from two of those groups in support of the legislation.

AARP,
February 24, 2015.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Rayburn Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD YOUNG,
Longworth Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DOGGETT AND REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the nearly 38 million AARP members and the millions more Americans with Medicare, we are pleased to endorse the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility (NOTICE) Act of 2015 (H.R. 876). Thank you for working together to address the growing problem of Medicare beneficiaries paying high out-of-pocket costs due to hospital stays in which they were classified as an outpatient, rather than being formally admitted as an inpatient.

As you know, the use of ''observation status'' has become more prevalent in recent years, and the duration of observation stays has grown longer. While there may be several reasons for these trends, it is clear that Medicare beneficiaries are spending more and more time in the hospital without being formally admitted. Admission as an inpatient activates Medicare Part A cost-sharing and a three-day stay requirement for skilled nursing facility (SNF) coverage; in contrast, observation status is billed under Part B, and can expose beneficiaries to unexpectedly high out-of-pocket costs amounting to thousands of dollars.

Beneficiaries must be informed and made aware of how any changes to their status will affect them. This legislation would require hospitals to provide meaningful written and oral notification to patients who are in the hospital ''under observation'' for more than 24 hours. While this does not solve all the problems regarding cost-sharing and access to SNF coverage, it is an important step to ensuring Medicare beneficiaries have access to information about their care. Clearly understanding their admission status will help patients, and their caregivers, better plan treatment options with their health care providers.

Again, thank you for your continued work to protect Medicare beneficiaries. If you have any questions, please contact me, or have your staff contact Ariel Gonzalez, Director of Federal Health and Family.

Sincerely,

JOYCE A. ROGERS,
Senior Vice President,
Government Affairs.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2015.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN DOGGETT: I serve as the president and chief executive officer of AHCA/NCAL, the nation's largest association of long term and post-acute care providers. The association advocates for quality care and services for the frail, elderly, and individuals with disabilities. Our members provide essential care to millions of individuals in more than 12,000 not for profit and for profit member facilities.

AHCA/NCAL, its affiliates, and member providers advocate for the continuing vitality of the long term care provider community. We are committed to developing and advocating for public policies that support quality care and quality of life for our nation's most vulnerable. Therefore, we are in support of the legislation, Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility (NOTICE) Act, that you and Congressman Todd Young (R–IN–9) have introduced again this Congress.

The NOTICE Act requires hospitals to give formal notice to patients within a period of time after classifying them as an inpatient or as an outpatient under observation. More specifically, the legislation works to ensure that hospitals notify patients entitled to Medicare part A coverage of their outpatient status within 36 hours after the time of their classification or, if sooner, upon discharge.

Often times, patients have no idea what their status is in a hospital or the importance of it. This can lead to thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket medical expenses should they need skilled nursing center care following their hospital stay. The observation stays issue is a financial burden on seniors and their families. It can cause unnecessary spend-down, accelerating the time frame in which seniors will have to turn to programs such as Medicaid to pay for their care.

This legislation is a positive step forward, and raises attention to a complex and critical issue hurting the nation's seniors. AHCA/NCAL applauds Congressmen Doggett and Young for serving as champions for seniors and those individuals who need our services the most.

Sincerely,

MARK PARKINSON,
AHCA/NCAL President & CEO.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I also appreciate the help we have received from the Center for Medicare Advocacy. They have had reports, again, from people all over the country being placed in this situation.

The hospitals may act in the best interests of a patient's health but not always in the best interest of the patient's pocketbook. The NOTICE Act will equip patients and their loved ones with the knowledge that they need to be effective advocates and avoid crippling financial repercussions.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if they have any other speakers? We are prepared to close.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have one speaker on the way. If you are prepared to close and he is not arriving, then we will close.

Do you have any other speakers?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will just say a few things. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker.

This is basically common sense. What is happening is people on Medicare are going to the hospital. They don't know what their status is, whether they are considered inpatient or outpatient. As far as they are concerned, it is the same thing. The problem is they are being declared one or the other, unbeknownst to them, and that has a huge difference in the billing that they receive.

So what this bill simply says is you will know your status so that you can make an informed decision as a patient in a hospital, because there are huge financial implications to that status. This is very simple. It is good government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds and will welcome my colleague, JOE COURTNEY, who has long sought to respond legislatively to protect health care consumers from the financial pain of this observation status.

While the passage of the NOTICE Act is an important step, Representative COURTNEY has an Improving Access to Medicare Coverage Act that would treat observation stays the same as inpatient stays. I support his legislation as he has supported, from the beginning, this initiative, and I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, salute Congressman DOGGETT for his effort in terms of bringing this legislation forward. As the chairman of the committee said, this is really about giving patients a fighting chance to challenge this coding, a change that happens while people are in the hospital and have absolutely no idea that they are not being treated as full part A inpatient patients at hospital facilities.

The impact of being coded as observation versus inpatient may sound extremely arcane, but what that means is that at time of discharge, if a patient is medically prescribed to go to a nursing home for rehab care for a broken bone or for home health services for a heart condition, they are not covered by Medicare if they are in the observation bucket as opposed to the inpatient bucket.

The inspector general's office for Medicare issued a report in 2012 that 600,000 patients across the country with long-stay hospital visits over 3 days fell into this black hole, this no man's land where, again, their doctors are telling them that they need to have rehab services so that people can walk again and deal with activities of daily living; but the price for doing that, because you are in observation status,

can be tens of thousands of dollars, which is where long-term care facilities, nursing home coverage for private-pay patients, out-of-pocket patients, exist today.

This bill at least gives patients the opportunity to challenge that decision. But the fact of the matter is, what we need to do is to restore the 3-day rule, which is in statute. It has been there since 1965. Observation status is something new within the last 10 years, and what we need to do as a Congress is to restore that 3-day rule, which says to a patient: If you are coded observation or if you are coded inpatient, it should not interfere with your medically prescribed course of treatment at the time that you are discharged from the hospital.

That, unfortunately, is not going to be fixed as a result of this legislation. We should build on this legislation and again restore Medicare's promise, which, again, from day one, has said that medically prescribed care will be covered by the system at time of discharge from a hospital for longer than 3 days.

The horror stories of people who in some instances were in hospital for 9 days with broken bones, broken hips, who, again, are staring at a 10 to $15,000 fee to be admitted to a nursing home—again, 600,000 cases in 2012.

So again, we need to build on this legislation, but fundamentally, we need to restore the 3-day rule which has been in statute since 1965. We will be introducing that legislation later this week. It will be a bipartisan bill. We think we can withstand the test of any pay-fors to make sure that it allows the Medicare system's finances to stay in a stable condition. In the meantime, we should pass this legislation today.

Again, I want to salute the Member from Texas for his leadership on this issue.

□ 1645

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from Connecticut.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I agree, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 876, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MEDICARE DMEPOS COMPETITIVE BIDDING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 284) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 284

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Medicare DMEPOS Competitive Bidding Improvement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING BID SURETY BONDS AND STATE LICENSURE FOR ENTITIES SUBMITTING BIDS UNDER THE MEDICARE DMEPOS COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) BID SURETY BONDS.—Section 1847(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(G) REQUIRING BID BONDS FOR BIDDING ENTITIES.—With respect to rounds of competitions beginning under this subsection for contracts beginning not earlier than January 1, 2017, and not later than January 1, 2019, an entity may not submit a bid for a competitive acquisition area unless, as of the deadline for bid submission, the entity has obtained (and provided the Secretary with proof of having obtained) a bid surety bond (in this paragraph referred to as a 'bid bond') in a form specified by the Secretary consistent with subparagraph (H) and in an amount that is not less than $50,000 and not more than $100,000 for each competitive acquisition area in which the entity submits the bid.

''(H) TREATMENT OF BID BONDS SUBMITTED.—

''(i) FOR BIDDERS THAT SUBMIT BIDS AT OR BELOW THE MEDIAN AND ARE OFFERED BUT DO NOT ACCEPT THE CONTRACT.—In the case of a bidding entity that is offered a contract for any product category for a competitive acquisition area, if—

''(I) the entity's composite bid for such product category and area was at or below the median composite bid rate for all bidding entities included in the calculation of the single payment amounts for such product category and area; and

''(II) the entity does not accept the contract offered for such product category and area,

the bid bond submitted by such entity for such area shall be forfeited by the entity and the Secretary shall collect on it.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF OTHER BIDDERS.—In the case of a bidding entity for any product category for a competitive acquisition area, if the entity does not meet the bid forfeiture conditions in subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (i) for any product category for such area, the bid bond submitted by such entity for such area shall be returned within 90 days of the public announcement of the contract suppliers for such area.''.

(b) STATE LICENSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847(b)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3(b)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) The entity meets applicable State licensure requirements.''.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require State licensure of an entity under the Medicare competitive acquisition program under section 1847 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3) before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) GAO REPORT ON BID BOND IMPACT ON SMALL SUPPLIERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that evaluates the effect of the bid surety bond requirement under the amendment made by subsection (a) on the participation of small suppliers in the Medicare DMEPOS competitive acquisition program under section 1847 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date contracts are first awarded subject to such bid surety bond requirement, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1). Such report shall include recommendations for changes in such requirement in order to ensure robust participation by legitimate small suppliers in the Medicare DMEPOS competition acquisition program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 284, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply want to, again, commend our committee, Republicans and Democrats, for working on a bipartisan basis to fix a problem in the Medicare Program that needs fixing.

I want to specifically highlight Mr. TIBERI, a senior member of our committee from Ohio, along with Mr. LARSON, a senior member of the committee from the Democratic side of the aisle, for working together to fix a very deep flaw in a competitive bidding system which needs a lot of work to be improved.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for the purpose of describing and explaining the need for this legislation.

Mr. TIBERI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support of H.R. 284, the Medicare Competitive Bidding Improvement Act which, as you said, I introduced with my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Mr. JOHN LARSON.

The bill does fix a fundamental flaw in the Medicare durable medical equipment Competitive Bidding Program by simply requiring that bids be binding. It will promote fairer competition. More importantly, it protects our seniors and supports small businesses.

DME includes items like home oxygen, blood sugar monitors, and walkers for seniors. The Competitive Bidding Program was intended to reduce out-of-pocket costs for these seniors.

However, over the last several years, it has become very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the bidding process is extremely flawed, in large part because the bids are not binding. This encourages low-ball bidding—or suicide bidding—which artificially drives down prices and will eventually lead to market failure because there is no performance on many of these bids, meaning seniors don't get their equipment.

I have heard from seniors, beneficiaries, and small business suppliers in my State of Ohio that the program is impeding access to needed items for seniors, like the ones I just described, ultimately harming their health and making costs more expensive for our seniors and the program itself. This is absolutely unacceptable.

The goal of the bill is to reduce the number of bad actors who are now participating in the program by simply imposing a penalty if the supplier who wins the bid doesn't accept the contract to the bid they won.

The bill will help ensure that these suppliers submit bids in good faith, creating more certainty for those suppliers, and, most importantly, making sure that seniors get the supplies and the equipment that they need and qualify for, increasing access to more quality products and services at the end of the process.

If this bill is signed into law, seniors across the country will no longer have to worry about whether the company in their area will provide the information and, more importantly, the equipment to which they bid on and actually be able to provide that wheelchair, walker, or oxygen tank that that senior so desperately needs.

As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee mentioned, the bill has bipartisan support. It is a commonsense bill that actually passed the Ways and Means Committee unanimously. It was scored by the Congressional Budget Office to actually save taxpayer dollars over the next 10 years.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I thank Mr. LARSON for his partnership.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know that this legislation has been in the works by Representatives TIBERI and my good friend Mr. LARSON from the State of Connecticut. Unfortunately, he could not be here to speak on his own bill due to unforeseen circumstances, so I am but a poor fill-in for Mr. LARSON.

The bill is a commonsense bill that will save a lot of money. The durable medical equipment Competitive Bidding Program has reduced well-documented overpayments to DME providers.

It is estimated that it would result in $42 billion in savings over a 10-year period, with $26 billion in savings for the Federal Government and more than $17 billion in out-of-pocket savings for beneficiaries themselves.

This legislation, as I mentioned, was introduced in the Ways and Means Committee by Representatives TIBERI and LARSON. What they are essentially trying to get at is the issue of low-ball bidders, and what this legislation would do is require bonds for companies who wish to participate in the program.

The Ways and Means Committee did pass this bill out of the committee on a unanimous voice vote, and I, as well, support its passage. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 284 as a commonsense solution that will save money in the long run.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say the gentlewoman understates the point. She is a perfectly fine fill-in for Mr. LARSON.

I congratulate my colleagues on the committee for seeing a problem and rushing to fix this problem. This is what we are supposed to do here.

We are legislating a solution to make sure that senior citizens have access to the highest quality, lowest price durable medical equipment. There is a flaw in the law in how that is being done, and this bill rectifies that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 284, 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.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1191

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act''.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND CERTAIN NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

''(A) EMERGENCY SERVICES VOLUNTEERS.—Qualified services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to an eligible employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms 'qualified services', 'bona fide volunteer', and 'eligible employer' shall have the respective meanings given such terms under section 457(e).

''(B) CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to a specified employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee.

''(ii) BONA FIDE VOLUNTEER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'bona fide volunteer' means an employee of a specified employer whose only compensation from such employer is in the form of—

''(I) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or

''(II) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

''(iii) SPECIFIED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'specified employer' means—

''(I) any government entity, and

''(II) any organization described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

''(iv) COORDINATION WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—This subparagraph shall not fail to apply with respect to services merely because such services are qualified services (as defined in section 457(e)(11)(C)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1191, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very commonsense bill aimed at protecting our volunteer firefighters across America. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for bringing this issue to our attention. It is something that he, as a former mayor, is very familiar with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for the purposes of explaining his bill.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1191, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

I had hoped by now that we would not have to be on the floor of this body talking about my legislation once again. This is the third time I have brought this bill to the floor of the House.

It is intended to protect volunteer firefighters and emergency services personnel from ObamaCare. The first two times I introduced it, it passed the House by a combined vote of 811–0.

I know that there are very few pieces of legislation that attract such amazing bipartisan support, and for that, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Today, I come asking for your support again.

Let me tell you why this bill is necessary. In 2013, a firefighter from back home named Bob Timko approached me at a parade in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. He told me about a serious problem regarding volunteer firefighters and the Affordable Care Act, or ACA.

Because the Internal Revenue Service specifically considered volunteer firefighters employees for Federal tax purposes, there was the fear that they would fall under the employer mandate of the ACA. If volunteer fire companies were subject to the employer mandate, they could be liable for crippling new health care costs, causing many to have to close their doors.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the threshold for the employer mandate is 50 employees. That raised the question of how volunteer firefighters would be counted. Would they be counted as employees just under the fire company, or would they be counted as municipal employees?

If that were the case, many volunteer fire companies could easily achieve 50 employees. If they did, these companies could be forced to pay health insurance costs for their volunteers or pay a fine.

This is very important in my home State of Pennsylvania. Ninety-seven percent of our fire companies depend either mostly or entirely on volunteers. Across the country, 87 percent of fire companies depend on volunteers.

As a former mayor, I can tell you that volunteer firefighters are part of the essential fabric of our communities. These are people who risk their lives every day to protect their friends, families, and people they don't even know. I can tell you that no one becomes a volunteer firefighter because they want health insurance. While they are on duty, they are, of course, covered by workman's compensation insurance.

Our volunteer firefighters have a hard enough time raising money needed for basic equipment. They cannot afford to pay for health insurance—or pay a fine—on top of it.

Last year, the IRS finally decided—after months of pressure from Members of the House, from firefighters, and from the media—that they will not consider volunteer firefighters ''employees'' for Federal tax purposes, but I don't think we should leave something as important as public safety in the hands of unelected bureaucrats at the IRS. Our brave volunteer emergency personnel deserve certainty.

As I said, this is the third time we have had this bill before this body. The first time, in 2014, it passed the House of Representatives 410–0. When it got to the Senate, they used it to attach unrelated language about emergency unemployment insurance. The bill died.

The second time, just earlier this year, it passed the House of Representatives 401–0. This time, the Senate stripped all of my language out of the bill. It got turned into a 1-week funding measure for the Department of Homeland Security.

This is a bill that deserves to become law. This legislation has the strong support of the National Volunteer Fire Council, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute.

I appreciate their support and the work of all the men and women they represent who protect us every day in our hometowns. We all agree that public safety is too important of an issue to play politics with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I ask all Members to vote ''yes.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartened that my Republican colleagues are acting on legislation to improve the Affordable Care Act, rather than to simply repeal it.

Technical corrections have long been part of the legislative process for such fundamental pieces of legislation, and this bill does the same.

Volunteer first responders are absolutely critical to the safety and security of communities across the country. Seventy percent of all firefighters across the country are volunteers. For the communities aided by volunteer first responders, the services donated annually by these volunteers are estimated to be worth more than $140 billion.

This legislation allows communities to continue to benefit for the time and commitment of our firefighters and other first responders.

□ 1700

Treasury has responded to the concerns that Mr. BARLETTA and many other Members raised through their final regulations. But this legislation makes permanent the reasonable solution that the administration put forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Treasury specifically outlining the regulations that address those concerns.

This bill is bipartisan, and it is noncontroversial. It, as I said, codifies a regulation that has already been issued by the administration.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2014.

Hon. STEVE ISRAEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ISRAEL: I am writing regarding your interest in how the employer shared responsibility provisions of the Affordable Care Act will apply to volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency medical personnel. In particular, you have urged the Treasury Department to consider not requiring the volunteer hours of these personnel to be counted in determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees for purposes of the employer shared responsibility rules. We appreciate your efforts and leadership on behalf of the volunteer emergency responder community, and want to assure you that we share your concern that emergency volunteer service be accorded appropriate treatment.

Treasury and the IRS issued proposed regulations providing guidance on the employer shared responsibility provisions under section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code (Code) in December 2012 and invited public comments. Numerous comments were received from individuals and local fire and EMS departments that rely on volunteers, from the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), and from Members of Congress. The comments generally suggested that the final employer responsibility rules not count volunteer hours of nominally compensated volunteer firefighters and emergency medical personnel in determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees.

Treasury and the IRS carefully reviewed those comments and spoke with IAFC representatives to gain a better understanding of the specific issues presented by volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency personnel under the employer responsibility provisions. Treasury and the IRS also reviewed pertinent rules that apply to such volunteer personnel under other laws. These include the statutory provisions applicable to bona fide volunteers for different purposes under Code section 457(e)(11) (relating to deferred compensation plans of state and local governments and tax-exempt organizations) and rules governing the treatment of volunteers for purposes of the wage and hour laws. As a result of that review and further analysis concerning the appropriate treatment of volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency personnel under section 4980H, the forthcoming final regulations generally will pot require volunteer hours of bona fide volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency medical personnel at governmental entities or tax-exempt organizations to be counted when determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees.

The forthcoming final regulations, which we expect to be issued very shortly, should provide timely guidance for the volunteer emergency responder community. Under the transition relief announced by Treasury in July of 2013, no employer shared responsibility payments will be assessed for 2014; such payments will be assessed only for 2015 and subsequent years (see IRS Notice 2013–45).

I hope this information is helpful. And thank you for the important insights you have provided with this issue. If you have

any questions, please contact me, or ask a member of your staff to contact Sandra Salstrom at 202–622–1900.

Sincerely,

ALASTAIR M. FITZPAYNE,
Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

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

I want to thank Mr. BARLETTA for bringing this to our attention. This is a problem with the law and, therefore, the law needs to change. It is insufficient that we have some regulatory forbearance from the administrative branch because the law has to be changed, and that is why this legislation is necessary.

Again, I just wanted to thank Mr. BARLETTA for his leadership on this issue. We need to do right by our volunteer firefighters, and this does that.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 284. I have heard from many stakeholders in eastern Connecticut about this issue, and believe that this bill is a commonsense approach to making needed improvements to the competitive bidding process for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies.

Requiring bidding entities to meet state licensure requirements in product category areas and obtaining reasonable bid surety bonds for each area are sensible prerequisites to improving the competitive acquisition program. Requiring vendor bidders to be licensed, means that they have attained basic standards of education and training, which patients can rely on. These reforms will ensure that the competitive DME bidding process produces a more stable supply chain of life saving equipment for Medicare patients.

I am proud to support this legislation, and urge bipartisan support for this bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1191, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 647, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 648, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 876, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING TRAUMA CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 647) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 10, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—389

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—10

Amash
Foxx
Huelskamp
Jones
LaMalfa
Massie
McClintock
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—33

Becerra
Capuano
Carney
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
DeFazio
Fincher
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Holding
Jeffries
Kaptur
Lipinski
Lummis
Mulvaney
Pascrell
Payne
Posey
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Turner
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (SC)

□ 1855

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

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

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. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 647—Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act.

TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 648) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) 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 382, nays 15, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—382

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—15

Amash
Foxx
Garrett
Huelskamp
Hunter
Jones
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Ribble
Rouzer
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Westmoreland
Yoho

NOT VOTING—35

Becerra
Capuano
Carney
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
DeFazio
Fincher
Fortenberry
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Holding
Jeffries
Kaptur
Lipinski
Lummis
Meadows
Mulvaney
Pascrell
Payne
Posey
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Turner
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (SC)

□ 1903

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. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 648—Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act.

NOTICE OF OBSERVATION TREATMENT AND IMPLICATION FOR CARE ELIGIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 876) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals, as amended, 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—395

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek 1

Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—37

Becerra
Capuano
Carney
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
DeFazio
Edwards
Fincher
Fortenberry
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Holding
Jeffries
Kaptur
Lipinski
Lummis
Meadows
Mulvaney
Pascrell
Payne
Posey
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Turner
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (SC)

□ 1910

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 876—Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, as amended.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 113 on the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, H.R. 647, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 114 on the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, H.R. 648, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 115 on the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, H.R. 876, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on today, March 16, 2015, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the three rollcall votes of the day. Had I been present I would have voted:

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 113—H.R. 647—Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act;

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 114—H.R. 648—Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act;

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 115—H.R. 876—Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2015 I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On rollcall vote No. 113, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 647, the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, I would have voted "aye";

On rollcall vote No. 114, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 648, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, I would have voted "aye";

On rollcall vote No. 115, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 876, the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–44) on the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF THE DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table (S. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 7

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

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be

used on April 15, 2015, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, collectively, in recognition of the military service and exemplary record of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1102

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) from H.R. 1102, the Police Accountability Act.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1041

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1041.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1915

RECOGNIZING DR. ERICK HUECK OF MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding educator in my south Florida Congressional District, Dr. Erick Hueck, a chemistry teacher at Miami Senior High School. Dr. Hueck has been an accomplished teacher for more than 25 years, and he has the awards to prove it, including the Miami-Dade Teacher of the Year Award and the Governor's Teacher of the Year Award, among many others.

But more than these accolades, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hueck is known to his students as a mentor and a role model, someone to whom they can come for both academic and life wisdom and who is making learning and science fun.

Dr. Hueck is a positive influence, giving his students the knowledge, the confidence, and the opportunity to follow their dreams.

Thank you, Dr. Hueck. We are all so very proud of you.

Go Stingarees.

BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American families expect us to work hard to keep them safe. It is our job to work together in addressing their national security concerns, not to diminish our government's standing for political sport.

In 2 short months, this Congress has allowed party extremists to push us to the brink of having no Homeland Security funding, and now we must deal with the dynamic created by misguided Senators whose attempts to undermine the President on Iran have set a dangerous precedent that compromises the authority of future Presidents to negotiate on matters of foreign and national security policy.

I ask my colleagues: What are we doing? We can't cater to political extremes here at home and protect American families from real extremist threats abroad. Let's move beyond the politics that divide us and commit to working with the President to ensure that Iran does not obtain a nuclear weapon. The Illinois families I represent deserve it, and the American people demand it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JEFFREY BUCK, LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER

(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 honor the life of 18-year-old Lawrence Township volunteer firefighter Jeffrey Buck.

On March 3, Jeff was battling a house fire in Clearfield, Pennsylvania, when the porch roof collapsed on him and two fellow firefighters. For the next 6 days, Jeff was in critical condition, on and off sedation, and on March 9, Jeff succumbed to his injuries.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragedies like this that remind us how selflessly these brave volunteers act in order to protect their neighbors and our communities.

This is a sad time for Clearfield and the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On Friday afternoon, I attended the memorial service for Mr. Buck in Clearfield, and it was truly remarkable to see the entire community come together and unite in the wake of this terrible tragedy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in offering their prayers and deepest sympathies to Jeff's family, friends, and fellow first responders.

HONORING MALCOLM JAMES ''JIMMY'' KEEP, VETERAN OF WORLD WAR II

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Malcolm James ''Jimmy'' Keep, a lifelong Memphian and a veteran of World War II who fought bravely against Japanese forces in Guam, Saipan, and Iwo Jima. Keep, now 88 years of age, served with the 4th Marine Division after joining the Marines at age 17 in 1943.

Tomorrow, Mr. Keep and his son, Mickey, will travel to Iwo Jima, with the help of a Memphis-based nonprofit organization called Forever Young Senior Veterans, to join 70 other Marine veterans for a 70th anniversary gathering.

Jimmy Keep was assigned to reconnaissance duty early in his career and recalls fighting on Saipan as the bloodiest thing he had ever seen. He came under enemy fire from all sides on Iwo Jima when his amphibious tank was disabled, causing him and his partner, Charlie, to evacuate on foot. The two escaped unharmed, earning them the nickname ''rain-walkers.'' If they could survive that kind of heavy fire, they could surely walk through rain without getting wet.

On Iwo Jima, Keep cleared out huge tunnels that were used by the enemy to launch attacks on the Marines, and he helped carry a fellow marine who was injured back to the beach. He told him: ''You're getting off this rock. I'll trade places with you.''

Jimmy Keep is a true hero. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Malcolm James ''Jimmy'' Keep for his service and bravery as a marine with the 4th Marine Division during the Pacific campaigns in World War II. He will have the Memphis Grizzlies flag when he gets there at Iwo Jima, and that will be part of his contribution to Memphis.

CONGRATULATING THE OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the robotics team at Bloomington's Oak Grove Middle School, the Typhoons, for taking first place in the Minnesota First Tech Challenge State Championships last month. This is the first year that the Oak Grove team had the opportunity to compete in State competition, but they still managed to beat out 47 other teams for first place. The team is now qualified to compete in the upcoming North Super Regional Championships coming up in Des Moines.

Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to be driven by advancements in new technologies, it is important that our youth and young people have the opportunity to learn and explore in the science, math, technology, and engineering fields.

Robotics clubs and competitions bring out the best of students' imagination, ingenuity, and skill. They inspire students to pursue educational opportunities that will help them compete for the jobs of tomorrow. That is

why, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the teachers, the staff, and the mentors that have made STEM a priority at Oak Grove, and also congratulations to all the students on a job well done.

2016 BUDGET PRIORITIES

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our Vice President, JOE BIDEN, once said: ''Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value.''

This body's routine budgeting practices have faded away in the last 4 years only to be replaced by partisan bickering that uses austere budgets as messaging tools. These budgets invariably go nowhere, while the most vulnerable individuals and families in our communities see their needs grow larger and their potential to make their own success grow smaller.

Our national priorities should be simple enough: public investment in quality education accessible by every student, infrastructure, job training programs, research, and a national energy policy that encourages innovation and new jobs. The strategy we have seen of cutting our way to prosperity simply does not work. The more we do it, the more we cut ourselves down while more nations pass us by.

As we work our way through the 2016 budgeting process, instead of telling our constituents our values, let's show them what we value by producing an ambitious budget that creates opportunity for our American middle class and those struggling to enter it or to stay in it.

THE DEPLORABLE ACTIONS OF THE MADURO REGIME

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Maduro regime in Venezuela has moved to expel opposition leaders from the National Assembly, arrested the mayor of Caracas on charges of conspiracy to commit violent acts, and has detained opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez for treason. The government issued a policy allowing police to use deadly force to control protests, which has resulted in the death of a 14-year-old student on his way to school. Over the weekend, Maduro's cronies in the legislature gave him dictatorial powers to more harshly crack down on internal dissent. Venezuela is sadly teetering closer towards a Cuba-style dictatorship.

I condemn these acts of repression which are a desperate attempt by Maduro and his henchmen to cling to power, despite policy failures that have led to shortages of food and medical supplies, long lines at shops, and soaring inflation.

These sanctions announced last week are a long overdue first step to holding the Maduro regime accountable for its grotesque disregard for human rights. But more must be done to ensure that these thugs answer for their crimes.

I stand in solidarity with the peaceful, democratic Venezuelan opposition there and in the U.S. that oppose thuggish rule. They have been instrumental in spreading information about Maduro's deplorable actions.

LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERSHIP

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, maybe even a few months ago, I had the privilege of listening partly to the testimony of Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch, a brilliant expression of a seasoned and competent, qualified and wise attorney that has served this Nation for many, many years. Formerly, as the U.S. attorney in Brooklyn, New York, she has been one who has received accolades from all over the Nation.

Now, unfortunately, the Senate, the other body, chooses to create a constitutional crisis. As she lingers waiting for a confirmation vote, already approved by the Judiciary Committee with a bipartisan vote, it begs the question: Why we are having this kind of treatment of the appointees of President Obama?

So I ask the other body if they would do what is right for the American people as we look for law enforcement leadership, as we continue to look for direction on antitrust issues, voting rights issues, women's rights issues, human rights issues, and many issues dealing with terrorism that fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Justice. It is time, and now, for this confirmation to be done and approved and for this former U.S. attorney to be sworn in as the United States Attorney General in the Department of Justice.

THANKING TIM BUTLER, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 87TH HOUSE DISTRICT IN THE ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a former staffer for his service to this House, my office, and to the people of Illinois. Tim Butler, who most recently served as my district chief of staff, left my office recently to represent the people of the 87th House District in the Illinois General Assembly.

Tim was an asset to my team from day one, as we set out to make sure every constituent in the Thirteenth District knew we were there to serve them by getting answers from Federal departments like the VA, listening and acting on legislative ideas, and much more. Under Tim's leadership, we opened five district offices, helped more than 1,500 constituents through casework, and launched 10 advisory boards, just to name a few of our team's accomplishments during my first term.

Tim began his service in the House in 1991 with the Committee on Education and Labor, and after leaving the committee, he worked for then-Congressman Ray LaHood for 14 years. It was during his time with Congressman LaHood and my time as projects director for Congressman SHIMKUS that Tim and I met and became friends. With his dedication and record of success helping constituents in Congressman LaHood's office, I knew he would be a perfect fit for mine.

Tim's leadership in my office will be missed, but I know he will provide the same level of exemplary constituent services representing the people of the 87th District in the Illinois General Assembly.

I thank Tim for his service to this House, and I congratulate him on his new opportunity to serve the people of Illinois.

THE BATTLE WAGES ON: SECURING EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be before you this evening on the heels of our Nation's recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Selma marchers which tore down many obstructive barriers to voting for African Americans and which led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We have grown as a nation since the night Jimmie Lee Jackson was murdered peacefully marching for voting rights in Alabama, and we are not the America we were when Mamie Till made the world see what had been done to her baby. But we are still living in dynamic times for our democracy. Selma has changed, but the issues of Ferguson, Missouri, remain.

Nearly 60 years after Emmett Till was buried, Black mothers still worry about the value of their son's lives when they leave home. We are reminded of this every time we look into the eyes of Trayvon Martin's mother. We are better today than we were then,

and the changes we made to our laws paved our path to prosperity. The President spoke of this in Selma, and Republicans and Democrats alike were united in our feeling that we must uphold the promise of the Nation we inherited because of Selma.

□ 1930

The U.S. Senate should vote to confirm very qualified and exceptional U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General. The CBC devoted an hour of floor testimony last month in defense of her confirmation, but in her role as Attorney General, Loretta Lynch will be tasked with defending the Federal laws that protect the right to vote, and that brings us to our topic this evening.

Tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour is entitled: ''The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States.'' This topic is truly timely. This conversation needs to take place now. Work remains to secure equal voting rights in the United States.

Actions like the Supreme Court's decision to gut the Voting Rights Act remind us that the equality that should exist at the ballot is still lacking and why I dream of a day when the Voting Rights Act is no longer necessary. The truth is that voter discrimination and suppression remain as tragic legacies of our past.

In the past few years, many States have introduced restrictive legislation that diminishes an individual's access to the voting booth. The Justice Department may have the tools to fix this problem and go after places that are discriminating against certain voters.

In some places, getting a voter ID that you can use to vote can cost up to $150, and that can be a burden for someone who is on a fixed income and not driving anymore and doesn't have a license.

Discriminatory laws and policies that hamper access to the ballot box are reasons that the protections and the Voting Rights Act are necessary. The VRA must remain intact as its principles are powerful democratic agents that make our Union more perfect.

With that, I would like to kick off this Special Order hour by yielding to my colleague and anchor, a man who has dedicated his life to the issues of justice in America—a lawyer, judge, and statesman who has defended voting rights—the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman KELLY. Thank you for your leadership, and thank you for what you mean to the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Congressional Black Caucus is now the largest caucus in our history. We are very proud to announce that we have 46 members now in CBC, representing more than 30 million people from 23 States, in addition to the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, so I am delighted that you have taken this responsibility each week, Ms. KELLY, to come to the floor and manage this time.

Typically, Congressman DONALD PAYNE would be joining Congresswoman KELLY tonight, but Mr. PAYNE is not able to come to the floor tonight to help with this Special Order due to, what I am told, is complications from foot surgery, so we wish Congressman PAYNE a very speedy recovery.

Ms. KELLY, I wanted to particularly thank you for selecting this subject this evening. This is a very timely conversation that we must have in this Congress, and that is the whole subject of the Voting Rights Act. The topic that you have chosen, ''The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States,'' is so very appropriate; and, hopefully, in the next 2 or 3 minutes, I want to tell you why.

Let me just start by explaining the whole voting rights story. Some of my colleagues may not fully appreciate it and understand that when we talk about voting rights, we just don't talk about 1965.

In order to fully appreciate the voting rights history in this country, we must go back to the end of slavery when 4 million slaves became free. They did not have the right to vote. Once the 15th Amendment was added to the Constitution, then all of the former slave men got and obtained the right to vote.

They got engaged. They got involved in the political process. From 1870 until 1900, a period of some 30 years, African American males, particularly in the South, were fully engaged in the political process.

But do you know what? In 1900, Mr. Speaker, in 1900, that right to vote came to an end. It came to an end because of Southern States like South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and the like, all of these Southern States passed disfranchisement laws, particularly a literacy test.

This literacy test had the practical effect of denying the former slaves and their descendants the right to vote. Not only did you have to read and write in order to be able to register to vote, you had to convince the registrar that you were literate.

The practical effect of that was that the whole voting rights movement during those days came to an abrupt end in 1901 when Congressman George H. White, who was one of my predecessors in North Carolina, stood on this House floor on March 3, 1901, and made a very profound welfare speech to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first era of voting rights in this country.

The next era, I would say, would be from 1901 to 1965, when African Americans, for the most part, were not allowed to register to vote because of the literacy test and were not meaningfully involved.

The next and final phase would be from 1965 until the present. In 1965, this Congress passed a historic 1965 Voting Rights Act, and it was a bipartisan bill. Democrats and Republicans promoted the bill all the way to the finish line with the help of then President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The 1965 voting rights, Mr. Speaker, did many great things, but the three things that I will highlight tonight are: Number one, it eliminated the literacy test; number two, it gave a right of action, it gave to African American communities all across the United States the right to bring legal action to file civil lawsuits in Federal court to challenge discriminatory election laws or practices or procedures; the third part of the Voting Rights Act was what we now refer to as section 5.

The Congress in 1965 set aside certain States in the country and certain subdivisions within a State to require them to get preclearance before election laws when new election laws went into effect.

Many of our Southern States did not like section 5, but it was put on the books for a purpose because, if given the opportunity, these States were going to pass discriminatory election laws that made it very difficult for African Americans to vote.

Section 5 has now been on the books since 1965. It has been strongly enforced by the Attorney General. Section 2 has been strongly enforced in courts all across the country. Now, we have 46 African Americans serving in Congress, we have thousands elected at State and local levels all across the country, and it was because of the Voting Rights Act in many respects.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we received a great surprise on June 25 of 2013. The U.S. Supreme Court declared that section 5 could not be enforced because the formula that gives life to section 5, which is section 4, the court said that section 4 needed to be updated and called on this Congress to amend section 4 to make it more contemporary in its application.

This Congress has failed to act. Now, this is the spring of 2015, and we have failed to act. Our voting rights are under continuous assault with more and more States and counties enacting voting laws that, on their face, appear to not be an impediment to voting. Many of these new laws are discriminatory, I want you to know. Some are intended to be. Others, though not intentional, will have a discriminatory result.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am just unable to understand why my Republican colleagues refuse to support an amendment to section 5 to make this provision compliant with the Supreme Court decision.

Through the years, this Congress has been called upon to extend section 5, and it has done so in a bipartisan way. In 2006, as section 5 was about to expire then, there was a bipartisan bill passed by this Congress, signed by President

George W. Bush. There were 192 Republicans who voted for the bill.

I want to say that to you again, my colleagues: 192 Republicans voted to extend section 5 just a few years ago. I saluted them then; I salute them now. Sixty-six of those Republicans continue to serve in the House today, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. Speaker, we must fix section 5 to comply with the Supreme Court's decision to update the formula. If we continue down this path and if we do nothing, the practical effect will be that jurisdictions will pass election laws or implement election practices or procedures that will discriminate, and we know it, and we must prevent it from happening.

The only remedy African American communities have to obtain redress from discriminatory practices will be to file very expensive litigation. In the meantime, the law, the new law goes into effect.

If section 5 was in place, there wouldn't be the need for expensive litigation. The jurisdiction would simply be required to make a showing to the Department of Justice, and the Attorney General would determine the effect of the change on minority voting strength. That is the way we have done it for the last 50 years.

I call on my Republican colleagues to please join with us in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to fix the formula so that section 5 can be enforced in our country.

Thank you, Ms. KELLY.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman BUTTERFIELD.

It is now my honor to introduce the gentlewoman from Alabama, one that was our gracious host last weekend, and we appreciate everything she did, TERRI SEWELL.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 2015, nearly 100 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle went to Selma to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery. I was humbled to welcome so many of my colleagues in Congress to my hometown of Selma, Alabama.

It meant a lot to me and the State of Alabama to also welcome President and Mrs. Obama and their daughters, as well as President and Mrs. George W. Bush to Selma to commemorate the significant events in American history. The Selma movement for voting rights was a uniquely American story of how ordinary Americans working together achieved extraordinary social change.

I want to thank all of the Members and everyone who participated in the Faith & Politics pilgrimage to Alabama this year. I especially want to thank my Alabama colleagues—Senator SESSIONS, Representative MARTHA ROBY, Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT, Representative BRADLEY BYRNE, and Representative GARY PALMER—for their participation in the delegation. A special thanks to Congressman JOHN LEWIS and the Faith & Politics Institute for a job well done.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to walk in the footsteps of JOHN LEWIS with JOHN LEWIS is an unforgettable experience that is truly transformative. The bipartisan participation by Republicans and Democrats alike was truly something to behold, especially given the hyperpartisanship of Washington.

It was something to see us gather together in Selma, Alabama, to honor the sacrifices of the foot soldiers who dared to fight for voter equality 50 years ago. I tried not to have any expectation from this bipartisan showing, but I must admit my hope was that all of us would be motivated by the experience of traveling with JOHN LEWIS, in his footsteps with him, to honestly look at modern-day threats to voting rights today.

Now that the spotlight is no longer on Selma, we must move beyond the bridge and see that there is still a need to fight to ensure that all Americans can participate equally in the political process.

New barriers to voting rights have been legitimized in State legislatures across this country. Photo ID laws and efforts nationwide to get rid of early voting or weekend voting are modern-day efforts that have had the profound effect of restricting access to voting.

Any effort that restricts or decreases the likelihood of citizens to vote is a threat to the voting rights of all Americans. There is no denying that modern-day laws imposed to ostensibly prevent voter fraud has had the ''unintended consequence'' of making it much harder for certain sectors of the population to vote.

My father is a perfect example of an individual who has found it harder to vote because of these modern-day laws. Prior to the State of Alabama imposing a photo ID law to vote, my father, Andrew, a stroke victim who has been wheelchair bound for the last 10 years, had been voting by using his federally issued Social Security card, which does not have a photo; but once the law was imposed, my father—who no longer drives, who no longer works, is retired—had no way of getting a photo ID.

After the Alabama law changed, my mother and I made sure that my father would get a photo ID to vote. The effort was tremendous. We transported my father in a special wheelchair access van and got him into the old Dallas County courthouse, which was grandfathered in from having ADA laws and, therefore, no wheelchair ramp. Once inside the courthouse, the elevator to the registrar's office was being serviced, and we had to wait an hour in order to use it.

Once we finally got to the office of the board of registrars, there was only one person waiting on 25 people in line. My mother and father persevered. They persevered to make sure that my father got a photo ID that day because he was resolved in voting because his daughter was on the ballot for reelection.

□ 1945

Just think of all of the seniors or disabled citizens who do not have a relative or a person to take them to get a photo ID. This photo requirement definitely reduces the number of and the ability of certain segments of the society to exercise their right to vote.

In the Supreme Court ruling which invalidated the preclearance provisions of the VRA, the Court said that the formula used by Congress to determine the covered States was outdated, and it implied that there was no need for the Voting Rights Act today since, after all, there was an African American elected as President. Oh, how shortsighted the Supreme Court was. As long as there are vulnerable communities that face barriers to voting, there is still a need for Federal protection.

Just last year, after the Supreme Court ruling, the city of Evergreen, Alabama, came under Federal scrutiny for unfairly excluding African Americans from the voting rolls and for attempting to further dilute their voting power with a redistricting plan that would pack its majority Black population into only two of the five municipal districts. Incidences like this in Evergreen, Alabama, remind us that progress is always illusive and that the injustice suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago has not been fully vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the bridge, there are still laws that explicitly or unintentionally limit the access of Americans to vote. Now that we have commemorated the movement that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, what are we going to do to protect the progress that has been made and to expand access to the sacred right to vote?

On March 7, 2015, while en route to Selma, President Obama signed H.R. 431, the bill that awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the Selma to Montgomery march of 1965. Finally, this Nation is acknowledging the bravery of these foot soldiers, who dared to make this Nation live up to its ideals of justice and equality for all. While a great honor, a medal is not adequate repayment for their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest tribute that we as Members of Congress can give is to work honestly and earnestly on a bipartisan bill to restore Federal voting protections to vulnerable communities under the Voting Rights Act. While I applaud bipartisan efforts made in the Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, which creates a new formula that would determine which jurisdictions require Federal preclearance, this new formula that is in the current VRA Amendment Act omits key States, key States like North Carolina, South

Carolina, and Alabama. I can't imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the very State—Alabama—that prompted the Voting Rights Act that was signed into law 50 years ago would now not be afforded the protection of Federal oversight. The fight for voting rights was born in Alabama, and on my watch, it will not die there.

Voting rights advocates and everyday citizens must remain vigilant and do all that they can to safeguard against efforts to constrict democracy in State and local governments. Our democracy requires it. We can all pay a debt of gratitude to those foot soldiers by voting in every election—local, State, and Federal. We all have our part to play, and we in Congress can play a vital role.

To echo the President's call to action, President Obama said on that day:

> Selma shows us that America is not the project of any one person. The single most powerful word in our democracy is the word ''we.'' We the people are tasked with strengthening and safeguarding our democracy. We the people are responsible for ensuring our Nation lives up to its very principles.

On the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act and the historic march from Selma to Montgomery, I urge my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to recommit ourselves to the work that was done by our predecessors, to work together to restore the Voting Rights Act for all Americans. That is the least we can do on this, the 50th anniversary. I look forward to this august body taking up a voting rights amendment act that fully restores Federal protection to all vulnerable communities so that all Americans can definitely exercise that sacred right to vote.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Alabama. Thank you for sharing the challenges citizens like your dad can have in complying with the new Voting Rights Act law. Thank you for standing up.

At this time, I would like to introduce the fierce and gentle woman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, Representative ROBIN KELLY from Illinois, for her leadership on this night, this first night back.

For Members back from Selma, I appreciate that our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus has been here to give us very important background and history. I particularly appreciate that we have just heard from a Member from Alabama, itself, Representative TERRI SEWELL, and all of that seems to me to be the appropriate prelude for what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this is the first day we are back from this historic trip and are back from the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. There is no place for the almost 100 Members who went to Selma to be but on this floor this evening. I want to thank Attorney General Holder for taking the crippled Voting Rights Act and continuing to enforce it. The trip to Selma essentially set the stage for Members to come back and to regard our trip as a call to action and get down to work to revitalize the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

My thanks to Representative JIM SENSENBRENNER and to Representative JOHN CONYERS for cosponsoring a revised version of the act. My thanks to JOHN LEWIS, who has kept Selma and the Voting Rights Act alive by his annual trips with Members and others to Selma. I am appreciative of the almost 100 Members from both parties who went to Selma on the 6th and 7th.

What was the purpose of going?

It could not have been a celebration. You can celebrate the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It has not been dismembered. You can celebrate the 1968 fair housing law. It still is on the books. But you go to Selma to try to bring back to its full glory the Voting Rights Act of 1965, where setback with section 5 has rendered the act virtually obsolete for most of its original purposes.

I stress that the Supreme Court did not invalidate the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It invited the 100 Members who went to Selma and the others in this body to modernize the act. We may differ on how to do that. I do not think there can be any doubt that it has to be revised and that we have to meet the challenge that the Supreme Court has given us. After all, the Voting Rights Act has prevented, literally, hundreds of discriminatory voting practices, and there were countless practices that it simply deterred. I must say that I was disappointed that, early on in this session, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative GOODLATTE, indicated that he did not believe that the act was necessary, and he talked about the 11 Southern States that had been under the act.

The fact is that the preclearance Voting Rights Act requirements went far beyond those States. At the time of the Supreme Court decision in 2013, Arizona and Alaska were covered. Parts of California, New York, South Dakota, and Michigan were covered. In the past, parts of Hawaii, Colorado, New Hampshire, Idaho, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Wyoming, Maine, New Mexico, and Oklahoma have been covered. It is true that at the heart of the coverage were the 11 Southern States, but that is where the heart of the violations were, in fact, tracked. That is where the poll taxes were. That is where the violations were.

There has been a compromise bill that has been put forward by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS. In the very act of going to Selma, there was put upon us an obligation to come back and respond to that trip. The bill before us has tried to meet some of the objections that were raised. There is a rolling preclearance formula, for example, that does not require congressional reauthorization. There is a bail-in section of the act to reach those who had not been covered. There are a minimum number of violations over a period of time that have to be recorded in order for a state to come under the act.

As my good friend from Alabama, TERRI SEWELL, says, the act is not what all of us wanted, but it does mean that in the spirit of compromise and because of the necessity of this act, this act which democratized the South and is necessary now—perhaps not as necessary as it was 50 years ago—but no one can doubt, as a Supreme Court Justice himself said when he said he didn't doubt that there was still discrimination in voting practices, but he said it was up to the Congress to modernize the bill.

I don't see how almost 100 Republican and Democratic Members can have gone to Selma on the 50th anniversary without coming back to revise the act. We went emptyhanded. We went without a bill. I hope that what we got in Selma was the gumption to come back and to put forward a bill. Yes, the act has been dismembered by the Supreme Court, but the Court asked us to reshape it. It asked us to restore it. It was one thing to go without a bill. It is quite another to come back and do nothing about a bill.

The President did not hesitate to say where the responsibility, in fact, lies, and I am quoting from his speech in Selma:

> One hundred Members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right it protects. If we want to honor this day, let these 100 go back to Washington and gather 400 more and, together, pledge to make it their mission to restore the law this year.

That is our mission. The trip to Selma, where we went in the name of the entire Congress, demands that we act before the end of this Congress.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you so much to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C.

At this time, I would like to introduce the gentleman from South Carolina, our leader, JAMES CLYBURN.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I often refer to this Hall as America's classroom. I do that because I do believe that, as we conduct ourselves here on this floor, it is to set an example for all citizens, especially our young citizens, who look in on our proceedings and get some idea about how they ought to conduct themselves as Americans going forward. One of those things, I think, that we ought to be very careful of is how we address the rights and responsibilities that we all have as citizens.

□ 2000

We teach our children in our classrooms and in our homes that the right to vote is basic to this democracy of ours. I know that all of us are aware that in our past it is a right that has not always been practiced, but in its

wisdom this body, acting collectively, decided back in 1965 that it would do something about making right the wrongs that have been heaped upon citizens for decades when it comes to voting. And so we did.

A formula was adopted that was based upon the 1964 results of the Presidential election. We have renewed time and time again that law, always updating under that formula; but several months ago the United States Supreme Court looked at the formula and decided that the formula had outlived its usefulness, but the Voting Rights Act was still needed. They invited the Congress to take a look at the formula and update it, as the chair said, and to make it more contemporary. We have worked for months.

I want to thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin and Mr. CONYERS of Michigan for the work they have done to put together some amendments that would update that formula.

This time we decided to look back just a few years and to see, within the last 10 or 12 years, what jurisdictions have still continued to violate people's rights and who have been found guilty of doing so. Rather than apply the formula to everybody, what we will do is come up with a series of wrongs, put some numerical qualification on it, and make a new formula.

Now, that formula is not going to cover South Carolina today, but under the formula, any jurisdiction, any State that permits these kinds of atrocities and is found to have done so, they will be brought under the formula. So the formula applies to every jurisdiction in the country. I think that it is time for us to be honest that everybody will not do right, but we should have something in place so when a jurisdiction fails to do right, we will have a mechanism to address those ills.

Now, let me hasten to add—and I want all that are listening in to understand—this part of the Voting Rights Act is a preventive measure. It says that it allows for the Justice Department to move to prevent any kind of implementation of a change in the voting laws so that we won't have expensive litigation if something in it is not quite right. I believe that it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to employ methods that will not require citizens and the jurisdiction, their States, their cities and counties, to go to the expense of litigation when we can have an administrative procedure in place to take a look at what has been done and make a decision as to whether or not there is any possibility that someone's voting rights could be taken away. That is all this formula does. That is all section 5 is about.

I would hope that those of us who traveled to Selma last week to renew our commitment to making this country of ours a more perfect Union will sit down in the near future, and before we get to the 50th anniversary of the signing of that 1965 Voting Rights Act, which comes on August 6 of this year, sometime between now and August 6, let's put in place the kind of amendments that would allow the Voting Rights Act to maintain the life that it has given to so many communities for so many years.

I want to thank Ms. KELLY for putting together this Special Order.

Let me close by saying: The longer I live, the more I get in touch with those old adages that we grew up with, one of which was ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'' I believe that these amendments that we are proposing are preventive measures, and it is much more valuable than for us to come back looking for a cure that could be very, very expensive.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for your important insight and your important comments.

Now it is my honor to introduce the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my colleagues and thank Congresswoman KELLY and Chairman BUTTERFIELD for the opportunity to carry forward the spirit of the 50th commemoration of the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Let me also begin by thanking our colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and all of the Alabama delegation for their hospitality and their spirit of unity.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am so moved by that experience that I frankly believe that now is the time to move the bill that is bipartisan that is a response to the United States Supreme Court to the floor of the House, to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the floor of the House.

Leader CLYBURN was very apt in describing a very significant point that really answers the question of the Supreme Court. If I had my way, coming from the State of Texas, I frankly believe that the reauthorization that we did through the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, and which I was very much engaged in in 2006 and 2007, was a thorough expose of the value of the Voting Rights Act. We did 15,000 pages of testimony, and witness after witness from different perspectives indicated that the formula that we were using at that time on the preclearance was an effective formula. Of course, the Supreme Court challenged the data, and I would only argue that it is appropriate to update the data. I welcome that.

But we have gone even further. As has been articulated by the bill that has just been introduced by a number of us, we have crafted a formula that says it is an even playing field, an even playing field for a State to opt in because they have voting rights abuses for all people or to opt out because they have a smooth, evenhanded process for citizens in their State to vote.

So I believe it is important that the message get out of what the Voting Rights Act stands for and what it meant for those foot soldiers to cross that bridge. They crossed that bridge, and they were willing—and were bloodied, frankly—to do something nonviolent, and that is to petition their leaders at the voting box.

I can't imagine that there is any Member here in this place, in this august Congress, that would not want to go to their constituents, whether they live in South Dakota or Utah or Mississippi or New York or Texas, as I do, that there is an unfettered right to vote.

I will soon be introducing a Voting Rights Act that establishes the date that we signed the Voting Rights Act by the President that came from Texas, Lyndon Baines Johnson, with the leaders of Martin Luther King and JOHN LEWIS and many others standing at his side, to introduce that as being Voting Rights Act Day, to reinforce the value to Americans of the importance of voting.

Who would want to oppose the idea that voting is not important?

So I am looking forward to having Members join on the simple premise that it is important to vote in America and that it is important to commemorate the signing of the Voting Rights Act and make it Voting Rights Day. That inspiration came as we saw the thousands that were marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Let me just clarify for a moment, under section 5, the submitting jurisdiction under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and H.R. 885, Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, has to prove that the proposed changes are not retrogressive, that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. We have expanded that, again, to go by acts, by occurrences that would keep someone from voting.

So I believed that this past weekend, or the weekend of Bloody Sunday, was a moving moment that would draw us together, that would allow us to understand H.R. 885. And might I say this: I know that many of us will be willing to have teach-ins to ensure that our colleagues understand the importance of this legislation and that we do it in a bipartisan manner.

Let me conclude my remarks by saying, earlier today I stood on the floor and asked for a bipartisan approach to the approval of the Attorney General nominee by the other body. I say that from the spirit of recognition of the three branches of government. A President has nominated a very well-qualified, distinguished member of the bar, Loretta Lynch, to be the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

We understand differences of opinion with legislation. I have no quarrel with those differences. I happen to support the human trafficking bill and recognize that there is a disagreement on language that I agree with the disagreement, but that disagreement can

be worked out through ongoing talks and however they want to approach it or a vote on the floor. But Loretta Lynch, the Attorney General nominee, should not be held up captive to disagreements on legislation and moving toward a constitutional crisis.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is wrapped up together. The Department of Justice enforces the Voting Rights Act, enforces the voting rights of Americans. As we look to the future, as we formulate the understanding of the three branches of government, to avoid a constitutional crisis of not having the leadership that is timely for the work that has to be done, I would hope the Senate would move forward, and I would hope that all of us would honor the Voting Rights Act and the message of Selma that we stand together under this wonderful flag and stand for voting rights for all.

Since its passage in 1965, and through four reauthorizations signed by Republican presidents (1970, 1975, 1982, 2006), more Americans, especially those in the communities we represent, have been empowered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 than any other single piece of legislation.

Section 5 of the Act requires covered jurisdictions to submit proposed changes to any voting law or procedure to the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. for pre-approval, hence the term ''pre-clearance.''

Under Section 5, the submitting jurisdiction has the burden of proving that the proposed change(s) are not retrogressive, i.e. that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

In announcing his support for the 1982 extension of the Voting Rights Act, President Reagan said, ''the right to vote is the crown jewel of American liberties.''

And Section is the ''crown jewel'' of the Voting Rights Act.

But a terrible blow was dealt to the Voting Rights Act on June 25, 2013, when the Supreme Court handed down the decision in Shelby County v. Holder, 537 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b), the provision of the law determining which jurisdictions would be subject to Section 5 ''pre-clearance.''

FACTS OF SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER

In 2006, the City of Calera, which lies within Shelby County, enacted a discriminatory redistricting plan without complying with Section 5, leading to the loss of the city's sole African-American councilman, Ernest Montgomery. In compliance with Section 5, however, Calera was required to draw a nondiscriminatory redistricting plan and conduct another election in which Mr. Montgomery regained his seat.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b): ''Times change.''

Now, the Court was right; times have changed. But what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited are due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

And that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed.

Let me put it this way: in the same way that the vaccine invented by Dr. Jonas Salk in 1953 eradicated the crippling effects but did not eliminate the cause of polio, the Voting Rights Act succeeded in stymying the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did eliminate them entirely.

Before the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans.

And until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also suffered systematic exclusion from the political process.

In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress.

Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, there are now more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

The Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress.

Now to be sure, the Supreme Court did not invalidate the preclearance provisions of Section 5; it only invalidated Section 4(b).

But that is like leaving the car undamaged but destroying the key that unlocks the doors and starts the engine.

According to the Court, the coverage formula in Section 4(b) had to be struck down because the data upon which it was based—registration rates and turn-out gaps—was too old and outdated.

But my colleagues in Congress and I refuse to let the Voting Rights Act die.

And so we went to work, crafting and drafting the legislation that would repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court decision and capable of winning majorities in the House and Senate and the signature of the President.

After months of hard work, consultation, negotiation, and collaboration, we produced and have reintroduced in the 114th Congress, a bill, H.R. 885, ''Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015'' that can achieve these goals.

To be sure, this legislation is not perfect, no bill ever is.

But—and this is important—the bill represents an important step forward because it: 1. is responsive to the concern expressed by the Supreme Court; and 2. establishes a new coverage formula that is carefully tailored but sufficiently potent to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

First, H.R. 885 specifies a new coverage formula that is based on current problems in voting and therefore directly responds to the Court's concern that the previous formula was outdated.

The importance of this feature is hard to overestimate. Legislators and litigators understand that the likelihood of the Court upholding an amended statute that fails to correct the provision previously found to be defective is very low and indeed.

H.R. 885 replaces the old ''static'' coverage formula with a new dynamic coverage formula, or ''rolling trigger,'' which works as follows: 1. for states, it requires at least one finding of discrimination at the state level and at least four adverse findings by its sub-jurisdictions within the previous 15 years; 2. for political subdivisions, it requires at least three adverse findings within the previous 15 years; but 3. political subdivisions with ''persistent and extremely low minority voter turnout,'' can also be covered if they have a single adverse finding of discrimination.

The effect of the ''rolling trigger'' mechanism effectively gives the legislation nationwide reach because any state and any jurisdiction in any state potentially is subject to being covered if the requisite number of violations are found to have been committed.

Prior to Shelby County v. Holder, the Voting Rights Act covered 16 states in whole or in part, including most of the states in the Deep South.

The rolling trigger contained in H.R. 885, unfortunately, does not; at least not initially. The only states that would be covered initially under the new bill are: 1. Texas 2. North Carolina 3. Louisiana 4. Florida 5. South Carolina.

To compensate for the fact that fewer jurisdictions are covered, our bill also includes several key provisions that are consistent with the needs created by a narrower Section 5 trigger.

For example, H.R. 885: 1. Expands judicial ''bail-in'' authority under Section 3 so that it applies to voting changes that result in discrimination (not just intentional discrimination); 2. Requires nationwide transparency of ''late breaking'' voting changes; allocation of poll place resources; and changes within the boundaries of voting districts; 3. Clarifies and expands the ability of plaintiffs to seek a preliminary injunction against voting discrimination; and 4. Clarifies and expands Attorney General's authority to send election observers to protect against voting discrimination.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and many of us in Congress, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

ABOUT TEXAS NAACP V. BERRY

(TEXAS PHOTO ID CASE; CONSOLIDATED WITH VEASEY V. PERRY)

1. The suit alleges that the State of Texas' photo ID requirement for in-person voting, enacted in 2011, was adopted for discriminatory reasons, in violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and has a discriminatory ''result'' in violation of Section 2. The case is consolidated with similar suits filed by the United States and other private plaintiffs.

2. Trial was held from September 2 to September 11, 2014, and closing arguments were presented on September 22, 2014.

3. On October 9, 2014, U.S. District Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos issued a 147-page opinion in which she ruled that the Texas photo ID requirement violates both the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

4. Judge Ramos found that the law was enacted for the purpose of discriminating against African-American and Latino voters, and that it denies minority voters an equal opportunity to participate in the political process in violation of the Section 2 results standard.

5. Judge Ramos also found that the photo ID law unconstitutionally burdens the right to vote, and functions as an unconstitutional poll tax.

6. On October 14, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit granted Texas' motion to stay the district court's permanent injunction until Texas' appeal is briefed, argued and decided.

7. On October 15, 2014, the Lawyers' Committee and co-counsel filed an emergency application with the Supreme Court to reinstate the district court's injunction.

8. On October 18, 2014, the Supreme Court denied the application to vacate the stay; Justice Ginsburg filed a dissent, joined by Justices Sotomayor and Kagan.

9. Oral argument before the 5th Circuit is scheduled to take place during the last week in April.

10. Previously, in a lawsuit litigated under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, a three-judge district court in Texas v. Holder, 888 F. Supp. 2d 113 (D.D.C. 2012), ruled that Texas' photo ID law did not satisfy the nondiscrimination requirements of Section 5.

11. However, the district court ruling was vacated by the Supreme Court, 133 S. Ct. 2886 (2013), following the Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder, 133 S. Ct. 2612 (2013), that the geographic coverage formula for Section 5 is unconstitutional.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady from Texas for her remarks. Now it is my honor to yield to the gentlelady from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged just recently to stand hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder in Selma, Alabama, with 100 Members of Congress, with civil rights leaders, friends of the movement of all races from every State in the United States, with civil rights luminaries such as Mrs. Abernathy, Dorothy Cotton, Amelia Boynton—113 years old—Doris Crenshaw, and, of course, our very own colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who helped lead a march for a better life and more equality for all of America.

But it was very, very hard to celebrate. There was a very sober mood in the crowd as we realized that the voting rights of Americans, particularly African Americans, were under threat 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed. As the President said in his remarks:

> Right now, in 2015, 50 years after Selma, there are laws across the country designed to make it harder for people to vote.

□ 2015

> As we speak, more of such laws are being proposed. Meanwhile, the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of so much blood, so much sweat and tears, the product of so much sacrifice in the face of wanton violence, the Voting Rights Act stands weakened, its future subject to political rancor.

As we think of those martyrs like Viola Liuzzo, James Earl Chaney, Andy Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, it is very, very difficult to deal with the reality that States such as the one that I hail from, Wisconsin, is one of the States who has joined the map of shame and passed one of the strictest voter ID laws in the country.

In the following years since 2011, Wisconsin has been a battleground in fighting this pernicious law. In 2014, a Federal judge ruled that our voter ID law was unconstitutional and violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. It found that 300,000 Wisconsinites lacked the proper ID needed under the law and that the law would have a disparate impact on Blacks and Latinos.

Despite that powerful finding, the Federal district court was recklessly overturned by a three-judge panel in the Seventh Circuit. Right before our 2014 election, the United States Supreme Court stepped in and enjoined this law in an emergency stay to prevent them from implementing the voter ID law only 6 weeks before the 2014 election. Recently, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have sent an amicus brief, and I am optimistic that justice will prevail.

I know that there have been many African Americans and people of other races who have marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge. As a woman, I know that the brave suffragettes fought equal treatment for over 70 years while they faced humiliation and shame from society.

History has made it so very, very clear that voting rights are so fundamental. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution protects voting rights; the 15th Amendment provided that males, even former slaves and males of any race, could vote; women's suffrage; with the 24th Amendment, poll taxes supposedly were eliminated, and the 26th Amendment allowed 18-year-olds to vote.

Of course, we have the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I think it is very, very clear, when you look at the history of this protection, that it is one of the most constitutionally protected rights that there is.

I would urge my colleagues here in this body to do more than hold hands and sing, ''We Shall Overcome,'' but to really pass laws to strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

We have all heard the adage that history repeats itself, and we have seen a race across the country for Republican legislatures and Governors to pass these voter ID laws, but I think we also have the power to shape our future by drawing from the lessons of the past: our civil rights movement, our march in Selma, where we stood hand in hand, arm in arm, and fought back against this tide of oppression.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin. Thank you for sharing your thoughts.

Now, it is my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, FREDERICA WILSON.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. In Miami-Dade County, I have a program called the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. It is a program of Black and Hispanic boys who are trying to grow up into good men.

The Friday before Bloody Sunday, over 500 12th graders—graduating seniors—from that program went to a movie to watch a private screening of the movie ''Selma.''

I want to give a special shout-out to Nancy Sewell, who is the mother of TERRI SEWELL. As I watched the two of them on C–SPAN, MSNBC, and CNN, I was so proud of them.

These boys were prepared by men who experienced the civil rights battles and know the bitter history and violent battles we had to endure. I wish I had the resources to take all 500 of them to Selma.

During the movie, we planned a Twitter war. Thousands participated all across the Nation. Movie stars, rappers, sports legends, and the White House joined in the Twitter war. These boys will never be the same. They were visibly moved; and their applause, tears, hugs, and tweets proved their transformation.

The next day, on that Saturday, when the President spoke, the Twitter war continued. It was based at my home. So many of them watched and marveled at Representative JOHN LEWIS, a card-carrying, sworn-in member of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. They watched so proudly as he introduced the first Black President of the United States. In fact, he is the only President that they know. They are beyond proud.

Why did I do this? I wanted as many students as possible to experience the importance of voting, and I am not finished. All 8,000 of them will see the movie as soon as it is released for distribution. This generation of children needs to know the importance of voting. They need to know what their forefathers had to endure so that they could vote.

When I was on the Miami-Dade County School Board in 1996, we set up a process in partnership with the department of elections. Every eligible student is registered to vote in the 11th grade, and when they graduate and turn 18, their voter registration card is mailed to their homes. This is a policy that all school districts all across America should adopt.

While they repair the damage to the Voting Rights Act through legislation, graduating seniors in Miami-Dade public schools—Black, White, and Hispanic—will still have the opportunity to vote. Every single one of them will vote. I hope that other school districts will adopt this policy so that children will know and understand the importance of voting. It is their voice.

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, let us as a people march on until victory is won.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Florida. Thank you for sharing your success stories. Hopefully, those can be duplicated.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS.

Ms. ADAMS. Thank you, Congresswoman KELLY, for your leadership. I

appreciate what you are doing very much. Certainly, it is something that we need to do, and we must do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of equal voting rights for everyone. Just over a week ago, I traveled to Selma with several of my colleagues to retrace the steps of those who shed blood as they tried, again, to gain equal access to the ballot box.

As a professor for 40 years at Bennett College in North Carolina, I made sure that the students that passed through my classroom and our campus knew just how important it was to have their voices heard, and to this day, students know: ''Bennett Belles are voting belles.''

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down a major provision of the Voting Rights Act limiting Federal oversight over State voting laws. Sadly, my home State of North Carolina quickly implemented voting laws that disenfranchise voters by making cuts to early voting, reenforcing strict ID requirements, and ending some preregistration programs which did not allow young high school students to be able to register to vote.

As I think about those who risked their lives in order to exercise their right to vote, I cannot believe that 50 years later, in 2015, that simple freedom given to us in the Constitution is still under attack.

It is time for all of us, Mr. Speaker, to come together to restore the Voting Rights Act, to ensure that every voter—no matter their race, no matter their class or creed—can make their voice heard and elect the leaders of their choice.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, again, for her insight and comments.

Here we are, 50 years removed from Selma, 50 years after Americans—young and old, Black, White, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, Jewish—made a decision to stand up for what they knew was right. They stood up for democracy and demanded fair and unobstructed access to the ballot.

As you have heard this hour, the evolution to the America we are today has been a long and challenging journey. The Voting Rights Act has done much to make our Union more perfect, but the strength of the Voting Rights Act has been diminished. With new, discriminatory laws on the books, this Congress must act. This Congress can pass a bipartisan bill that extends section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

As was the case in Selma, the law is not equal for all. We must unite, as we did then. I urge my colleagues to take up this important issue and strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to take this time to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and all my colleagues who took the time to speak to us this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen PAYNE and KELLY for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago 600 men and women began a peaceful march in Selma, Alabama to demand their full and equal right to participate in our democracy. Their quest for equal voting rights was met with physical violence and racial hatred on what has become known as "Bloody Sunday."

The marchers were turned back that day, but they remained steadfast. With unwavering determination, residents of Selma, civil rights activists, and inspired people from across the nation completed the march from Selma to Montgomery. Their heroism was instrumental in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; a watershed bipartisan action of the U.S. Congress.

Fifty years later, on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, I stood with President Obama and my House and Senate colleagues to honor the legacy of those brave foot soldiers for justice. But unfortunately, the battle wages on. There is still much to be done to ensure the sacrifice of those marchers was not in vain.

The Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder to strike down Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act left many Americans more vulnerable to voting discrimination. In the absence of this historic safeguard, numerous states have attempted to suppress voting through restrictive voter ID laws and limits on early voting. My home state of Ohio is one of them.

Congress must act to restore Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act and update critical voter protections. In 2015, no eligible citizen should be disenfranchised. No eligible citizen should be denied full participation in our democracy. Let us recommit to rejecting intolerance and injustice in all forms, and continue the fight for equal voting rights for all Americans.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader:

Dr. George T. French, Fairfield, Alabama

Dr. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, New York, New York

Mr. Ralph A. Wolff, Oakland, California

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a function in the district.

Mr. ROSKAM (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the passing of his father.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 639. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing; with an amendment (Rept. 114–41, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 647. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 648. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 132. Resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. (Rept. 114–44). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 639 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1365. A bill to prevent the reclassification of certain ammunition as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to set the retirement benefits age for today's eight-year-olds at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN (for herself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to clarify the application of that Act to American Samoa and

the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent foreign diplomats from being eligible to receive health insurance premium tax credits and health insurance cost-sharing reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1369. A bill to modify the treatment of agreements entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish nursing home care, adult day health care, or other extended care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1370. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1371. A bill to improve the Compliance, Safety, Accountability initiative of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 1372. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1373. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consider, within the annual rulemaking processes, the effect of regulatory changes to certain Medicare payment systems on provider consolidation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for counterfeiting or selling Presidential inauguration tickets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1375. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1376. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit provisional approval of fast track products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for dependent youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1378. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues related to recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Board of Veterans' Appeals to develop evidence in appeal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for a medallion furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to signify the veteran status of a deceased individual; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to improve access to information in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, House Administration, the Judiciary, Ethics, and 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 Miss RICE OF NEW YORK (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certified adult day services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H. Res. 150. A resolution expressing support for designation of July as National Sarcoma Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 151. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 15, 2015, through March 21, 2015, as National Young Audiences Arts for Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1365.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Amendment II of the United State Constitution: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1366.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1367.

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. ROYCE:

H.R. 1368.

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

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1369.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1370.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states ''Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

The management of the Missouri River by the Army Corps of Engineers directly impacts commerce. The river is a sourre of barge traffic carrying a variety of goods.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1371.

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

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1372.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1373.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 1374.

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

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;''

Article I, Section 3, Clause 6: ''To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;''

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 1375.

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

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1376.

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

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

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1377.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Commerce Clause

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1378.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1379.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1380.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1381.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1382.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1383.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1384.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 93: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 131: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 140: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 167: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 169: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 173: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 213: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 232: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 235: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. JOLLY, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 249: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 250: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 310: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 317: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 353: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 358: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SIRES, Mr. JONES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 381: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 386: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 402: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 407: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 444: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 451: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 453: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 465: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 472: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 500: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 509: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 513: Mr. COSTA and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 528: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 531: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 540: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 546: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 570: Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 572: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 578: Mr. NUGENT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 586: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 592: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 594: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 595: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 598: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 601: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 610: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 612: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 616: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 617: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 628: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 631: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 638: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 639: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 647: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 648: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 650: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUM, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 654: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 662: Mr. JONES, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 663: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 685: Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 702: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 706: Ms. Lee.

H.R. 707: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 721: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 722: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 742: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 751: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 756: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 767: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 775: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 784: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 793: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 802: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 805: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 815: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 816: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 822: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 825: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 842: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 845: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ASHFORD, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 849: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 852: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 855: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 863: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 869: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 879: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 884: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 885: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr.DOLD, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 903: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 909: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 919: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 920: Mr. NADLER, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 923: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 924: Mr. HURT of Virginia and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 928: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 931: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 932: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 969: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 970: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 973: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 976: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 977: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 978: Mr. KILMER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 993: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 997: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1019: Mr. COOPER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1059: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BLUM, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1062: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1063: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. FARR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BARR, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1090: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1095: Mr. WELCH and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1100: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1104: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1114: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1125: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1128: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1129: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1131: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1135: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1142: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1153: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1162: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1174: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1178: Mr. OLSON, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1180: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1190: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1191: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BOST, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1192: Mr. POLIS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1195: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1206: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1218: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1233: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1234: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1248: Mr. TURNER and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1249: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1258: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1267: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1284: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1301: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1319: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1320: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1323: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1339: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1341: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1343: Ms. MENG, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1358: Mr. BEYER.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROKITA and Ms. FOXX.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BARR.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. NEAL and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 11: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 12: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 14: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H. Res. 26: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. NEAL.

H. Res. 45: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 54: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 92: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. TORRES.

H. Res. 106: Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 111: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 137: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 139: Mr. TROTT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 140: Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. SALMON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. DESANTIS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1041: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1102: Mr. PERLMUTTER.