United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2016 No. 3

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 11, 2016, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2016

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 6, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RYAN A. COSTELLO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

RAIDS BY THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION ON FAMILIES FROM CENTRAL AMERICA MUST STOP

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, over the holidays, the Obama administration sent a very special Christmas greeting to immigrant families. They launched a series of home raids targeting Central American asylum seekers and immigrant families with children.

As its New Year's resolution, it is clear the Obama administration is embarking on a new enforcement initiative to deport Central Americans who entered the U.S. in 2014.

Last weekend, 121 children and adults were taken into custody, and most were sent to private family detention centers—a kind of privately run, for-profit family jail. They will probably be deported, just like the 2 million before them deported by President Obama.

How they are treated and whether they get meaningful due process remains a question mark. What is undeniable is that such raids strike maximum fear in immigrant communities. The government is saying they could be coming to your house, and they could be coming at any time.

Already, we are seeing signs of panic. We hear that children aren't going to school and parents aren't going to work out of fear. Not even a week into the new year, and 2016 has turned into one of fear and hiding.

But let us be clear: Deporting families will not solve the violence and corruption that push people from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras to risk assault, rape, and murder to seek refuge in the United States. Deporting families will not weaken the gangs who terrorize and extort their own people in Central America. Deporting families will not solve America's immigration problem. Deporting families will not strengthen border security. Deporting families will not create legal channels that allow immigrants to come with visas instead of smugglers. Deporting families will not reduce the insatiable demand in the United States for the very drugs that fuel the gangs, the guns, the smuggling operations, and the ruthless violence in Central America.

The raids by the Obama administration on families from Central America must stop. They are a cruel reminder of a discredited policy.

We do not want to repeat the scenes from April 2000 when armed agents forcibly took Elian Gonzalez from his house in Miami. That vision of terror is seared into America's memory and should not be repeated.

But even the raid on the home of Elian Gonzalez was carried out after all peaceful means of negotiation were exhausted. Surely there is a better way to take action when people have exhausted all of their legal remedies than to send armed agents into neighborhoods, apartment complexes, and family homes.

Those who are being deported are the ones most likely to have no attorney, no understanding of the laws and the practices of immigration courts, and now could be vulnerable to attack and murder back in Central America.

The fact is that some of the people the U.S. Government has deported in the past years have ended up dead in days or weeks after their return. We have to make sure that same tragic

fate does not wait for the individuals and families the government is currently rounding up.

Along with other Members of Congress, I am seeking answers from Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson as to why this policy is needed, why it was launched to instill fear in immigrant households over the Christmas holidays, and why family detention centers I have been trying to close are now filling up with new families awaiting deportation.

This is not the Democratic Party's solution to immigration questions, nor should it be America's. We expect heated calls for raids and deportation from the other side. We hear their calls for walls, bigger jails, and further restrictions on legal immigration. We will fight their efforts to erect religious or economic barriers to who can qualify for a chance to come to America.

Our party has rejected those calls with good reason. Americans want order and legality in immigration, not deportations and families forcefully split apart or exiled. We do not need to repeat that scene multiplied by hundreds or thousands of times across our Nation.

What we need to do is not easy, but it is the right thing to do. We need to take steps to solve the problems of gangs, weak and corrupt governments in Central America, and people who have no hope for a brighter future right here on our continent.

Serious aid is more than giving more money to the police departments of those countries. It is more than putting U.S. personnel in those countries to tell moms and dads, no, you can't seek refuge in the U.S. It is more than working with Mexico at its southern border. We need to give mothers and fathers and children a way to live in their own countries.

I have gone to the detention centers in Texas and met with the moms and the kids who were detained there when they came to the United States. One woman summed up their plight concisely by saying: LUIS, in Honduras, my family and I could live in poverty, but we could not live in peace.

Raids will not bring her peace. Raids will not bring us order. Raids will only bring misery.

TEACH ACT

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a growing problem in the United States: Employers across our country have millions of job openings but are unable to find workers with the skills needed to fill those jobs.

According to a recent study by CareerBuilder, nearly 50 percent of employers nationwide cannot find skilled workers to fill open positions. Many of these jobs are located in lucrative career fields like welding, emergency medical response, electrical engineering, robotics, and carpentry.

This gap between employers and our workers is holding our economy back; it is exacerbating our unemployment problem; it is hurting our communities; and it is placing unneeded pressure on our families.

The American economy needs qualified workers with the skills and drive necessary to fill these open jobs. I believe part of the answer to how we address this problem is career and technical education. Career and technical education, or CTE, is simply education that specializes in the skilled trades, applied sciences, information technology, and similar disciplines.

Career and technical education occurs in schools across America. In my home State of West Virginia, about 65,000 students each year participate in CTE courses. Those who do are much more likely to succeed. Over 80 percent of West Virginia participants meet industry-driven performance requirements for the technical skills they receive, and 95 percent go on to additional postsecondary education, the workforce, or the military.

I hear about CTE all the time as I travel across my district in West Virginia and visit schools and community colleges. I have seen the classrooms and the students whose eyes light up when they show off their work. I have spoken to the faculty and administrators who have committed their careers to training up a next generation workforce, and I know that just a little more support will make a huge difference.

While there is no silver bullet to our Nation's unemployment problem, additional investment in CTE is one way to help put people back to work and grow our economy.

The skills provided by CTE are some of the most highly sought-after skills in our economy today. But ironically enough, these are the hardest jobs to fill in the United States because of the lack of adequately trained individuals. According to a recent study by the Manufacturing Institute, over 2 million manufacturing jobs will go unfilled in the next decade because of the skills gap.

I believe we can help. That is why I joined with seven of my colleagues to introduce H.R. 4263, the TEACH Act, also known as the Technical Education and Career Help Act.

My bipartisan bill will invest in our CTE programs by providing new resources for the technical education teachers without authorizing any new spending. My bill will authorize the Higher Education Act's teacher residency grant program to be used to help schools recruit and train high-quality CTE teachers. This is currently not allowed.

My bill will increase the quality of training that students receive by recruiting midcareer professionals in relevant technical fields. Having teachers with real work experience in the fields that they teach will ensure students receive the best training.

I would like to thank Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK for cosponsoring this bipartisan bill with me, along with Representatives ROD BLUM, BRUCE POLIQUIN, TOM MACARTHUR, JIM LANGEVIN, PETE AGUILAR, and AMI BERA.

Our bill has been endorsed by a broad group of experts, including the Alliance for Excellent Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the Association for Career and Technical Education, and the Future Farmers of America.

My bill is an example that Republicans and Democrats can work together. My bill will help provide new hope to our communities by equipping hardworking West Virginians and all Americans with skills they can actually use.

We need to invest in career and technical education now or we will miss out on this important opportunity. I encourage my colleagues in the House to support the TEACH Act and consider the important difference it would make across our great country.

GUN VIOLENCE AND THE PATH FORWARD

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, traditionally we start the new year on a note of hope. Notwithstanding troubled headlines and difficulties home and abroad, the new year is an opportunity to consider the future afresh, to reflect on opportunities, past accomplishments, and new opportunities.

I appreciate President Obama beginning the new year with a continued focus on gun safety. His modest proposal was greeted with predictable opposition and scorn as some Republican politicians attempted to distort it all out of proportion and to change the subject to a nonissue: confiscation of the guns of law-abiding Americans when, in fact, virtually all responsible American gun owners support reasonable background checks to make it more difficult for people we all agree should not be armed to get guns.

It is interesting to speculate on what would have been the response in today's superheated, contentious political climate with the efforts of a generation ago to reduce the carnage on our highways from unnecessary auto deaths or the hundreds of thousands of people who became addicted to cigarettes and died of cancer and heart disease. There would have been screams of outrage about the nanny state and political correctness, that the government was going to take cigarettes away from people because it knew what was best for them. It was going to force people to pay unconscionable levels of tax that would fall on the poor, that a

more aggressive auto engineering program was the government telling the private sector and the consumer what was best for them, that it would drive up the cost of automobiles, and that it would have law enforcement interfere with people having an innocent drink on a night on the town.

Most telling would have been the argument that this really wouldn't make any difference, that none of these steps would stop people from smoking or reckless driving on the roadways. People would still die.

Those excuses for inaction are demonstrably false a generation later. We have cut the rates of adult smoking in half and saved millions of lives. The carnage on our highways has been dramatically reduced and American families are safer.

It is important to have perspective going forward. Yes, there is no single solution to gun violence. But the fact remains that the United States is unique among developed countries, being unable to protect our families from unacceptable levels of death at the hands of the deranged or the careless.

There are things we can do to make a difference, and the public is willing to accept them. I begin this new year hopeful that we don't have to accept Capitol Hill as an island of denial, whether it is the threat from climate change or the potential to do something about gun violence to make our families safer.

Last year, there were times when we in Congress came together and produced some constructive results. At the State and local level, people are not waiting for our Republican colleagues to come to their senses to deal with carbon pollution or gun violence. They are taking action.

I am hopeful that we will be able to broaden the conversation about what, in fact, we can do: tone down the rhetoric and find steps on issues that are both contentious and even those where there is basically no disagreement but we simply haven't gotten around to taking action.

□ 1015

There are clear opportunities for us to broaden that agenda. We can avert a crisis in Gaza from a lack of water and adequate sanitation. We could pass Representative MURPHY's bipartisan mental health bill. We could link food and farm policy with new awareness and research.

Let's not in 2016 have the opportunities for cooperation and progress drowned with political vitriol. Let's cooperate where we can, focus on solutions even where we can't, and set the stage for giving Americans what they deserve: a government not in denial, a Congress willing to cooperate and to face problems, large and small, so as to make progress rather than to revel in discord and hyperbole in order to win votes in contentious primaries. Let's focus on what we can get done and do it. We will feel better, and the American public will be better served.

RECOGNIZING HUMAN AND SEX TRAFFICKING AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize January as Human and Sex Trafficking Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, let's call sex trafficking what it is. It is modern-day slavery that exploits our society's most vulnerable. Unfortunately, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of any organized crime in the world. This isn't a faraway problem. In the United States, it is an estimated $9.8 billion industry and, sadly, children aged 12 to 14 are the largest at risk for sex trafficking. This is absolutely disgusting.

Last year we passed important legislation aimed at stopping sex trafficking, but the fight is far from over. It is our collective obligation to do everything that we can to put a definitive end to this modern-day slavery, which is why we must come together as a country, we must come together as a Congress, to do everything we can to stop this disgusting crime.

MENTAL WELLNESS MONTH

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mental Wellness Month.

To this point, our government's approach to mental health has consisted of ineffective and disjointed policies. Too often, those in need of care end up either in jail or on the streets because adequate services are simply not available.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, which would help the Nation's broken mental health system and care for those who are most in need.

This bipartisan bill would improve effectiveness and efficiency in Federal programs that help people, with a focus on early intervention and prevention programs in addition to suicide prevention. I want to thank my friend TIM MURPHY for his leadership on this bill.

I am glad that the administration this week recognized the importance of mental health programs in reducing gun violence, but we need a long-term legislative fix if we are really going to make progress on solving the mental health crisis in our Nation.

That is why, in recognition of Mental Wellness Month, I call on my colleagues to pass this bipartisan bill and to stop playing partisan games with people's lives.

WAUKEGAN HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Waukegan High School Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this week.

Waukegan's program is the oldest JROTC program in the Nation. It was created before the national JROTC program was instated in late 1916. Its initial purpose was to prepare high school young men for military service during World War I. This organization has come a long way over the past century, as half of the cadets of this 777-member corps are young women.

The Waukegan High School JROTC offers a curriculum not only of military training, but also of good leadership and citizenship skills. Students receive an education of flag and military structure, self-discipline and guidance on personal, financial, college, and career planning. Of the 777 cadets, 75 percent go on to postsecondary education and 10 percent serve in our military.

Congratulations to the Waukegan High School JROTC for this program and for leading and being a strong and positive representative for our Waukegan community.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S GUN VIOLENCE EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Obama's executive actions taken this week to reduce gun violence in America. These policies will help keep guns out of the hands of criminals and dangerous individuals and will prevent gun trafficking, while also protecting the Second Amendment rights of responsible, law-abiding citizens.

With over 30 Americans killed by guns every single day, inaction is not an option. In my nearly 3 years in Congress, House Republican leadership has refused to do anything on gun violence, not one hearing, not a single vote.

In facing Congress' inertia, President Obama did what was necessary to address a threat to our long-term national security and economic stability. While we can't stop every criminal from committing every crime, we can take actions that will save lives, and President Obama's executive actions will do just that.

Under these commonsense changes, everyone who profits from the sale of firearms will be required to obtain a license. It shouldn't matter if you sell a gun in a store, online, or at a gun show. It is the sale of a dangerous weapon, and the seller should make sure the buyer is safe, responsible, and law-abiding.

It is a sobering fact that the majority of gun deaths in the United States is from suicide. Expanding Federal funding for mental health services and streamlining States' abilities to report data to the background check system are essential to keeping guns out of the hands of the dangerously mentally ill.

President Obama's executive actions make essential strides in advancing smart gun technology. If you can use a thumbprint to get into your iPhone, there is no reason that the same technology can't be invented so that guns won't fire without the right fingerprint. If a gun would only fire when it

is held by the right owner, stolen guns would be inoperable, drastically decreasing firearm deaths.

Similarly, just like there are childproof caps on aspirin, there should be childproof guns. This will help protect children from accidentally discharging firearms. Smart gun technology is centuries old. Smith & Wesson invented the first childproof trigger over 150 years ago.

While President Obama's executive actions are crucial steps to reducing the senseless gun violence that is plaguing our Nation, they don't absolve Congress of its moral responsibility to act. There are gaps in existing gun laws that leave us all vulnerable to gun violence. These holes are ones that only Congress can plug.

I have two commonsense bills which will complement President Obama's executive actions and help bring a reduction in firearm mortality.

The first bill, H.R. 224, the Recognizing Gun Violence as a Public Health Emergency Act, would require the Surgeon General to submit an annual report to Congress on the public health impact of gun violence. The bill currently has 135 cosponsors, and I hope that this commonsense proposal can get an up-or-down vote this year.

For the past 20 years, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health have been prevented from conducting research on firearms. This lack of data has limited academic research on guns, and it has prevented Congress from obtaining the data it needs to craft impactful legislation.

The second bill, H.R. 225, the Firearm Safety Act, would close the loophole which prevents the Consumer Product Safety Commission from creating rules regarding the safety of firearms.

Quite simply, if the Consumer Product Safety Commission can regulate teddy bears, bicycle helmets, and car seats, it should be able to regulate firearms. Simply improving safety lock quality and improving storage safety will reduce accidents, misfires, and will prevent theft, saving thousands of lives.

These bills would give Congress the data it needs to pass meaningful and impactful gun violence prevention legislation, and they would ensure firearms are as safe and consumer friendly as possible, all without obstructing the Second Amendment rights of responsible gun owners.

Senseless gun violence has been plaguing our Nation for too long. It is simply unacceptable in the United States of America that gun violence is the leading cause of death for people under 24. It is time for us to come together to end the gun violence that is taking a generation of young Americans.

I applaud President Obama's leadership and his important actions to curb the violence that is plaguing our communities, actions he took because Congress has done nothing, not even calling up bipartisan bills with many cosponsors. Congress must now carry the torch and pass meaningful gun violence prevention legislation.

REPEAL AND REPLACE OBAMACARE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I have voted over 60 times to repeal or to replace all or portions of ObamaCare. I have voted numerous times to defund Planned Parenthood.

These issues have always been held up by the parliamentary rules in the Senate, which is the ability of a minority number of Senators to block bills from coming to the floor. But not now, not today. Under reconciliation procedures, a simple majority vote can move a bill out of the Senate Chamber.

So today we will vote to repeal and replace major pieces of ObamaCare that distort the market, raise prices, and deprive our citizens of choice. The bill today will eliminate the individual mandate and the employer mandate. The government's forcing of our citizens to buy a product that they do not want is un-American and costly. I say good riddance.

We were all aghast over the recordings that were released that highlighted Planned Parenthood's selling of baby body parts. As a Member who believes that individual, distinct life begins at conception, Planned Parenthood's lack of remorse or even of concern highlights its dark business. Today we send a bill to the President's desk to defund Planned Parenthood.

Many of my constituents have told me: We gave you the House majority in 2010. What have you done? We gave you the Senate majority in 2014. What have you done? Why can't you get something to the President's desk?

Today we do. We send a bill to the President's desk that repeals ObamaCare and defunds Planned Parenthood, and it is about time.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what the new year gives us is an opportunity to refresh, to regroup, to look forward to opportunities in this instance and in this august body to protect the American people.

So today I rise with a great deal of applause and enthusiasm, words that I think do not connote the presentation made by President Obama yesterday, for it is not often the American people can see the deepness of our hearts, the affection we have for them, and the concern that we have over loss of life.

The President did all of that. In his teary expressions, he pierced the hearts of Americans, and he should have pierced the hearts of the Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats. There is no doubt that thousands are dying from gun violence. There is no doubt that people with guns kill. There is no doubt that more people get guns who should not have guns.

I am particularly excited by the President's thoughtful and collaborative work, along with that of Attorney General Lynch and a number of my colleagues, and of, certainly, the House Judiciary Committee, in particular our ranking member, JOHN CONYERS, those of us Democrats on the committee, and particularly those on the Crime Subcommittee, on which I have the privilege of serving as the ranking member.

We have worked together to have an agenda on criminal justice. The issues dealing with guns deal with criminal justice. Why should we run away from the wide and well-known proposition that there are people who are getting guns without their having had background checks?

Tragically, in my own community, an off-duty officer was attempting to sell guns in an open parking lot or in an open area in which he thought he would be protected. What ensued? A gun battle.

I don't know how those individuals purchasing those guns could have had background checks, but I would say that that is certainly not representative of the many in law enforcement with whom I have engaged who have already said that guns kill and that so many guns in America—more guns, we understand, than there are people—provide for a deadly mixture.

□ 1030

So I think it is important for the American people to know that the Federal Government has been working, unlike some have said. In 2015, NCIS received more than 22.2 million background checks, an average of more than 63,000 per day. By law, a gun dealer can complete a sale to a customer if the background check comes back clean or has taken more than 3 days.

I think, in this instance, we need to look at the legislation of Mr. CLYBURN, who indicates you must have a background check. I also think we should look and work legislatively with the President. Why would we be against hiring 200-plus more ATF officers? Why would we be against putting more resources in mental health?

I am very proud that I have introduced H.R. 4316—this bill is the Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act—just last evening to add those 200-plus ATF officers. I ask my colleagues to join me. I introduced that with Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY.

I introduced, with Representative KAREN BASS and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, H.R. 4315, the Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Act of 2016, to increase the resources necessary, yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, how many more need to die? Do we still need to have an amnesia check on Connecticut, San

Bernardino, Columbine, or Oregon, and many places beyond? Guns must be restrained. The President's mission is correct—more data for secure technology, more NCIS data in order to run through those background checks appropriately.

Remember Charleston, South Carolina? Remember the message? He got the guns because 3 days had passed. And he killed nine people worshipping in a church.

So it is important, Mr. Speaker, that Congress owns up to its own responsibility, not one that says the Second Amendment is being undermined. It is not. You can never undermine our Constitution. It is a procedural structure that we are not engaged in. We are only trying to provide a guidepost to save lives of children and families. I am looking forward to working with the Judiciary Committee in the House and the Senate to look at constructive legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am saddened that again we come on the floor with Planned Parenthood legislation that talks to the very heart of America, quality of health care, protecting women in terms of cervical cancer. This is a nonstarter. Vote against it. Protect American women. Protect families and children against gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, upon taking office, every Member of Congress makes a solemn pledge: to protect and defend the American people. This is the most important oath we take as elected officials—and, to honor this promise, we must do everything in our power to stem gun violence in our nation.

Yet, after another mass shooting and countless acts of gun violence in communities across our country every day, House Republicans are still unwilling to act to stop gun violence and save lives in American communities.

The Democrats have been calling for an immediate vote on the bipartisan King-Thompson Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act to strengthen the lifesaving background checks that keep guns out of the wrong hands.

This Congress has a moral obligation to do our part to end the gun violence epidemic. Now is the time for Republicans to join Democrats in protecting the lives of Americans by taking common sense steps to save lives.

The Administration is announcing two new executive actions that will help strengthen the federal background check system and keep guns out of the wrong hands. The Department of Justice (DOJ) is proposing a regulation to clarify who is prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law for reasons related to mental health, and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is issuing a proposed regulation to address barriers preventing states from submitting limited information on those persons to the federal background check system.

Too many Americans have been severely injured or lost their lives as a result of gun violence. While the vast majority of Americans who experience a mental illness are not violent, in some cases when persons with a mental illness do not receive the treatment they need, the result can be tragedies such as homicide or suicide.

The Administration takes a comprehensive approach to mental health issues by expanding coverage of mental health services so care is affordable, launching a national conversation on mental health to reduce stigma associated with having a mental illness and getting help, directing funds we have now to improve mental health facilities, and proposing more funds be used for efforts such as training additional mental health professionals.

At the same time, the Administration is committed to making sure that anyone who may pose a danger to themselves or others does not have access to a gun. The federal background check system is the most effective way to assure that such individuals are not able to purchase a firearm from a licensed gun dealer. To date, background checks have prevented over two million guns from falling into the wrong hands.

The Administration's two new executive actions will help ensure that better and more reliable information makes its way into the background check system. The Administration also continues to call on Congress to pass common-sense gun safety legislation and to expand funding to increase access to mental health services.

PROGRESS TO STRENGTHEN THE FEDERAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM

Over the past year, the Administration has taken several steps to strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), which is used to run background checks on those who buy guns from federally licensed gun dealers to make sure they are not prohibited by law from owning a firearm. For example:

The President directed federal agencies to make all relevant records, including criminal history records and information related to persons prohibited from having guns for mental health reasons, available to the federal background check system. This effort is beginning to bear fruit. In the first nine months after the President's directive, federal agencies have made available to the NICS over 1.2 million additional records identifying persons prohibited from possessing firearms, nearly a 23 percent increase from the number of records federal agencies had made available by the end of January.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIONESTA DAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the Tionesta Dam, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, in Forest County.

This vital flood control project is estimated to have prevented more than $570 million in flood damage over the past seven decades. The Tionesta Dam, located in Forest County, was officially dedicated on January 9, 1941, as a result of the Flood Control Act of 1936 and 1938. The dam itself is located on the Tionesta Creek just over one mile from the Allegheny River. It is key to flood protection along the Allegheny and upper Ohio Rivers.

Mr. Speaker, this dam is so important that during the 1972 Tropical Storm Agnes, which caused damage all across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is estimated to have prevented more than $60 million in additional damages.

Today, the dam and the lake it created serves purposes beyond flood protection. Tionesta Lake and the area around it amount to more than 3,000 acres available for camping, hiking, fishing, and hunting. The lake itself is a hotspot for boating, water skiing, and other activities for families each summer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Army Corps of Engineers for their years of work at the Tionesta Dam, and I wish the Park Rangers and staff the best for the future.

SAVING TREES IN THE ALLEGHENY NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of efforts by the Allegheny National Forest, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, in addressing invasive insects which are threatening the forest's ash, beech, and hemlock trees.

Invasive species are a major concern for national forests across the United States, with the emerald ash borer decimating white ash, the wooly adelgid affecting Pennsylvania's State tree, which is the eastern hemlock, and the beech bark beetle killing American beech trees.

In some areas in the Allegheny National Forest, steps are being taken to proactively manage and treat trees. Over the summer, I met with the local forest service and helped apply a wooly adelgid treatment to eastern hemlock trees. In other areas of the forest, the best approach is to harvest these trees while they still have value.

That is what is proposed across 4,000 acres in the forest, which includes high percentages of these tree species. The harvesting project itself will spread across the forest's four counties, adding up to a total scope of more than 100,000 acres.

I appreciate the approach of the Allegheny National Forest's personnel, their hard work, their dedication, and their continuation to advocate for such proactive management practices.

Now, I will continue to do what I can in the House and as chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee for Conservation and Forestry to help our national forests address these invasive species, which threaten both the health of the forest and the timber resources which helped build this Nation.

REVEREND CHRIS HADGIGEORGE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional

American and extraordinary human being who led with quiet strength, the Reverend Chris Hadgigeorge of Toledo, Ohio, who was laid to rest this week.

Father Hadgigeorge served the Toledo community so wisely and so generously for over a half a century, anchoring his service at Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral, which he helped to elevate from a church to a cathedral during his service. He was 91. What an incredible life.

Surviving are his beautiful wife, Presvytera Ann Hadgigeorge, who he married in 1948; daughters Pattie Senerius and Angie Bohland; son, William; sister, Presvytera Zafera Bartz; six grandchildren, and two great-granddaughters. He worshipped them all.

He was born in Youngstown, Ohio, to immigrants from the Greek island of Samos. When he was growing up, he served as an altar boy. When the family went visiting with friends, children asked what he would like to play and he said: ''I would like to play church.'' So Father Chris would be the priest. As he said in a Blade interview back in 1998, he would marry his brother to one of the girls, and he would have a bag of marbles that he would use as his censer.

Father Hadgigeorge attended Holy Cross, a school of Greek orthodox theology in New England, and was ordained in 1948. He served as pastor in a broad range of communities, including Indianapolis and Detroit, before arriving in Toledo. How lucky we have been.

He served as pastor starting in 1960 and pastor emeritus after 1991, and he has been a leader for more than half of the North Toledo landmark church's existence. As I mentioned, it is now a cathedral due to his efforts.

He had such an influence beyond the congregation he so dutifully served. The pastor recognized the changing needs, not only of the congregation, but of the community, as he saw his own congregation transition from U.S.-born members whose forebears arrived decades ago to more recent Greek and Cypriot immigrants. As his son said: ''I always called him a peacemaker.''

He served as a board member of the Toledo Council of Churches and was active in the International Institute, building goodwill with every step and every word he uttered. He raised his article of faith far beyond the congregants of his own cathedral.

He planted his congregations's commitment in the heart of Toledo and maintained it there at a time when it was really needed, before the community had transitioned to the new century when it was struggling. He led his community to oversee renovations to the church building as it was elevated to a cathedral, including the construction of a beautiful educational center and the purchase of surrounding property, while supporting the parish leaders' decisions to stay put and not move, not suburbanize. He felt that that congregation should control its own destiny and to grow where it was planted.

Father Chris was enthusiastic when the parishioners decided to throw a festival in 1971. The Holy Trinity's Greek festival has become an annual affair in our region, bringing people back to the city and being so much a part of the revitalization of Toledo long before it was popular. He was a true leader. He was such a leader for us.

''There are many generations who knew Father Chris,'' said the Reverend Larry Legakis, who became Holy Trinity's pastor in July 2014. Reverend Legakis said: ''For some of the people in their eighties, they remember working side by side'' with Father Hadgigeorge. ''Some see him as a father and a grandfather. And he was with us for so long, others see him as a great-grandfather.'' Personally, this Congresswoman sees him as a friend.

Our community is forever indebted to him, and the Greek American community he shepherded is an essential building block of the city of Toledo. We would be so much less without having their faith-filled commitment.

May his family draw strength from his beautiful life and from the lessons that he taught us and from the city that he loved and the cathedral to which he gave his life. May his family be blessed and may he rest in peace.

I would like to place in the RECORD as well the obituary that was printed in the Toledo Blade this week.

[From The Blade, Jan. 3, 2016]

THE REV. CHRIS HADGIGEORGE (1924–2015): ORTHODOX PRIEST UNIFIED GREEK COMMUNITY, PARISH

(By Mark Zaborney, Blade Staff Writer)

The Rev. Chris Hadgigeorge, a leader of what is now Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral, as pastor and pastor emeritus, for more than half the North Toledo landmark's existence, died Thursday in his Sylvania Township home. He was 91.

He died in his sleep, his son William said. The cause was not immediately known. He had surgery recently to replace a heart valve and put in a pacemaker, but he did not appear ill and took part in liturgies at Holy Trinity for much of December.

The Holy Trinity community was organized in June, 1915, and has worshiped at its distinctive home on Superior Street north of downtown since 1919. Father Chris arrived as pastor in 1960.

''There are many generations who knew Father Chris,'' said the Rev. Larry Legakis, who became Holy Trinity pastor in July, 2014. ''For some of the people in their 80s, they remember working side by side. Some see him as a father and a grandfather, and he was with us for so long, others see him as a great-grandfather.''

Holy Trinity was consecrated as a cathedral in 1966, ''because of his leadership,'' said George Sarantou, a former parish council president.

Father Chris oversaw renovations to the building and the educational center and the purchase of surrounding property while supporting parish leaders' decision to stay put.

''He felt we should control our own destiny,'' said Mr. Sarantou, Toledo finance director and a former member of the city council. ''He was a good solid leader who understood what our needs should be. He got the job done with his quiet but effective leadership. He knew how to motivate people.''

Father Chris was enthusiastic when the parish threw a festival in 1971, and Holy Trinity's Greek festival has become an annual affair.

''He loved the city and the community. It was home,'' his son said.

The pastor recognized the changing needs of the congregation, from the U.S.-born members whose forebears arrived decades ago to more recent Greek and Cypriot immigrants.

''He was a great unifier in the Greek community. He could work with all groups, young and old,'' Mr. Sarantou said.

His son said: ''I always called him a peacemaker.''

''I'm speaking as a son now,'' William Hadgigeorge said. ''He would never lecture me about God's way. It was always the right way; do the right thing, even when others aren't looking.''

Father Chris retired as Holy Trinity pastor in 1991. Afterward, he was interim pastor of a Springfield, Ohio, church for several months but stayed in Toledo.

He was named a protopresbyter in the church by Archbishop Iakovos in 1973, and received the patriarchal cross from Patriarch Bartholomew in 2006.

Father Chris was born Aug. 3, 1924, in Youngstown, to Paraskevi and William Hadgigeorge, immigrants from the Greek island of Samos. He was an altar boy growing up and sang in the choir. When the family went visiting and friends' children asked what he'd like to play, ''I'd say, 'Let's play church,'" Father Chris told The Blade in 1998. ''And I would be the priest. I would marry my brother to one of the girls. I would have a bag of marbles that I used as my censer.''

He was a 1942 graduate of Youngstown's East High School. He went to Holy Cross, a school of Greek Orthodox theology in New England and was ordained in 1948. He was a pastor in Indianapolis and Detroit before arriving in Toledo.

He'd been a board member of the Toledo Council of Churches and was active in the International Institute.

Surviving are his wife, Presvytera Ann Hadgigeorge, whom he married March 7, 1948; daughters, Pattie Senerius and Angie Bohland; son, William; sister, Presvytera Zafera Bartz; six grandchildren, and two great-granddaughters.

Visitation will be from 1–9 p.m. Monday in Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral, with Trisagion prayers at 7 p.m. A vesperal liturgy at 9 a.m. Tuesday will be followed by funeral services at 11 a.m. in the cathedral. Arrangements are by the Ansberg-West Funeral Home.

The family suggests tributes to Holy Trinity's memorial fund.

SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, with the recent announcement of new policies to restrict firearms, President Obama has yet again used executive overreach to force his agenda on the American people. Congress has already rejected these policies in a bipartisan fashion, and this action is another example of the President overstepping his constitutional authority to circumvent the people's voices in Congress. The administration's assault on Americans' constitutional rights must stop.

Time and time again, our courts have defended the Second Amendment, and

Congress has voted repeatedly to reject new restrictions on our constitutional rights. For more than 200 years, the Second Amendment has been protected and championed by Americans, the courts, and Congress. We must stand together to defend and protect our constitutional rights. As a staunch supporter of the Second Amendment, I am outraged by President Obama's actions and will fight to stop this executive order.

In my home State of West Virginia, using guns for sport and hunting is a way of life. We respect firearms and are taught at an early age how to use them. In many families, fathers and mothers teach their children how to hunt and, when they are old enough, they receive their own gun as an important coming-of-age tradition. West Virginians are not alone. Families across this country have these same traditions and sports.

As West Virginians, we know that law-abiding citizens are not the problem and our country was not founded on the principles of taking away rights from the people. Our rights cannot and should not be taken away. This administration is determined to attack our way of life, our traditions, and our constitutional rights. I wish I could say this is a surprise, but time and time again, this President has used executive actions and regulations to eliminate policies and rights he disagrees with.

□ 1045

Sadly, we have seen this far too often with the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, which has aggressively—aggressively—used regulations and rules to destroy our coal-mining communities, in particular, in my State of West Virginia.

I have fought to stop the EPA and will fight to stop President Obama's executive actions on gun control. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I will use the power of the purse to eliminate funding for these new actions. As a Member of Congress, I am dedicated to working for our State and doing what is right for the people of West Virginia. I will continue to support our constitutional rights, including the Second Amendment, and push back on the administration's overreach into our lives, businesses, and communities.

REMEMBERING OUR FRIEND RICHARD SMITH

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a good friend, Richard Smith.

Mr. DENHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my good friend, as we both recognize an amazing life of a good friend and acknowledge and honor the life of this personal friend and beloved community leader, Rich Smith.

He was a loving husband, father, and grandfather, who passed away peacefully in the comforts of his home, surrounded by his family, on December 27, 2015.

Born on December 19, 1946, Rich was raised in Walnut Creek, California. Growing up, Rich's family was involved in 4–H, and agriculture had always played a major role in his life. Rich continued down this path by obtaining a bachelor of science degree in ag science and management from the University of California, Davis in 1968.

Originally, Rich was interested in the technical aspects of agriculture. He worked in a lab performing analysis on soil, water, and plant nutrition. Never did Rich believe he would be the owner of a successful wine company, but in 1987, this became a reality when he and his new bride, Claudia, purchased the vineyard known as Paraiso Vineyards.

Today Paraiso Vineyards is owned and operated by the Smith family and is located in the Santa Lucia Highlands in Monterey County. The family business consists of almost 3,000 acres of vineyards and continues to evolve in all aspects. Rich leaves behind a tremendous legacy that can be celebrated and appreciated by everyone who visits this magnificent vineyard.

Rich had a generous spirit and provided lasting contributions to the community. He was a local hero to the Salinas Valley, and he demonstrated time and again a desire to share his resources and talents with others.

I was one of those whom he shared his talents with as he encouraged, supported, and advised me to run for political office. Rich's motto always was: Treat people the way that you want to be treated. All that were lucky enough to spend time with him found that he truly lived by these words. Rich will forever be remembered for his kindness, generosity, leadership, and love.

On kindness and generosity, he and Claudia were kind enough and generous enough to host, 23 years ago, then my fiance, now my wife, Sonia, and our wedding at the beautiful Paraiso Springs.

On leadership and love, as I was in the State senate, Rich provided leadership for not only the State of California, but the Salinas Valley, the wine industry, creating a wine mecca, pioneering Monterey County to be a leader in wine production as well as a new tourism corridor.

His love for family and his community was unmatched. He is a friend that is going to be forever missed. Not only was he a leader, a very kind man, a very generous man, but he had a tremendous sense of humor. I will never forget soon after our marriage, his daughter, Sonia's best friend, was being married at Paraiso Springs as well, and a funny episode happened where Sonia passed out in the middle of the wedding. Rich seized the moment to rib me a little bit and my new mother-in-law. He made it clear that he thought that Sonia may be pregnant on that day. It was a funny gesture that, as a young man, made me a little nervous at the time, but he will always be a friend and sorely missed.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, we both got to know Rich through politics. It is amazing that he was a person who supported us both: Jeff being a Republican, myself being a Democrat; Jeff being in the State legislature, I being in the State legislature.

I got to know him when I was a county supervisor in Monterey County. Rich was always the go-to guy to really do sort of the technical issues that you drill down deep on a lot of controversial agricultural issues. His ideas were always based on good science, good farming practices, always sort of the idea of conservation in the best sense of the word.

He also was participatory in my daughter's wedding because the wines we served at that wedding were from Rich's vineyards. In fact, I brought a bottle of his wine today here on the floor to show the world that this man did some great things. His wines were served also at many, many charitable events that they did at their vineyards.

He and Claudia were kind of leaders. Claudia was very interested in getting the whole ecotourism, agritourism involved to get people out into seeing how agriculture is really produced, and wine visits are obviously a good way of attracting people, but the knowledge of it.

We are going to really miss him. He was a great person, and I am glad that we are able to create a national park right across from his vineyard so he can always stare at it.

Got bless Richard Smith and the great wines he made.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of life and in firm opposition to Planned Parenthood's unconscionable activities.

But as I begin my remarks, I want to be very clear about one thing. The vote that the House will take today is a victory for women's health while also serving as a cry to end the monstrous actions of an organization that continually attacks our most vulnerable unborn children.

There are more than 13,500 publicly supported alternatives for women's health care in the country and 588 in Missouri—alternatives that treat women without performing abortions, alternatives that will have more access to Federal money for women's health care. This means that in Missouri alone, there are 45 health clinics for every Planned Parenthood clinic in the

State. So, please, please don't be distracted by political rhetoric.

We are strengthening our support for women's health, and we are stripping Federal taxpayer dollars from an organization that performs more than 327,000 abortions a year.

While I have long fought to stop this atrocious practice, I was especially shocked this summer by videos of Planned Parenthood's cold indifference and barbaric murder of the society's most vulnerable members.

It is our duty as lawmakers, as citizens of a great nation, as friends, as neighbors, as family members to protect those who cannot protect themselves. It is a tragic shame to watch employees of Planned Parenthood so willing to sell the body parts of unborn babies.

These are truly some of the most horrifying and heartbreaking videos I have ever seen, even throughout all my work in combating sex trafficking, sexual assault, and abuse.

The United States is a nation that seeks to protect the least among us in numerous ways, from medical research assistance for the needy to elderly care. It is time that we do the same for our precious unborn children.

Mr. Speaker, today is an historic day when we will finally stop taxpayer dollars from funding Planned Parenthood's abortions. Surely, no Member of Congress can, in good conscience, claim that we should fund these heinous activities with your hard-earned dollars.

After seeing these horrible videos, I was compelled to take action. I joined Congressman SEAN DUFFY and Congressman CHRIS SMITH in sending a letter to Chairmen UPTON and GOODLATTE, requesting an immediate investigation into Planned Parenthood's actions. I would like to thank House leadership and the committee chairmen for granting our request and for the work that they have done on their committees already.

Planned Parenthood has shamelessly tried to defend the indefensible before these committees. They have shown no remorse for the actions described in these videos, apologizing only for the tone of them. In response, they have effectively dared Congress to act. And today we do.

Today Congress says enough is enough. Today we pass legislation that will give the President a very stark choice: continue paying for acts that are so disturbing, so horrifying, and so disgusting that they require congressional investigation, or simply respect life and respect the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the heart of my team's mission statement, which currently hangs in my office, reads: To confront injustice and serve as a voice for the most vulnerable in our society.

Defunding Planned Parenthood is the right thing to do. Today I will give voice to the voiceless. I will proudly cast my vote for life, for these innocent angels. I will continue to fight for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but is unthinkable.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

At the beginning of this new day, we are grateful as individuals and as a Nation for all the blessings we have been given.

We ask Your blessing upon the Members of this people's House as they reconvene for the second session. May they anticipate the opportunities and difficulties that are before them and before so many Americans with steadfast determination to work together toward solutions that will benefit their countrymen.

Grant that they be worthy of the responsibilities they have been given by their constituents and truly be the people You have called them to be. May the walls of disagreement that have divided this assembly be put aside and replaced by a spirit of respect and dignity.

May Your Spirit, O God, be in all of our hearts and minds and encourage us to do the works of justice and peace now and always.

May all that we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING PEGGY SAMPSON

(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 honor and congratulate Peggy Sampson, a long-time member of our congressional community, who retired after more than 37 years of outstanding public service.

Throughout her exemplary service, Peggy demonstrated strong commitment and dedication to the House of Representatives and to our great country.

Peggy arrived on Capitol Hill in 1978 as part of our proud U.S. Capitol Police. After 8 years, she was appointed as the Republican Page Supervisor. Since 2011, Peggy has been helping Members and staff as the House Floor Operations Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deep gratitude to Peggy on her many positive contributions to the institution we are so humbled to serve.

Peggy, I wish you all the best in your much-deserved retirement, and I look forward to your continued friendship. Godspeed, my friend.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States announced another series of actions that his administration is taking to curb our Nation's gun violence epidemic, for they are important steps, and I commend the President and Vice President for their continued focus on this ongoing crisis. As the President said yesterday, Congress still needs to act.

In my 15 years as a Member of the House, Congress time and again has

failed to answer the cries of Americans who have lost their loved ones, particularly our children, to the scourge of gun violence.

Congress has failed to respond to the pleas of Americans who have been disabled by stray bullets. Congress has failed to acknowledge the vast majority of Americans—Republicans and Democrats, gun owners and non gun owners—who believe that every gun purchased should be accompanied by a background check. With each failure, we are closer to a day when tragedies like those of San Bernardino and Sandy Hook will become what they never should be: commonplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to find the courage to take action. It is long past overdue.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ACTIONS RESTRICT SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as citizens of the United States, we are afforded basic rights and privileges under the Constitution. One of these fundamental rights is the Second Amendment, and its guarantee to keep and bear arms is clear.

Yesterday, in yet another attempt to erode our basic liberties, President Obama announced plans to undermine the will of Congress and challenge the Second Amendment rights of all Americans.

Just like his unilateral actions on immigration, this proposal is an overreach of the President's constitutionally granted executive authority. Congressional refusal to pass bad policy does not transfer legislative authority to the President, and I will fight against this attempt to diminish our constitutional rights.

Guns are one of many tools that people use to commit horrific crimes, but the problem of evil cannot be legislated away. It is important that any legislative response, whether it is at the Federal, State, or local level, ensures that the constitutional rights of all citizens are protected.

GUNS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last year more than 13,000 Americans lost their lives because of a gun. More than 3,300 children were killed or injured. As the President said yesterday, the question of whether we address gun violence is really a question about who we are and what kind of country we want to live in.

Do we want to be a country in which we have a mass shooting nearly every single day of the year? Do we want to be a country in which children in a school have to practice hiding silently under their desks or in a closet in order to avoid an active shooter? Do we want to be a country in which the National Rifle Association buys influence and drowns out the voices of concerned citizens? Do we want to be a country in which all Congress does after a mass shooting is hold another moment of silence instead of addressing the problem?

That is the country we live in today, a country in which gun violence threatens lives every day, a country in which we are growing accustomed to atrocities that just don't happen as often in other developed countries.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. The President has done his job. Now it is time for Congress to do its job.

Let's pass universal background checks. Let's do more to keep guns from criminals and from those with serious mental illness, such that possessing a gun would pose a threat to themselves or others. Let's get military-style assault weapons out of our communities. Let's do better.

PROTECTING AMERICANS' SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has announced plans to use an executive order to implement new gun control measures. This plan is a complete overreach into the lives of the American people.

Unfortunately, this President has spent his entire time in office expanding the size of our Federal Government and infringing on our constitutional rights. This disappointing news is just another example of his blatant disregard for the United States Constitution.

As a gun owner myself, I will continue to fight to protect our Second Amendment rights. I remain completely opposed to any action that puts any level of new restrictions on our Second Amendment right to bear arms.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have barely started 2016 and here we are, about to take our 62nd vote to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and facing the 11th attack on women's health care in the 114th Congress. Defunding Planned Parenthood and dismantling the ACA will rob hardworking Americans of affordable family planning, and it will strip life-saving cancer screenings away from millions of women across the country.

As Congress, we haven't taken 62 votes to improve women's health and access to healthcare programs for women and seniors. The 114th Congress hasn't declared war on the appalling lack of healthcare, nutrition, and mental health programs.

But here we are again, wasting valuable tax dollars in order to rehash the ideology of a loud few, one that hurts women and our most vulnerable of constituents. This is just a sad and shameful day.

Congress, this must stop.

ROYER-GREAVES SCHOOL FOR BLIND

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Viola Wiskoski, a resident of Paoli, Pennsylvania, which is in the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Recently, Viola retired from the Royer-Greaves School for Blind after 70 years of dedicated service as the school's secretary. The Royer-Greaves School for Blind has been a staple in the Paoli community since 1941, and for nearly a century it has provided quality care and assistance to individuals who are visually impaired.

Viola coined her work as an ''experience of a lifetime,'' particularly the privilege of having worked directly with Dr. Royer-Greaves.

For 70 years, Viola ensured that the school operated smoothly, enabling it to work toward its mission of ''providing a supportive education and training environment for students with multiple disabilities to help them reach their full potential and enjoy an enhanced quality of life.''

In 2009, her service to the school and community was honored with accolades, including the Jessie Royer-Greaves award.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and thank Viola for her dedicated service to the Royer-Greaves School for Blind. Her achievements have left a meaningful impact on the school, its students, and the community. She is a great and caring American. We wish her the best in health and happiness in retirement.

GUN VIOLENCE AND OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have stood here many times in the last few years with the same message to my colleagues: Let's take action on gun violence and save some lives.

I have named horrible statistics on gun death, like young people in the United States are more likely to be killed by a gun than in a car accident.

I have told stories about people who have suffered incredible loss, like Vicky Lindsey from Compton, who lost her son to gun violence and founded Project Cry No More.

I have cited polls showing bipartisan support from voters for sensible reforms; but year after year, Congress

has refused to act, despite its knowing how easy it is for criminals and dangerous people to buy these deadly weapons.

This week there was a bright spot. President Obama has taken executive action to increase the number of background checks on gun sales, a move which we know will help to keep guns out of dangerous hands.

I thank the President, but our work to prevent gun deaths cannot end there. Congress must finish the job by instituting universal background checks, banning assault weapons, and closing the dangerous loophole that allows a gun dealer to sell a gun if the FBI has not completed the background check within 3 days. We have to act. There is no excuse not to.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF LINDA OSMUNDSON

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a survivor, a leader, and a compassionate woman who dedicated her life to making the Pinellas County community and the State of Florida safer. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Linda Osmundson, who passed away this Monday at the age of 66.

A longtime activist against domestic violence and a survivor herself, Linda was best known as the director of Community Action Stops Abuse, or CASA, in St. Petersburg, Florida. Linda served as head of CASA for 26 years before retiring this past summer. Before that, she guided programs in both Gainesville and West Palm Beach. Under Linda's leadership, CASA grew from a staff of 7 working out of a small home to over 80 employees with a 100-bed facility.

Linda started a first-of-its-kind substance abuse program for victims. In addition, she worked with law enforcement, who are now properly trained on dealing with domestic violence. She cofounded a program to secure pardons for victims of domestic violence convicted for defending themselves. For that, she earned the Governor's Peace at Home Award.

Mr. Speaker, Linda Osmundson leaves a legacy that will not be forgotten. She was a quiet hero in our community, and her life's work undeniably saved thousands of lives and made Florida a safer place. For that, we are grateful.

ATTACKS ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE AND TAKING AWAY HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, it may be a new year, but the Republicans are celebrating with the same old extreme attacks on women's health care and trying to take away health insurance from hardworking American families.

It is a shame that the House Republican leadership has chosen to spend the first week of 2016 attacking Planned Parenthood and dismantling those important benefits to 22 million Americans.

The bill that we will vote on today will defund Planned Parenthood and the important family planning services that they provide, including lifesaving cancer screenings for millions of women across this country. This bill would dismantle affordable health care for millions of more workers, for families, for students.

Instead of wasting time on a radical bill which, quite frankly, some on the other side have acknowledged will not become law, we ought to be focusing on the questions that the American people sent us here to work on—on getting our economy moving, putting Americans back to work, and rebuilding our infrastructure. That is the challenge that we face, and we ought not politicize women's health care in order to pander to the extreme voices on the right.

FAILED POLICIES, EMPTY RHETORIC

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, the Augusta Chronicle published an editorial with significant insight:

''President Obama finally has a counterterrorism strategy: Photo-ops and speeches. After dawdling for several years in the fight against ISIS, his advisers must realize that Mr. Obama is losing not only the war on terror, but the domestic audience as well.

''This administration is a story of one failure after another. The President calls ISIS the JV team of terror. He says ISIS is contained, the day before the Paris attacks. The morning of the San Bernardino terror attack, he says: 'Our homeland has never been more protected by more effective intelligence and law enforcement professionals at every level than they are now.' ''

The editorial continues: ''American lives are on the line, and this President won't identify the enemy or secure our borders and communities. And his plan of attack? Photo-ops and speeches and unvetted refugees.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Thank you, Peggy Sampson, for your dedicated service.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS TO REDUCE GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's actions to address our Nation's epidemic of gun violence.

Yesterday at the White House, I joined with families from Newtown, Connecticut, which I am proud to represent, and with families from across this great country as the President outlined four steps within the current law to improve gun violence prevention.

First, strengthening background checks. If you are in the business of selling firearms, whether at a gun show or online, your customers should have to go through a background check.

Second, improving enforcement of the background check system so that it works better and faster.

Third, expanding access to mental health treatment and to tear down barriers to implementing existing law.

And, fourth, directing lifesaving new research into innovative technologies to make guns safer.

These are small but meaningful steps to address a public health crisis about which this House has been astoundingly silent. It is time for this House to honor the victims of gun violence, not with moments of silence, but with days of action. We can and we must do better to save American lives.

100TH PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

(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, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud to rise in recognition of the 100th Pennsylvania Farm Show, which starts this weekend in the Commonwealth's State capital of Harrisburg.

Agriculture is so important to our Nation's economy, and the same is true in Pennsylvania, where it is our largest industry. The farm show is the largest indoor agricultural exposition in the Nation, with nearly 6,000 animals and 10,000 competitive exhibits from across the State.

The event itself started in 1917 with several events held across Harrisburg. By 1931, attendance had risen to 131,000. Today, the figure stands at an estimated 400,000.

This weekend, I will visit the farm show with Agriculture Committee Chairman MICHAEL CONAWAY and several other House colleagues. We will take part in a listening session to order to hear from farmers and others involved in agriculture regarding Federal policies.

I am looking forward to showing all those who make the trip to Harrisburg

why the farm show brings visitors back year after year.

REMEMBERING COMMISSIONER EL FRANCO LEE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this past week in Harris County, Texas, we lost a giant of a man in the name of Commissioner El Franco Lee, who served the Harris County Commissioners Court and the people he loved for 30 years.

One could never describe Commissioner Lee as a typical politician. As he walked through his district, I truly believe his giant footsteps touched everyone and everyone's heart. He was a lover of seniors and created opportunities for them to enjoy their life and swim in a fantastic pool at the Hester House. More importantly, he coddled and nurtured and created the Lyndon Baines Johnson Hospital that has served so many from all over the county and State. The Baylor Teen Clinic called him a guardian angel, providing healthcare services for vulnerable teens.

And, yes, he believed in something called the Olympics, not around the world, but right in Harris County; 10,000 children during the summer would have the opportunity to test their athletic prowess. And he was an athlete as well.

He was a friend of Mickey Leland and Craig Washington. More importantly, his beautiful family, wife, and children lived in his beloved community, Fifth Ward. He was a friend of the community.

He did so much as a county commissioner. He left behind wonderful parks and the opportunity for trails. He was a man in our community who knew about flooding. He was a strong, strong proponent of making sure that the infrastructure in Precinct 1 was the kind that would give a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, as I close on this wonderful public servant, let me say may he rest in peace, working until his tragic death, and offering to the people who were left behind our praise for him. May he rest in peace.

Thank you, Commissioner El Franco Lee, for being the giant of a man who reached low and touched all, loved us all, and brought us to a day in Harris County where we can be so proud of all that you have done.

IF TODAY WERE PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LAST NATIONAL SECURITY BRIEFING

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

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, over the holidays, I had the opportunity to read ''Killing Reagan,'' another interesting book by Bill O'Reilly. In the book, he talks about the President's last warning. He had cleaned out the Oval Office, and he left a note in the desk for his successor. Then Colin Powell came in to deliver his last national security briefing. He simply said to the President: All is quiet in the world today.

Can you imagine if today were President Obama's last national security briefing? The gentleman or gentlewoman would say: Sir, we have a lot of problems in China, in North Korea, in Ukraine, in Yemen, in Syria, in Iraq, in Iran, in Afghanistan, in Saudi Arabia, and in North Korea. The Taliban is on the rise. ISIS is not contained. Israel is still mad at us. There has been recent terror activity in Munich, Paris, and Belgium. Sir, because of your leadership, all is quiet today in Greenland.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Senate amended Budget Reconciliation Act, a bill with several extreme provisions, including the repeal of the core of the Affordable Care Act for the 62nd time and the revoking of Federal funding for Planned Parenthood for the 11th time in this Congress.

It is a new year, but instead of bringing legislation to the floor that helps and makes Americans healthier, safer, and more secure, we are repeating the same old partisan fights.

Last year, many of my colleagues took advantage of a political stunt by an antichoice group that released falsified videos to damage the credibility of Planned Parenthood. There were congressional hearings, State-level investigations, and even a select committee formed to investigate the organization. The inquiries have resulted in no evidence of wrongdoing and have been a waste of taxpayers' money.

There are 2.7 million women in America who rely on Planned Parenthood for their basic healthcare services that they otherwise cannot afford and cannot access. There is no replacement for Planned Parenthood in many parts of the country, so taking away its Federal funds needlessly risks the health of millions of American women.

The CBO estimates that dismantling the Affordable Care Act will cause 22 million Americans to lose their health care. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 3762.

Thank you, Peggy Sampson, for your dedicated service.

PROMOTING CHARITABLE GIVING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of our country's most treasured values is helping others who are less fortunate. We see it all the time in communities around the Nation, with Americans raising money for a worthy cause, donating food, or volunteering their time to help their neighbors.

It is important that our Tax Code reflect these exact same values. It was gratifying last month to see Congress come together passing a new law that will promote charitable giving. One of the charitable provisions in the new law was a bill that I authored. It makes permanent a provision to allow a rollover donation from an individual's IRA to go to an approved charitable foundation.

In addition, the new law will encourage the donation of food to food banks from local businesses as well as promote environmental conservation through the granting of land easements.

Mr. Speaker, there are many Americans who want to give back and help others, and it is important that our Tax Code reflect these same values and doesn't punish them for wanting to do so. Each of these provisions help make that possible.

IN MEMORY OF WALTER McCREARY

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the memory of Mr. Walter McCreary, a former but longtime community leader and resident of Ohio's Third Congressional District.

Mr. McCreary was a member of the famous Tuskegee Airmen. He flew almost 100 combat missions over Europe in his red-tailed P–51 fighter plane during World War II. In 1944, he was shot down and spent 9 months as a POW. After the war, he was assigned to Lockbourne Army Airfield, now known as Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base in Columbus, Ohio.

In 2007, the Tuskegee Airmen were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal. Their exemplary combat record and honorable service are rightfully credited as the driving force for the full integration of our armed services.

Walter McCreary lived his life with courage, bravery, and honor. I extend my condolences to his family, and honor the legacy of both him and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen.

Mr. Speaker, I am also here today to stand up for families, for women, and for preserving access to women's health care.

□ 1230

SUPPORT TODAY'S RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's reconciliation bill.

While it is true we have voted to repeal ObamaCare before, there is a reason why we continue to do so. We are

actually listening to our constituents. Every one of us has heard ObamaCare horror stories, including freshmen like me who have been here just for a year.

I continue to be inundated by grave concerns raised by families and businesses in my district. One individual wrote to me and summed it up this way: ''Mr. BISHOP, the Affordable Care Act is anything but.'' He explained that his family of four went from an overall $5,000 deductible to having the same deductible per family member in addition to having his premium doubled. ''Where is the affordability?'' he asked.

Another small-business owner from the small town of Fowlerville in my district called the other month to say that her rates for her family had more than doubled in just the past 2 years.

I could go on, but we know the story all too well. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the President's healthcare law is crushing our families and local communities. I urge my colleagues to heed their concerns and support this reconciliation package.

OPPOSING CUTS TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015. It really does just the opposite.

Not only does this bill represent Republicans' 62nd attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but it is yet another ideological attack on women's health care. It would defund Planned Parenthood for 1 year, preventing millions of women from accessing critical healthcare services, such as cancer and STI screenings and contraceptive care.

In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood provided healthcare services to more than 800,000 Californians and provided more than 93,000 pap tests and 97,000 breast screening exams.

Although Planned Parenthood centers make up only 10 percent of all publicly funded family planning centers, they serve, mind you, 36 percent of clients who obtain care from the family planning center network.

Denying access to healthcare providers such as Planned Parenthood will harm the communities that need these services the most, including low-income women and women of color.

Enough is enough. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon will mark the 11th vote to attack women's health care this Congress. It is past time for Republicans to end their attacks on Planned Parenthood and recognize that they are really harming women by denying them these badly needed healthcare services.

I hope my colleagues will vote ''no'' on H.R. 3762 and really begin to look at what they are doing in terms of the freedom of women to make their own decisions and to really access the vital healthcare services that they need.

Again, this reconciliation act does nothing to reconcile healthcare services, which women desperately need in our country.

HOUSING UNDOCUMENTED CHILDREN

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was informed last week that the Department of Health and Human Services is considering temporarily housing unoccupied minor children at military bases throughout the United States. Six bases are under consideration to house up to 5,000 of these undocumented children. One of the bases under consideration is Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress strongly enough my opposition to this plan. The reasons are numerous, but let me emphasize two of the most obvious: military bases are not appropriate for housing unaccompanied children, and unaccompanied children are not appropriate residents of a military base.

The last Congress clearly expressed our opposition to housing unoccupied minors at military installations through the passage of H.R. 5230. Additionally, funding sufficient to meet the needs at the southern border was provided just a few weeks ago in the passage of the fiscal year 2016 omnibus spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is neither compassionate to the children, nor in the country's best interests for national defense, to house these children at Grand Forks or any other military installation. I urge the administration to find a more appropriate solution to the crisis at our southern border.

POLITICAL THEATER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we closed the last year of Congress with some very productive work on both sides of the aisle: we passed a transportation bill; we reformed No Child Left Behind; we passed the tax extenders bill; and we passed an omnibus bill. I thank Speaker RYAN and the Republicans for working in a bipartisan fashion.

But we are back here in 2016, and as President Reagan would say: There they go again.

Yes, they are trying to repeal the ACA for the 62nd time, and for the 11th time to try to defund Planned Parenthood. These bills are not going to become law. The President will veto them.

It puts us back in a situation where this House isn't being used for America's priorities of putting people back to work, dealing with the crisis in the Middle East and maybe having an AUMF passed, and dealing with criminal justice reform and passing a bill.

The idea, as I understand it, is to pass the bill; the President will veto it; it won't become law; and have the first veto override on the day that the March for Life is here in Washington. This is being done for political theater, to appeal to the March for Life people, and not for what America needs: to put people back to work and protect our people from terrorism in the Middle East.

I wish we would get back to the way we finished up 2015.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS IS NOT UP FOR DEBATE

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a voice of warning for all Americans.

This administration's recent executive orders designed to further restrict Americans' Second Amendment rights is a dangerous move. Make no mistake, this administration will not be satisfied until all Americans no longer have the right to possess firearms.

This latest round of executive orders serves only to harass and intimidate law-abiding citizens. Nothing the President has proposed would have stopped a single tragedy. Americans have as much right to the protection of their homes and their families with firearms as the President does while sitting in the Oval Office.

As a firearm owner myself, from a family of firearm owners, and a defender of the Second Amendment, I want to remind the administration that the right to bear arms was settled in 1791. It is not up for debate.

PREVENTING GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Lucy McBath from metro Atlanta stood behind the President when he announced his actions to reduce gun violence.

In 2012, her son, Jordan Davis, was killed simply for playing loud music. I could see the pain of her loss and the anguish on her face. It broke my heart. Jordan Davis is one of the 100,000 Americans killed in the last decade who are no longer with us due to gun violence.

It is our duty to do all we can to protect all Americans. Every year mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, families and friends beg their government to act. Mr. Speaker, are we deaf to their cries? Are we blind to their suffering?

President Obama is listening, and he is leading. A leader must be a headlight and not a taillight.

Members of this House, we are not leading. His proposal is common sense and constitutional.

Now, as Members, we must do our part. We must do what is right and what is just. It is long overdue.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FIREARMS PROPOSAL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, time and again this President has noted that we can't change the law without action from Congress. Despite his claimed familiarity with the separation of powers, this week we see the President again trying to go around Congress to enact already-known antigun policies that have already been considered and rejected in the Senate.

The President's plan ignores what any honest observer already knows: limiting the rights of law-abiding Americans doesn't deter criminals and terrorists from breaking our laws.

Forcing Americans to jump through more hoops and spend more money to exercise their Second Amendment rights will, at best, have zero effect on public safety and, at worst, embolden those who already disregard our laws.

Finally, let's look at what the President's proposal boils down to. More Americans would have to pay more to the Federal Government in fees to exercise their constitutional rights. Enforcement of current laws could have a much better effect on that, yet we see very few red flags that are put up by people trying to legally purchase guns that are already felons. More investigations would be held and more people prosecuted if those laws were enforced, yet our attorneys general at the State level and Federal level don't follow up on those red flags.

We have plenty of laws on the books that are not enforced. We don't need more. We certainly don't need executive orders that the President is illegally putting across behind closed doors, which has been emblematic of what the entire Obama administration has been doing for the last several years to our constitutional rights.

REHASHING OLD, TOXIC ATTACKS

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, here we are, the very first day back for the House of Representatives in 2016, and already the House Republicans are rehashing old, toxic attacks on women's access to health care and on working families.

Here in 2016 we were hoping to see a House of Representatives that would look forward, forward to reducing the cost of health care for all Americans and to helping pass the bill that would require pay equity for women. Instead, under the guise of this reconciliation bill, a technical term that is coming before the body this week, this Republican bill would defund Planned Parenthood, strip away affordable family planning and lifesaving cancer screenings for millions of American women across the country. It would dismantle the Affordable Care Act. In fact, it is the 62nd vote from this body to repeal that act.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Republican bill before this body this week would take healthcare coverage away from 22 million Americans next year alone. That is not right for the country, it is not right for women, and it is not right for this body. Let's move forward with a pro-woman agenda, a pro-healthcare agenda, rather than the same toxic bills that they have tried and failed to pass over 62 times.

IT IS TIME TO REPEAL AND REPLACE OBAMACARE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, Congress silenced the voices of a majority of hardworking Americans and ran roughshod over the House minority and jammed a bill through Congress that would put a wet blanket of mandates, regulations, taxes, and penalties on patients, doctors, hospitals, and small businesses, driving up the cost of insurance and health care for most Americans. Longer lines, less access, less innovation, and higher costs have been the hallmark of this bloated bureaucratic nightmare.

Today the House will give voice to those who had this law and its expense thrust upon them. It is time to repeal and replace ObamaCare and move forward in a bipartisan fashion, passing legislation that will put patients back in control of their healthcare decisions, focus on competition and quality of care, reform our tort litigation system, and invest in innovation and research at the NIH, curing diseases, and reducing healthcare costs.

The House will also defund organizations that engage in the horrific and sad process of dissecting and harvesting aborted baby organs and reinvest that money in organizations that are truly focused on women's health care.

Mr. Speaker, by placing this bill on the President's desk, we have given voice to the defenseless, and we have focused on a better future of health care for every American.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 712, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1155, SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 712) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-37. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment

under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 580, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this structured rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2016, or the SCRUB Act. This is a bipartisan measure that provides a fair and reasonable way to find and repeal outdated and inefficient regulations that are still on the books.

It doesn't target any particular type of regulation or industry, but it prioritizes older, expensive rules that are ripe for improvement or may no longer be necessary.

The needs of our economy, small businesses, and American families aren't the same today as they were 15 or 20 years ago. Thus, we should ensure that the rules governing the way we live and work reflect what is best for our country today, not what agencies thought best decades ago.

I thank my colleague from Missouri for introducing this bipartisan solution and his staff for their hard work on this measure.

If you put a piece of paper in the hand of every single person who lives in my hometown of Gainesville, Georgia, it still wouldn't equal the number of pages in the 2015 Federal Register. In fact, it comes in at a record-setting 82,036 pages. That means there were over 82,000 pages of new rules and regulations proposed just last year.

The Code of Federal Regulations is 235 volumes long, containing 175,000 pages of Federal regulations. Knowing this, it should come as no surprise that Federal regulations impose an estimated burden of $1.86 trillion. That is roughly $15,000 per U.S. household and is higher than combined individual and corporate Federal income taxes.

It is difficult to imagine a scenario where there is nothing in those thousands upon thousands of pages that can't be improved, streamlined, or retired. Unfortunately, American businesses and families bear the burden of compliance, even when a regulation is outdated, ineffective, or just plain unnecessary. The SCRUB Act is a commonsense step toward reducing unnecessary costs for families and businesses, leading to more economic growth and job creation.

If you walked into a grocery store and found hundreds of expired and moldy food on the shelves, you would be shocked. You would be even more horrified if you were forced to purchase and eat them.

In the same way, my constituents in northeast Georgia and men and women all across this Nation are appalled that we don't have an existing process in place to clear duplicative, unnecessary, or ineffective regulations off the pages of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015. This legislative package contains the text of H.R. 712 in title 1; H.R. 1759, the ALERT Act, in title II; and H.R. 690, Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2015, in title III. Each of these measures were considered and marked up by the Judiciary Committee and are brought to the floor as reported by the committee.

America's small businesses and job creators need relief from the flood of new regulations and red tape from Washington. Small business owners often cite government regulations as the single most important problem they face today.

A heavy contributor to the burden of new regulation is the use of consent decrees and settlement agreements to bind Federal agencies to issue new rules. Regulators often cooperate with pro-regulatory organizations to advance their mutual agendas in this way.

The device agencies use is simple. An organization that wants new regulations alleges that an agency has violated a duty to declare new rules. The agency and the plaintiff work out a deal under the cover of litigation. The deal puts the agency under judicially backed deadlines to issue the rules.

These deadlines often give the public little opportunity to comment on proposed rules and the White House limited ability to review them. Deals can even require agencies to propose specific regulatory language negotiated by the agency and its regulation-friendly plaintiff.

Those who will be regulated by the new deal typically do not know about these deals until the plaintiffs' complaints and the proposed decrees or settlements are filed in court. By then, it is too late. Frankly, it is just also unfair.

Regulated businesses and individuals are unlikely to be able to intervene in the litigation. The court usually approves the deals before regulated parties have an opportunity to affect whether new regulatory costs will be imposed upon them. These regulated parties could be families, small businesses, farmers, ranchers, or even local governments.

I introduced H.R. 712 to restore transparency, public participation, and judicial review protections to shine a light on one of the worst regulatory abuses in our system today: these ''sue and settle'' agreements.

The Sunshine for Regulatory Consent Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015 puts an end to the abuse of this practice and ensures that those to be regulated have a fair opportunity to participate in the resolution of litigation that affects them.

The bill respects the basic rights of plaintiffs and defendants to manage litigation between them. As a result, the bill offers an effective and balanced remedy.

We must ensure more transparency and scrutiny of consent decrees and settlement agreements that require new regulations. These commonsense reforms are needed to help control the tide of excessive and costly rules.

It is time we get rid of the welcome mat outside the door of regulatory agencies for these suits, under which they can more easily issue expensive and controversial new regulations—policies that oftentimes could never pass Congress—claiming that ''The court made me do it,'' again bypassing our constitutional system. It is not a good idea.

H.R. 712 addresses the weaknesses in the current system while preserving consent decrees as an important mechanism for settling legal disputes. It accomplishes this by increasing participation of affected regulated entities and coregulators in the negotiation in the consideration of decrees and settlements.

The ability of citizens to hold government accountable is an important part of administrative law, but it must be appropriately carried out with transparency and full public participation.

Importantly, H.R. 712 puts an end to a practice that uses taxpayer dollars to

allow special interests to abuse the system and force regulators to put out even more regulations.

Title II of H.R. 712, the ALERT Act, continues our work to relieve the regulatory burden on American families by requiring agencies to publicly provide information on planned regulations, estimated compliance costs, and other updates so that those impacted by the new regulations have the information they need to make financial decisions and plan for the future.

Title III of H.R. 712, the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, is another good governing measure that demonstrates this body's commitment to making life better for all Americans. It requires agencies to publish a brief summary of each proposed regulation online and in plain language.

Agencies do not have the right to conduct their business behind closed doors and hide behind an overly complex regulatory system.

Every regulation impacts every American directly or indirectly, and agencies should be held accountable for the regulations they produce and how they communicate the new requirements to those who will be forced to abide by them.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met yesterday evening on these measures and heard testimony from the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, the chairman of Oversight and Government Reform, and the Government Operations Subcommittee ranking member.

This combined rule makes every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee in order. Seven amendments to H.R. 712 will be debated on the House floor, and 11 amendments to H.R. 1155 will be considered.

For H.R. 712, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

For H.R. 1155, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

This rule and the underlying legislation represents regular order at its finest. I am proud to see the leadership of Chairman SESSIONS and Speaker RYAN are reflected in this robust and open process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Over the holidays, like all Members of this body, I was back home and excited about coming back in January to legislate and move the country forward. I was hoping we could tackle some of the big issues of the day: balance a Federal budget; pass immigration reform and secure our borders; and, finally, deal with the contentious issue of what kind of authorization of military force we want to give to the Commander in Chief.

These are all important issues I was thinking about and reading about and hoping we would deal with when we got back here. Instead, here we are, our first day back in session. And I point out that most Americans, of course, had to go back to work a couple of days ago. We had a few days more to presumably think about what we wanted to do.

And here it is, another attempt to strip health care from over 22 million American families that rely on the healthcare insurance they have today that this reconciliation bill would take away and another attempt to defund Planned Parenthood and strip family planning and cancer screenings away from millions of women across the country, something that ultimately would add to healthcare costs, not to mention the human toll of not diagnosing cancers early, adding to the healthcare costs of this country by having to deal with far too many catastrophic events for what would have been preventable conditions, had they only been identified earlier through access to cancer screenings and family planning services at Planned Parenthood and other locations.

□ 1300

This bill that will be brought under one of the rules that is coming forward today would repeal or dismantle the Affordable Care Act for the 62nd time.

Again, I was hoping 2016 we would start something new. Instead, I am seeing the same kind of bill that Republicans have brought forward in 2011; they brought it forward in 2012; they brought it forward in 2013; they brought it forward in 2014; they brought it forward in 2015; and here we are, not only bringing it forward in 2016, but doing it as one of the very first bills in the very first week that this Congress is back.

Look, I rise in opposition to the rule and both of those underlying bills, H.R. 1155, which is called the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome, or SCRUB Act, and H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act. These bills will make the American people less safe, potentially removing important safety and health regulations that are already in place for a reason.

The gentleman from Georgia says, and I agree, there certainly could be unnecessary regulations on the books. Let's tackle those in a laser-like fashion.

And if the Chief Executive won't do it, then let's do it through a legislative approach that targets the authority for a specific set of rules that this body agrees are not necessary or are counterproductive, as we have done in a number of instances, and go after it, rather than somehow saying that, for every rule that is added arbitrarily, another rule needs to be eliminated, there is some presumed magic to the amount of words in rules.

The gentleman cited, I think it was 86,000 pages. There is no ideal amount of rules. The least amount of rules and regs that can get the job of keeping the American people safe done is the best, but you never know what that is going to be, and maybe we should strip away 10,000 pages of that, and maybe we need another thousand pages for some new technology and new device that could hurt people if there is not the right safety regulations.

We need an adaptive administrative structure to allow our health and safety agencies to do their job so that when people buy a consumer product at the store, they have confidence it is not going to kill them.

As a father of a 4-year-old and a 1-year-old, when I buy a toy and get holiday presents for our kids, I want to make sure that those products don't have lead or contaminants in them, make sure that my child won't be severely damaged or hurt by the failure of our health and safety agencies to make sure that those products are safe.

That is common sense. I think that is what the American people want out of our health and safety regulators, and these bills would impede their ability to do that.

Thirteen of the 16 Democrats who sat on the Judiciary Committee offered dissenting views on H.R. 712, which read, in part: ''This ill-conceived bill imposes numerous new procedural burdens on agencies and courts, intended to dissuade them from using consent decrees and settlement agreements to resolve enforcement actions filed to address agency noncompliance with the law.''

Effectively, what that means is this bill would reduce the cost of noncompliance with our regulations and laws. These burdens include the unworkable requirements that agencies solicit public comments on all proposed consent decrees and settlement agreements, and they respond to every single public comment before submitting them to the court.

Now, again, that is an administrative burden that makes it impossible for our eight health and safety agencies to do their job. You might get 100,000 comments on a particular consent decree or settlement agreement, if somebody is ramping up what we call kind of the astroturf side of trying to get people to write in about a particular topic. And to say, somehow, that every single one of those comments has to be responded to before submitting to the court is basically, not just a policy that would slow down this process, but

would deter agencies from ever engaging in settlement agreements and consent decrees because it would be so prohibitive, from a staff perspective, they would effectively be unable to do their job.

Like all antiregulatory proposals that have been brought forth in this Congress, H.R. 712 is another solution in search of a problem. Those in favor of the bill have failed to provide evidence to support their claim that agencies are somehow conspiring with plaintiffs to enter into consent decrees and settlement agreements.

But even if you agree with that claim, this bill wouldn't solve it. All it would do is impose burdensome procedural requirements on agencies and courts that hamstring and prevent the use of consent decrees and settlements which, oftentimes, are a more efficient way for both plaintiffs and defendants to get to a reasonable outcome than interminable processes and legal bills that go on for years and years.

The other bill to be considered under this rule is another example of a bill that would make the American people less safe. It is called the SCRUB Act, which is also a dangerous solution in search of a problem.

Now, every branch of the government already conducts effective oversight through retrospective review of agency rules. And again, if there are rules that this body disagrees with, we should go after them, go after the authority that this body has chosen to give the agency to make health and safety regulations that keep the American people safe.

Each branch of government already conducts oversight and overlooking this array of options that would provide the necessary scalpel for smart regulatory cuts. This is, instead, a meat-cleaver approach that can eliminate health and safety regulations, both good and ill-informed.

Rather than creating jobs, growing the economy or making Americans safer, this procedure would burden agencies with additional red tape and waste valuable agency resources and taxpayer dollars at the expense of the health and safety of the American people.

As my colleagues have alluded to, H.R. 1155's sole purpose is to actually obstruct the safety and regulatory process by burying agencies in endless red tape and extra costs. It would create legal ambiguity that could lead to increased cost for businesses, for local communities that rely on certainty to plan for the future, as well as uncertainty for consumers and American families who don't know that the products or services that they are buying are safe for them or their children.

Now, in principle, it is hard to argue against the notion that agencies should periodically assess whether rules they have implemented should be improved or repealed, and I agree with that concept. That is not in dispute. That is not what this bill is about.

Rather than streamlining rulemaking, or eliminating unnecessary rules, which we all want to do, through a thoughtful, retrospective review process, even if it is required periodically, this bill, instead, would result in years of delays for new and necessary health and safety rules by requiring a new rulemaking process for any rule that is eliminated.

The SCRUB Act would also establish a regulatory review commission to identify duplicative, redundant, or potentially obsolete regulations. Now, not only would the very creation of this commission be at the cost of taxpayers, as would its limitless resources, hours of staff work that the bill mandates, but the authorizing language of the commission binds it to consider only the costs to affected industries, while ignoring the cost to the general public.

So, if an industry, if this commission existed, and they were looking at a regulation around dumping of toxic materials or toys that could hurt kids, the only charge under this statute of that commission would be what are the costs of compliance of this to industry, not what are the savings to American families who won't have to worry about their kid being hospitalized because of a choking hazard for a 3-year-old, or increased cancer rate for a product that contains lead or a carcinogenic agent. They can't look at that side of the equation.

Rather than to do a thorough cost-benefit analysis, this kangaroo commission would rather superficially look at the cost to companies of making sure that their products are not dangerous to the American people. That is the wrong way to go about this.

Simply put, the SCRUB Act is a solution in search of a problem. There are many tools available to each branch of government to conduct effective oversight and make smart regulatory cuts. I think it is a fine criticism of any administration that they haven't done enough in that regard, and they should. And this body should encourage any President to move forward with cutting unnecessary regulations that cost businesses money and don't threaten the public health and safety.

But agencies must adhere to the robust requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act already, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, the Paperwork Reduction Act, and the Congressional Review Act, and if some of those can be consolidated, along with new ideas to cut red tape and regulation, you will find strong bipartisan support for that concept.

But that is not what this bill does. This bill ties up the ability of our agencies that this Congress has authorized to help keep the American people and American families safe with additional red tape and regulations. It creates a biased commission that, rather than looking at the costs and benefits of health and safety requirements, only looks at the costs.

Moreover, final regulations are subject to review by Federal courts already, who are a final backstop to ensure that agencies have not violated the authority that this body has given them, and that they have satisfied all the applicable statutes, and whether agencies have continued input from relevant stakeholders. We have set that process up.

Now, if we have a thoughtful way to improve that process, around encouraging more stakeholder involvement, looking at the authority that we have given each agency in certain areas, by all means, let's discuss those kinds of bills, rather than short-circuiting the very process that Congress has put in place to help reduce unnecessary regulations.

In many cases, Congress not only mandates that agencies issue a rule, they are doing the work that we have required them to do, but we also prescribe the process already by which they must do so.

This bill, if it passes, will continue to waste the government's time, and we are wasting more by even considering this today, as well as this reconciliation bill that would take healthcare coverage away from 22 million Americans.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that if Republicans were bringing forward a bill to remove healthcare insurance from 22 million Americans, you would think that they would have a plan for those 22 million Americans, but they do not. They simply strip them of their existing health care.

Twenty-two millions Americans will not be able to see their doctor that they have been seeing for years, know that they can go to the hospital if they need it, or have any adequate health insurance under this reconciliation bill.

It defunds Planned Parenthood. It strips affordable planning and life-saving cancer screenings away from millions of women across the country, precisely at the time that those cancer screenings would be more necessary than ever, if the SCRUB Act passed, which would hamstring our own Federal agencies in their ability to prevent carcinogenic agents from being in consumer products and food products that American people consume.

So, again, through these set of bills, the Republicans are saying: We are going to not do the job that we have told our agencies to do in keeping the American people safe; and, at the same time, the results of that lack of safety—more hospital visits, more disease, more sickness, more children choking, more sick kids—we are going to make sure that a lot more of them don't have health care when they need it because of the health and safety regulations that we have removed through tying them up in red tape for years after years.

That is not what the American people want. That is not what my constituents want.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as has already been said just a little bit earlier on this floor, here we go again. I guess the straw harvest was good this fall because, like my colleague, I was hoping that there would be some stuff changed. Undoubtedly, it is not, because the straw harvest was good, and it is now time to put up straw men when we talk about regulatory reform, and we are back at it again.

I want to comment in just a moment on regular order and the fact that stuff has been talked about.

We have two separate rules today. This is a rule that deals with the regulatory issues and regulatory reforms, two bills, and we have a rule that is going to come up here in just a little bit that deals with repealing ObamaCare and dealing with the heinous issues of Planned Parenthood. That is a separate bill.

I would want to talk about something else too, instead of the regulatory issues that are here, because they do matter, they do create jobs.

As we look at this, the one thing that always comes across, Mr. Speaker, as we think about this, is a very clear choice, especially from constituents all over the country, in my district, in particular, when I think about this.

One of the main arguments against this is that it will burden the government, so it is bad? The problem is, the government right now, through regulatory process, is burdening small business, is burdening families who simply want to be able to get up, go to work, do their job, and be free of unnecessary burdensome regulations.

Again, we want to talk about throwing up the straw man that the Republicans are out here poisoning the air, bad paint, terrible ideas, killing kids. That is not what we are talking about.

Again, the harvest is ripe; the straw is being developed. And instead of talking about getting rid of regulatory process, we are going to talk about, oh, we are taking away safety.

There is no Republican on this side of the aisle that I have ever heard stand from this place, or from anywhere else, and say: I want dirty water. Give me choking air. Give me paint that is bad. Give me products that are terrible. That is not what is ever said. And when that argument is brought up, it simply cheapens and demeans the process.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that was just said was that we don't want to have public comments, that you have to answer to public comments, that a government agency would have to answer to public comment. In fact, one of the issues is H.R. 712 actually addresses this because these sue and settlement agreements can take place without the affected party even being in the room or even know it is happening.

Tell me where that is fair. Show me where two people can go in a room and decide what is best for me in a business environment. Show where that is fair. It is not fair and you can't argue that it is.

Public comment to the government is expected, and public comment should be respected before these regulations or these consent decrees are put out.

□ 1315

We all have various roles. The executive branch has their role, and there are places where they meet. And we are appreciative of the work that is done. What is being talked about in these bills is, let's make it more efficient and let's make it better because what we have in Washington is, I would rather see this body take up the policy argument, this body discuss the billions of dollars in costs that are being implemented on businesses, and not the agencies who have no answerability to the public. So when we look at this, these are just the small things. We want to talk about what is actually coming to the floor.

I have the privilege of sharing the Rules Committee with my friend from Washington State, who is going to speak. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia, a fellow member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time to speak on this important topic. I am very pleased to be able to contribute to this conversation.

Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, I am a farmer. I can tell you that growing crops, cultivating crops, can teach you a lot about a responsible regulatory process. That may sound like a strange statement, but let me just say I primarily grow hops and grapes, two crops that require a trellis system. Neither of these crops would be successfully grown without a good, strong trellis system that gives them structure, direction, and support. However, on the flip side, if the trellises aren't constructed properly, if they are not maintained and kept in good working order, the crop growth would be affected. It would be stunted, and production in the end would suffer.

Our regulatory process is very similar, Mr. Speaker. Congress passes laws intended to provide a progrowth structure for our economy. Regulatory agencies build out and fill in the details based on the directions from us, from Congress. However, sometimes agencies provide regulations that can significantly harm people and harm businesses and the jobs they are supposed to be supporting. Many times these regulations exceed or are in contravention to the discretion or authority provided by Congress. Many times it seems as if the regulators write these regulations for the sake of regulations with little regard for the consequences to those that are forced to comply.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, as these bills will provide Congress and the American public with new tools to ensure that regulations truly have the public's best interest in mind and do not hinder economic expansion and growth.

For example, H.R. 712 will prevent what are called the sue and settle tactics that are used to circumvent the normal rulemaking process. It has been well documented that, on numerous regulations, the administration has intentionally dragged its feet and failed to propose a regulation in a timely fashion. So what happens then, they can be sued and ultimately settle on the terms decided solely by the court, by the administration, and by the plaintiff.

This tactic has removed the cost-benefit analysis required for many economically significant regulations. But more importantly, it has eliminated stakeholder engagement in the regulatory process as well as the public's right to comment on dozens of regulations with compliance costs totalling in the hundreds of millions to the billions of dollars.

This legislation also includes other commonsense measures, such as requiring agencies to post on the Internet in plain language 100-word summaries detailing what a regulation does. Few individuals or small businesses have either the time or the fleets of lawyers needed to pore over hundreds of pages of regulations and be expected to comment or comply.

I was also proud to cosponsor H.R. 1155, which this rule also provides for consideration. It is estimated that the current Federal code spans more than 175,000 pages. This important legislation will enact a commission to review the regulatory code and make recommendations on which regulations are necessary, which are overlapping, and which are duplicative or obsolete. Wouldn't it be a refreshing change, Mr. Speaker, if, for once, Washington, D.C., could actually cut red tape instead of creating new barriers to economic growth?

Too often regulations have begun to have costs that far outweigh their benefits, seriously harming those they were intended to regulate, help, and protect. Regulations resulting from sue and settle are often impossible to comply with, and the public is removed from the rulemaking process. We can and we must do better. These commonsense reforms in H.R. 712 and H.R. 1155 will help reverse the trend of regulations stunting growth and stalling production and restore the progrowth-oriented structure and direction that Congress has intended.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned that sometimes affected parties aren't in the room during consent decree or settlement discussions. That is a far cry from having to respond to potentially hundreds of thousands or millions of public comments one on one.

So, again, if there is a problem that they are trying to solve, let's look at who is in the room and who the affected parties are in making sure they are part of the process, not preventing any meaningful effort for consent decree or settlement from even going forward by putting a completely impossible requirement to fulfill, given the staff that they have, of having to reply to every public comment when we all know that public comments can be artificially ginned up through an Astroturf process to deliberately bog down a process that otherwise could more expeditiously settle a dispute than years and years of legal fees on both sides.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) to further discuss today's effort to strip away health care from 22 million American families and to remove the ability of hundreds of thousands of American women to have access to cancer screenings across our country.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is a brand-new year, but you wouldn't know it if you look at what we will be voting on this week.

Across the investigations of three separate committees in this body, eight States, and four Federal court cases, not a single shred of evidence has been found indicating that Planned Parenthood has broken any laws. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform chairman, JASON CHAFFETZ, has admitted that he found no evidence that Planned Parenthood did anything wrong.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to ignore the facts here. Planned Parenthood is a healthcare organization serving 3 million Americans each year. In the course of their lifetime, one in five Americans will receive care from Planned Parenthood. Despite arguments to the contrary, there are simply not enough health centers to fill the gap.

If we defund Planned Parenthood, we will be denying care to millions of families. We will be taking away options from underserved communities across the country—rural, urban, and otherwise. We will be saying to women, once again, that how and when they get health care is not their choice; it is the choice of a body overwhelmingly run by men.

When I got to Congress last January, I thought I would be voting on legislation that would improve the lives of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, giving them better wages, jobs, stronger education, and an economy that started at a level playing field. Instead, I have been on the floor more times than I want to count urging my colleagues on the other side to give up the attacks on women's health.

It is a new year, Mr. Speaker. We have a new Speaker. Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the underlying bill.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the bills that this rule brings to the floor, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. I primarily want to talk for a couple moments, though, about health care.

In the mid 1990s, I went to a reception, and the doctor who delivered me came and brought my records. I asked him how much he charged back then. He said he charged $60 for 9 months of care and the delivery, if they could afford it.

I recently read an article by a woman who wrote that you have to be over 50 now to remember a time when health care was affordable. And it used to be affordable, Mr. Speaker, for almost everybody. But then the Federal Government got into it.

Several years ago, I asked the administrator of a hospital in Knoxville how much medical costs would go down if you could get the government out of health care. His estimate was that it would come down 50 percent overnight and another 50 percent over the next 6 months so that costs would then be only about 25 percent of what they are now.

When the Federal Government got so heavily into health care, costs just exploded. A few people in companies got filthy rich, but almost everyone else got screwed. Now only a few billionaires can afford the costs of a major illness.

We need to make health care affordable again. We can't do that by making it even more bureaucratic than it already is.

The bill this rule brings to the floor is an attempt to give patients more control over their healthcare dollars and give the Federal Government less control and to stop making a very few rich off of the system because they know how to work the system. It is an effort to help bring down some of these ridiculous and exorbitant costs.

We can't get the government out of health care entirely. But thank goodness we don't pay for other necessities, like food, clothing, and housing, like we do for medical care. Thank goodness there is still primarily a free market for other necessities. If we paid for food the same way we pay for medical care, we would see crazy prices for steaks and other types of food. Or if we paid for cars the same way we paid for medical care, most people wouldn't have even been able to afford a Yugo.

We need to move in a new direction, a less bureaucratic direction, and a more affordable direction. This bill is an important first step in that better direction.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, last year, newly elected Speaker RYAN made a New Year's resolution that the House would once again consider serious legislation for the benefit of the American people. Yesterday was the very first day of our legislative session, and the bill we are considering is not a serious proposal. Yes, we are voting on repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 62nd time this Congress and attacking women's health for the 11th time, and we are, in fact, going to have the 5th vote on the defunding Planned Parenthood.

Now, we know that Speaker RYAN is a committed athlete. In fact, his favorite workout is the P90X. It is based on repetition. An exercise repeating the same action over and over again can lead to success. I am sure we all admire Speaker RYAN's commitment to a healthy lifestyle. Normally, doing additional reps builds muscle mass, but the one muscle Republicans aren't exercising is their brain. Repeating the same, tired repeal and defund bill does not lead to more healthy laws. It just makes the American people tired and sore at the waste of taxpayer money.

American women are scratching their heads thinking: Why does the Republican leadership hate us so much? Why is it they want to take away our rights? Why is it they want to take away the very services that actually protect life? Planned Parenthood protects life by providing more than 900,000 cancer screenings a year, and millions more receive services through Planned Parenthood. Why are Republicans trying to deny us from accessing this very vital health care?

It is time for the Republicans to stop shoving these unhealthy, wasteful bills down our throats. Put down the political equivalent of a giant plate of nachos and exercise the hard job of governing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this flabby rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind those who are here that the rule's focus here is dealing with helping regulatory reform burden. I do appreciate the opportunity of Republicans too to take the burden off of individuals.

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

□ 1330

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) to further discuss the Republican efforts in our very first week back to take health care away from 22 million Americans and remove resources that women have in place to engage in lifesaving cancer screenings and other affordable family planning services.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I wish I could say I am surprised that House leaders are kicking off 2016 the same way they spent 2015—attacking women's health—but I am not. For

anyone who has forgotten, let me refresh your memory.

Last year, the House voted 10 times to attack women's health. That included voting to restrict reproductive health care in private insurance, enact a sweeping 20-week abortion ban, and allow employers to discriminate against workers for using birth control.

Now we are voting to defund Planned Parenthood for the fifth time, even though three House committees tried and failed to uncover any evidence of wrongdoing. What is worse, today's vote takes place before the Republicans' taxpayer-funded select committee to investigate Planned Parenthood has even held its first meeting. It is shameful. Americans expect us to focus on facts, not ideology. So far, there are no facts to justify defunding a healthcare provider that 2.7 million Americans rely on.

Here is what we do know: Planned Parenthood provides nearly 900,000 cancer screenings each year; 78 percent of Planned Parenthood patients are low-income; and the services provided by Planned Parenthood help prevent more than 500,000 unintended pregnancies every year.

With each passing week, it becomes clear this Chamber isn't interested in the facts. It is only interested in pushing an extreme ideological agenda designed to take away women's constitutional right to choose.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

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

Here we are, week one of 2016 and we have a multifaceted Republican attack on women's health. On the one hand, we are removing the abilities of our safety agencies from making sure that products that are sold are safe. Whether that is shampoo or soap or makeup or a toy for your child, we rely on our health and safety regulators to make sure that nothing that can hurt the American people is put forward. Oftentimes, when there is some kind of litigation around that, we have a process that allows that to be settled to keep dangerous products off the marketplace.

In setting up this commission that would only be able to look at the cost of regulation rather than savings from a health and safety regulation, you are deliberately putting in place a process that will lead to additional costs going forward because it doesn't look at both sides of the equation.

I would be supportive, as would many Democrats, of a thoughtful approach to a red tape reduction commission, to a regulatory reform commission. What should it look like? It needs to have both industry at the table, as well as consumer health advocates, as well as thoughtful leaders to make up the balance of that committee to side with either side based on the merits. Importantly, their charge needs to be to look at the costs and benefits measured through economic measurements that the staff will be charged with doing, the costs and benefits of reforms, to find out and eliminate regulations that cost more than they benefit and to make sure that we improve and enhance regulations where we can have more savings and more benefit to the American people at a lower cost.

It is all about health and protecting the American people and economic efficiency, and the commission can accomplish that. But not the dangerous attack on women's health through this commission in this bill, coupled the very same week with defunding Planned Parenthood, taking low-cost cancer screenings away from hundreds of thousands of Americans, telling 22 million American families you no longer have health insurance, sending a cancellation notice in the first week of the year to 22 million American families that you can't go see the doctor, you can't go to the hospital or you are going to be bankrupt. That is not the kind of progress the American people want.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, guess what. Neither of these bills are going to become law. President Obama stated he will veto these bills. These bills that hamper the ability of our agencies to protect the health of the American people, these bills that defund Planned Parenthood, this reconciliation, they will be vetoed.

Therefore, the first week back, while the Republicans are trying to cancel healthcare insurance for 22 million American families, while they are trying to prevent low-income women from having access to cancer screenings, while they are trying to remove the ability of our health and safety agencies to keep our American people safe, they will not succeed. They are wasting time. Therefore, these bills come at a serious opportunity cost to the American people.

The American people want us to use their time and their money to address real problems: to fix our broken immigration system and restore order and security to our border, and to help the millions of Americans suffering under an unlivable minimum wage by increasing it. They want us to tackle reforming our archaic Tax Code by getting rid of special interest tax loopholes and giving the American people lower tax rates in return, rather than allowing Americans to avoid taxes by putting assets in overseas shell corporations.

When I was back in my district over the holidays, I didn't have a single constituent say that they wanted to remove or go after the process of creating health and safety regulations. They wanted to hear what we are going to do to create an environment that allows the private sector to create jobs. For that to occur, the American people need to have confidence that the products and services they buy are not going to injure or kill them.

But instead, what is on the docket so far? Bills that would actually increase red tape and disable agencies from generating meaningful rulemaking by burying them in having to do mandatory responses, not just to the affected parties, but to every member of the public that wants to comment on a particular settlement or consent decree; and it hands out special interest goodies through the regulatory review process by a commission that would fully be under control of those who have a vested interest in preventing even the most commonsense health and safety regulations.

This may be a new year, but it looks like we are playing the same political games.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would close a glaring loophole in our gun laws allowing suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill that we would like to bring forward, if we can defeat the previous question, would help keep the American people safe. The bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

On this day, today, Mr. Speaker, there are Americans that can't legally fly because we don't trust them to be in the cabin of an aircraft and are on the no-fly list, but they can quietly assemble an arsenal of deadly weapons fully legally. In what world does that make sense? With the increased risk of terrorist threats, with the occurrences in France, and with what happened in San Bernardino, how can we possibly stand by and say we don't trust somebody because of what we know about them through law enforcement and through the authorized practices that this body has set in place to investigate terrorism? We know enough about them to know that they shouldn't be on an airplane; but if they want to quietly assemble an arsenal of dozens of deadly weapons, that is fine, why not let them do it?

We can fix that. By simply defeating the previous question, we can bring forward that bill. I am confident it would have overwhelming support. We can pass it. It is a bipartisan bill. Rather than strip health care from 22 million Americans, rather than risk the health of American families by removing the health and safety processes that we want to put in place to make sure that products and services are safe, rather than defunding Planned Parenthood and preventing hundreds of thousands

of American women from having low-cost access to cancer screenings and reproductive health services, instead, let's make sure that those who represent a terrorist threat to our Nation are not able to quietly assemble deadly arsenals to commit terrorist acts.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

As this debate has come forward, I want to just point out, as a member of the Rules Committee talking about rules bringing forth the process for which debate will happen, I want to commend Chairman SESSIONS and the Rules staff and also leadership—the chairman has done a great job of leadership under Speaker RYAN and others—who have brought forth two rules today. I know in the last, probably, about an hour, that has become a little conflated, but this rule deals with regulatory burden. This rule deals with the issue of jobs and job creation.

I, like my friend from Colorado, have had many conversations with many folks in my district, and, yes, it does come around to job creation. One of the ways that you can do that, and one of the ways that we are looking to be able to do this, is to free them up.

According to research that came out from the American Action Forum, the savings from these bills that we are talking about under this rule can save a total of $48 billion annually and save 1.5 billion paperwork hours. If you want to make—and I have run small businesses, just as others in here have. If you want to make your employees more effective, have better contact with customers, come up with new ideas, and do creation, then let them do their jobs and not have to be burdened with government intrusion. This is a savings here.

Now, again, it has been stated over and over again, and we are at the point now we are not going to be able to overcome this, so here is the way. Mr. Speaker, just understand these are the parameters in which we speak.

When Republicans want to stand up, this Republican majority wants to stand up for businessowners and families who get up every day taking care of their families, who go to work, find jobs, get good employment. When we bring up ways that, unfortunately, as the other side characterized it, burdens government, then we are portrayed as wanting to ruin the environment, kill the babies, kill the toys, whatever it is that they want to come up with. This is just a false narrative that needs to cease.

The regulatory nation that we have become, apart from the constitutional process that is set forth by Members elected from their districts to come forward and put forth ideas, give those to the executive branch to carry out, not make up new laws or to enter into consent agreements without the litigant standing party available, is wrong. It is not about anything but fairness. It is about cleaning up government. It is about limiting government. It is about keeping our airways safe. It is about having clean water. It is about having clean air. It is about doing the things that government should be doing in a limited process, not simply a jobs program inside the beltway.

When you have regulators who regulate banks who have never worked in a bank and never gave a loan, that is not right. When you have folks who never get outside of a cubicle but yet are able to, without input many times, decide how farmers who have worked their land for many years are to react, that is not right. This rule today lets us go toward a forward step of doing just that. You see, it is about real people. It is not about bureaucracies.

It is about real people, like Mr. Puckett from Columbus, Mississippi. He has been creating jobs for over 100 years in his family. He has a family-owned brick company. Mr. Puckett attributes the success of his business to hardworking employees and loyal employees. Unfortunately, when I met Mr. Puckett, the conversation was not so optimistic. He testified in the Judiciary Committee in 2014 because his company had just lost 50 jobs as a result of two regulations crafted behind closed doors.

In a nation of over 300 million, 50 jobs may not seem like a lot, but in the town of Columbus, Mississippi, it is the difference between 50 families having food on the table or going hungry. Every State, every congressional district has their Mr. Pucketts. No business has been untouched by the toll of costly and overly burdensome regulations.

This probably, Mr. Speaker, is one of the greatest times to be here and to speak about this because the choice is clear. And you can try to conflate it and talk about other things, but this rule deals with these bills that deal with real jobs, such as Mr. Puckett. It deals with the real priorities of the Republican majority, saying we want to put people back to work, we want to make business more efficient, and we want to have rules and regulations that are smart, sensible, and safe. To say otherwise is not fair for the American people. In fact, it is just a coverup for a society or a governing philosophy that says: Bureaucracy knows best; government knows best; let us just continue to grow.

□ 1345

In fact, it was said earlier today that we have all of these executive orders and all of these other rules that are designed to help streamline regulatory burdens. If that is what they are supposed to be doing, then they are failing because all we do is keep growing and adding costs everywhere we go.

I can also understand my friend's concern about the government having to answer public comments because I guess the EPA didn't want to have to answer to itself when the EPA broke the law with the social media push for the water rules that the GAO just nailed them on.

You can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. You can't not want to answer to the American public and then, when you want to influence your own regulatory agenda, send out false narratives and break the law. This is not DOUG COLLINS' opinion or anybody else's. As reported in The New York Times, it is the GAO's.

I understand that is why the system is broken, and that is why the system needs to be fixed. That is why the vote is a ''yes'' on this rule, on bipartisan legislation, by the way, and on legislation that has been bipartisan. This is what we are talking about in this rule.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. When Members come to the floor for this rule, they are voting for a government that becomes more efficient, they are voting for a government that is responsive to those who are being affected, they are voting for those who are responsible for actually being able to do what they are being gifted to do in their communities. That is what this rule does, Mr. Speaker.

In just a few moments, my friend from Georgia will talk about getting this country back in shape and will talk about some other bills we are offering today to free up the American people.

But in this rule, the question is: Are we standing for the Mr. Pucketts of the world, the individuals and the businesses of the world, or, as has been said on the floor today, are we more concerned about burdening a government agency?

I think I know what the answer of the American people is: Government, do what you are supposed to do. Do it within a limited form. Let us be the generation of wealth and income in this country. Let us be the capitalist system that we have brought this country into.

When we do that, then we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. That is what this Republican majority is fighting for. That is what this rule is. I would ask that everyone vote for this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 580 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall

not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 579

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Section 3(b)(1) of House Resolution 5 is amended by striking ''the first session of''.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 provides for the consideration of the Senate-amended version of H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, on October 23 of last year, the House passed our reconciliation bill, which went through the process, which went through regular order. The Senate amended that bill in December. It is now back in the House for further consideration.

This rule today also provides an extension of deposition authority, Mr. Speaker, for staff members who serve the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Financial Services; Science, Space, and Technology; and Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great way to start 2016. There is a new sheriff in town, as you know, who has a commitment to regular order, and the process we have today is regular order at its finest.

We are here today on a reconciliation provision that came from the United States Senate. It came from the United States Senate because it was first passed by the United States House. It was passed by the United States House because, for the first time in over a decade, we had a conferenced budget agreement coming to balance, to govern these United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, for 5 years, I have been in this institution. For 5 years, I have served on the Budget Committee. For 5 years, I have served on the Rules Committee. Never before has this House considered a reconciliation measure that will, with its passage today, go to the President's desk tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care where you are on the policy. This is an issue of repealing the President's healthcare bill and the damaging impact it has had on my constituents across the district. I doubt seriously there is a Member in this body who has not made up his or her mind on where he or she is on this issue.

I will try to persuade no one on the merits today. What I will do, Mr. Speaker, is tell you that, when you get the process right, you have an opportunity to get the policy right, too.

This bill eliminates the penalty for noncompliance with the individual mandate, that individual mandate that changed the nature of the relationship between the governed and the governing. This bill would eliminate the penalty for noncompliance with the employer mandate.

It would eliminate the controversial reinsurance program. It would repeal the IRS' ability to provide insurance premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies. It would repeal the costly Medicare expansion. It would increase our investment in community health centers. All told, this bill would save the American people $500 billion.

I am not so naive as to believe that this bill is going to be the end of the story today, Mr. Speaker. But I celebrate the fact that, with the passage of this rule, we will have an opportunity to vote and an opportunity to act in ways that we have not year, upon year, upon year. I do not believe our mandate in this House is to agree. I think our mandate in this House is to decide, and we cannot decide with a process that is broken. We must have a process that is open, as this process has been.

Mr. Speaker, the President raised the American consciousness as it relates to the discussion of health care in this country. He persuaded the American people that preexisting conditions have no place in the American body politic. I believe he was right on that. I don't believe that will ever change.

He persuaded the American people that insurance policies shouldn't have lifetime caps, that when you are facing your deepest and your worst fears in your family—when those have come true—that you ought not get bad news from your insurance company on that same day. I agree with him on that. I don't think we will ever change that.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are folks in my district who had policies that they counted on but that were canceled. There are businesses in my district that had a commitment to take care of their employees, but they have now been priced out of the market. There are folks who wanted to exercise their choices and not the President's choice.

If you go to the most recent Rasmussen polls, the American people prioritized lowering costs over universal coverage. I am committed to providing health care to those who cannot afford it, but I am committed to lowering costs for those who can.

The free market is the mechanism that we will use to lower costs. With this repeal today, we have an opportunity to begin that discussion in earnest for the first time in 5 years.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our interest in the authority provided by Section 3(b) of H.Res. 5, providing staff deposition authority to the Energy and Commerce Committee, among other committees of the House.

We have appreciated your support of our efforts to conduct thoughtful and effective oversight of the laws passed by Congress. As you well know, such oversight activities are an integral part of our Article 1 responsibilities. This is especially true at a time when the policy objectives of the Executive branch have regularly led it to exceed clear statutory direction, and its representatives are regularly recalcitrant in providing us with explanations for those actions.

My goal has been, wherever possible, to work cooperatively with the subjects of our oversight work to accomplish the committee's objectives. The Congress's oversight tools are overwhelmingly powerful, and in order to maintain public trust in our stewardship of those tools, I have felt that it is important for us to use the use of our authority in a way that is prudent and proportional.

But there are clearly times when the legitimate Congressional oversight prerogative requires the threat of compulsion. This is why we believe the authority provided to the committee in H.Res. 5 has been valuable to the committee's oversight objectives. While the committee has not yet been required to conduct depositions under this new authority, we believe the availability of this authority has facilitated our efforts to obtain significant voluntary cooperation in several important investigations. For example, in the matter related to videotapes showing procurement of donated fetal tissue, Planned Parenthood Federation of America and a number of its affiliates, as well as several tissue procurement organizations, have voluntarily provided thousands of pages of relevant documents. In a matter related to allegations of contamination at a National Institutes of Health drug manufacturing facility, the committee has received detailed information concerning the impact of such contamination on hundreds of patients in experimental drug trials. And, in the recent matter related to ''defeat devices'' installed by Volkswagen in thousands of its diesel-engine cars, the committee has begun to receive detailed information regarding internal corporate deliberations and interactions with Federal and state regulators. In each of these cases, we believe these significant voluntary productions of documents and information are due in large part to an understanding that the committee has the authority to compel such information, including now through compulsory depositions.

We also believe that the authority to compel staff depositions will be an especially important tool in investigations of the executive branch. In an ongoing matter regarding the Administration's justification for subsidies paid under a provision of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), senior executive branch representatives have repeatedly ignored requests by our committee and the Ways and Means committee for relevant information. The committees recently wrote to Secretaries Burwell and Lew requesting interviews with specific senior executive branch officials. I expect that these requests will almost certainly involve invocation of authority provided by Section 3(b) of H.Res 5. Similarly, as the committee continues its oversight of other aspects of the ACA, including the failure of state exchanges and cooperatives, it is becoming aware of serious issucs of waste and negligent program administration. As the current Administration enters its eighth and final year, and works feverishly to implement its policy objectives, I expect there will be other areas where we will need every oversight tool available, including staff deposition authority, to ensure that the Administration is faithfully executing the laws enacted by Congress, and holding itself accountable for the prudent and efficient expenditure of taxpayers' dollars.

Thank you again for your work to provide us with the tools to do effective oversight and ensuring that these tools continue to be available.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chair, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules

Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: This is to request that the Committee on Rules extend the authority of the Committee on Financial Services (Committee) to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 which expires at the end of the present legislative session. Your letter of December 2, 2015, asks the Committee to provide the Committee on Rules with the following three categories of information in support of the Committee's request to extend deposition authority:

1. The number of depositions the Committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during the present legislative session;

2. Whether having deposition authority was helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of individuals in the course of the Committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests, and the estimated number of times that this authority resulted in voluntary interview compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise; and

3. A rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Committee on Rules should extend this authority to the Committee for the remainder of the Congress.

The Committee has conducted no depositions pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5. However, having deposition authority was and continues to be an invaluable tool in securing interviews and compliance with document requests. In the course of a single investigation, Committee staff conducted sixteen informal interviews of officials at three different agencies. As part of the same investigation, the Committee also sent interrogatories to a former government official and received a sworn written response in lieu of an interview. These interviews and interrogatories elicited crucial information that will be included in a Committee staff report that is expected to be released in early 2016.

The Committee's deposition authority has been a useful tool in securing agency compliance with the Committee's subpoenas and information requests. During the First Session of the 114th Congress the Committee sent four subpoenas duces tecum to four federal agencies. Three of these agencies ignored the Committee's subpoena until the Committee threatened to conduct transcribed interviews or depositions with agency officials responsible for delaying the production of the subpoenaed records, and the fourth will be sent a similar request for depositions or transcribed interviews in the near future.

Deposition authority continues to be critical to the Committee's oversight of an Administration that has been markedly indifferent to the Committee's subpoenas and voluntary information requests. The Committee also anticipates that it will be necessary to use its deposition authority in the near future as part of its oversight of independent federal agencies under its jurisdiction. The Committee will likely continue to face obstruction from this Administration concerning future information requests and, accordingly, will need to utilize its deposition authority to effectuate full and prompt compliance with respect to these future requests.

Lastly, the Committee's deposition authority should be modestly expanded to cover individuals who have recently left the federal government in order to prevent agency officials from sidestepping congressional investigations by resigning from their government positions. Under the Committee's current deposition authority, agency officials involved in wrongdoing or otherwise under investigation can effectively avoid the Committee's efforts to interview or depose them by resigning from their government posts. If key officials should leave their positions before being deposed or interviewed, those officials involved in possible wrongdoing in connection with their government employment could strategically avoid being held accountable by Congress and, as a result, several of the Committee's investigations may be significantly hampered by such departures.

Several federal employees previously under investigation by the Committee have already left government service and it is likely that other officials will follow suit, particularly because the Administration's last year will coincide with the Second Session of this Congress. Accordingly, expanding the Committee's deposition authority to include former agency officials provided that (1) such officials served in the federal government within two years of being served with a deposition subpoena and (2) the purpose of the deposition relates to their government employment, would greatly strengthen the Committee's ability to conduct effective oversight of the Administration's last year, as it would allow the Committee to investigate and conduct effective oversight of officials who have recently left or might otherwise choose to leave their positions as the Administration winds down.

Should you need additional information, please have your staff contact the Committee's Chief Oversight Counsel, Uttam Dhillon. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for your letter concerning the Committee on Ways and Means' authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5. Staff deposition authority is a powerful tool that has been extremely effective in gaining access to information that the Administration has been reluctant to provide. Reauthorization of this authority is essential for the Committee to exercise its oversight responsibility and ensure that the Administration is held accountable to the American people. Over the past year, this authority has been a valuable tool that has enhanced our oversight of the Administration and regulated entities.

The Committee has not yet needed to exercise compulsory process to depose individuals, as the deposition authority has been a successful means of encouraging voluntary compliance with the Committee's requests. It may become necessary in the near future to exercise staff deposition authority to obtain information from an Administration that is increasingly obstructing the Committee's oversight work. I appreciate your interest in how this authority has aided our oversight work, and I have provided answers to your questions below.

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

Response: The Ways and Means Committee has not needed to compel depositions in 2015, largely because the threat of using this authority has been successful in urging voluntary cooperation with the Committee's oversight. However, the Committee is in the process of requesting interviews with eight Administration officials in the course of its investigation of the Administration's decision to pay Cost Sharing Reduction subsidies, despite the fact that Congress did not appropriate funds for that purpose. The Committee has notified the Administration that if these eight officials are not produced for interviews willingly, the Committee will use compulsory process. More information on this investigation is provided in response to Question 3.

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

Response: Staff deposition authority was effective in facilitating voluntary interviews in the course of the Committee's oversight work. We estimate that the Committee has

gained access to two Administration officials in the course of two separate investigations into the Administration's funding of the Cost Sharing Reduction program and the IRS's obstruction of tax exempt applications by conservative organizations. In the course of the Committee's Cost Sharing Reduction investigation the Committee also sought and obtained document productions from nine insurance companies and a national insurance trade organization. Several of those companies were reluctant to produce documents, and oral reference to the Committee's authority to subpoena documents and depose the companies' employees encouraged voluntary compliance with our requests. More information about each of these successes is provided below.

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Response: Staff deposition authority has been a key factor in several investigations conducted by the Oversight Subcommittee. Three examples illustrate this fact:

During the course of the Committee's investigation on the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) unfairly targeting conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status, the Administration was reluctant to cooperate with requests to produce certain witnesses for interviews. One such witness was Hannah Stott-Bumsted, who served as legal counsel to the U.S. Department of the Treasury. During the course of the investigation, staff discovered that the Administration knew that some of Lois Lerner's e-mails were missing months before the IRS informed the Committee. From our interviews, Committee staff knew that an IRS employee, Catherine Duval, likely told her friend, Stott-Bumsted, that the e-mails were missing and that Stott-Bumsted then informed others in the Administration. The Committee requested an interview with Stott-Bumsted to confirm this information, but the Treasury Department dragged out the request for months. When staff suggested that the Committee would depose Stott-Bumsted if Treasury would not produce her voluntarily for an interview, Treasury agreed to produce her.

The Ways and Means Committee, along with the Energy and Commerce Committee, is investigating the Administration's decision to fund several programs established by the President's health care law, including Cost Sharing Reduction subsidies and the Basic Health Program, through an appropriation reserved specifically for tax refunds. The Committees believe that the method the Administration has used to fund the Cost Sharing Reduction program and the Basic Health Program may violate the Anti-Deficiency Act and Article I, Sec. 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution establishing Congress's appropriation authority. The Treasury Department and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) have refused to produce documents in response to the Committees' inquiries. The Committees are in the process of requesting interviews of Treasury and HHS employees. The Committees already have interviewed a senior HHS official regarding the Basic Health Program, and staff believes it was unlikely that the Administration would have produced that official for an informal interview if the Committees did not have deposition authority. As the Administration continues to ignore Congress's requests for information, deposition authority will be a crucial tool in order to proceed with these investigations.

While investigating the Administration's funding of the Cost Sharing Reduction program, the Committee determined that insurance companies might possess relevant information. The Committee sought information and documents from nine insurance companies and the trade organization America's Health Insurance Plans. Although some companies complied willingly with the request, others were reluctant to search for or produce documents. During negotiations with those companies, the Committee was able to persuade those companies to produce documents by threatening to issue subpoenas and depose employees. Fearing the reputational and financial consequences of receiving a publicized subpoena or deposition notification, the companies complied with the Committee's requests.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter, and for giving the Committee the opportunity to highlight the value of deposition authority in its oversight work. If you have any additional questions about the Committee's use of staff deposition authority, please do not hesitate to contact Tegan Gelfand with the Ways and Means Committee staff.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chair, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: On December 3, 2015, I received your letter regarding the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress). As you indicated, the Committee's deposition authority expires at the end of this session. I appreciate the opportunity to highlight the many positive results the Committee has obtained utilizing its deposition authority. I believe the following responses to questions posed in your letter reaffirms that deposition authority is a necessary tool for conducting robust oversight of the executive branch and limiting the overreaches of the Administration in its final year.

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

On September 17, 2015, the Committee conducted a deposition of National Weather Service (NWS) contract specialist Mark Miller, who facilitated an inappropriate contract that cost taxpayers nearly half a million dollars. In 2009, then-National Weather Service Deputy Chief Financial Officer Peter Jiron prepared to retire from the NWS. Mr. Jiron's supervisor, then-Chief Financial Officer Robert Byrd, suggested Mr. Jiron return to the NWS post-retirement as a consultant. One month before officially retiring from the NWS, Mr. Jiron negotiated the terms of his consultancy, drafted and edited the associated Statement of Work, dratted terms and conditions of his contract with NWS as a consultant, and eventually signed the consulting agreement. The contract Mr. Jiron drafted for himself increased his salary and provided for housing at the expense of American taxpayers. This contract is a violation of federal laws and regulations because Mr. Jiron used his influential position at NWS to obtain the consulting position.

According to a report by the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General, Mr. Miller had no concerns with Mr. Jiron becoming a consultant immediately after his retirement from the agency and had heard of other employees doing the same thing. Mr. Miller's statement raises questions about whether this type of contract misconduct occurs regularly. Indeed, the OIG found the ''lack of understanding about applicable laws and regulations on the part of multiple NOAA officials'' so concerning that the OIG is ''taking steps to ascertain whether this matter is indicative of more systemic 'revolving door' contracting problems within the agency. Unfortunately, several former senior officials refused to speak to the Committee voluntarily. After the Department of Commerce failed to adequately respond to multiple letters from the Committee requesting information, the Committee determined the best course of action was to interview Mark Miller because of his role facilitating Mr. Jiron's contract.

Because Mr. Miller is not a senior official at NWS and there is no evidence indicating he intentionally committed wrongdoing, the Committee requested to speak with him in a private setting. Through his attorney, Mr. Miller refused to voluntarily speak with Committee staff. Consequently, the Committee issued a subpoena compelling Mr. Miller's testimony in a deposition. During the deposition, Mr. Miller invoked his 5th Amendment right. While Mr. Miller did not speak on the record, the deposition made it possible for the Committee to pursue immunity for Mr. Miller. Majority staff is currently in discussions with Minority staff about moving forward with immunity for Mr. Miller. This is significant because the Committee not only has the opportunity to learn what happened during the creation of Mr. Jiron's contract, but also gives the Committee an opportunity to determine whether it is a common occurrence for departing NWS officials to draft their own consulting

contracts and whether legislation is necessary to remedy the issue. Given Mr. Miller's knowledge of the agency's contracting methods, he is in a unique position to provide information regarding whether such incidents are a systemic problem. The Committee is continuing to move forward with this issue in large part because of deposition authority, including the ability to recall Mr. Miller to continue his deposition.

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

Yes, during this session there are numerous instances of the Committee obtaining documents and voluntary interviews because of its deposition authority. In fact, as the following examples show, many key interviews and documents would likely not have been obtained without the Committee's ability to compel on-the-record interviews in a private setting.

NWS: CONTRACTING MISMANAGEMENT

Earth Resources Technology (ERT), the consulting firm who employed former National Weather Service (NWS) Deputy Chief Financial Officer Peter Jiron after he drafted his own post-retirement contract, was reluctant to speak with Committee staff. The company is a women-owned small business that apparently did not intentionally facilitate the inappropriate contract. Appearing at a public hearing would likely have been embarrassing for the company's CEO, Dr. Jingli Yang. As a result, after reviewing the Committee's rules regarding compulsory process for depositions, Dr. Yang's representative agreed to make her available voluntarily.

During the Committee's questioning of Dr. Yang, she acknowledged flaws in the contracting system that allowed Mr. Jiron's contract to move forward. For instance, there was not a safeguard in place to ensure that new ERT contractors were not current government employees. ERT relied on each new contractor to receive permission from ethics officials at individual agencies, but did not keep track internally. As a result of the Committee's questioning, ERT is implementing a plan to include additional steps in its contracting process when hiring new contractors, including paperwork to ensure contractors are not currently government employees. Additionally, ERT provided e-mails to the Committee regarding the facilitation of Mr. Jiron's consulting contract.

Furthermore, during the Committee's investigation of contracting misconduct at NWS, the agency initially refused to provide documents or make agency officials available to the Committee. After the Committee considered the use of compulsory process for agency officials to appear for interviews, the agency agreed to provide several key officials voluntarily, including Laura Furgione, the Deputy Assistant Administrator of NWS. Moreover, after the Committee requested to speak with additional NWS employees, the agency voluntarily began producing documents and information. Among the documents produced were e-mails between Mr. Jiron and Mr. Byrd, the former Chief Financial Officer at NWS, discussing Mr. Jiron's improper consulting contract.

NOAA: QUESTIONABLE CLIMATE STUDY

This past summer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) released a study refuting the long-established findings that warming of the earth experienced a hiatus during much of that past two decades. This study has large implications because it changes historical temperature data to show increased warming and is therefore used to justify costly regulations and further action on climate change. Shortly after publication of the study, the Committee began investigating the circumstances surrounding its release, sending a letter to NOAA requesting documents and information related to the publication of the study. After NOAA's unwillingness to produce communications related to the study, the Committee issued a subpoena in October 2013, The Committee continues to investigate the publication of this study, especially in light of whistleblower allegations that divulged potential political interference with the scientific process and that NOAA scientists were uncomfortable with the study's methodology and conclusions. While NOAA has still not produced all requested and subpoenaed communications, NOAA agreed to make the authors of the study available voluntarily for questioning by Committee staff.

Additionally, following the Committee's subpoena in October 2013 to NOAA for communications related to the study refuting a hiatus in the rise of earth's temperature, NOAA officials refused to comply with the subpoena. Shortly thereafter, the Committee informed NOAA of its need to interview agency officials who had a significant role in the agency's publication and release of the study. Following conversations with NOAA officials informing the agency of the Committee's ability to compel testimony, NOAA has agreed to arrange for the requested individuals to meet voluntarily with Committee staff.

NIST: MANUFACTURING ILLEGAL DRUGS

On July 18, 2015, National Institute of Standards (NIST) Police Officer Christopher Bartley caused an explosion on the NIST campus while attempting to manufacture the illegal drug methamphetamine. The Committee sent a letter requesting documents and information on July 22, 2015. NIST officials initially insisted that the matter was being managed by the Department of Commerce Officer of Inspector General and law enforcement officials. After considering the use of compulsory process to obtain interviews with agency staff regarding NIST's unresponsiveness, NIST agreed to voluntarily make Willie Mays, the Director of NIST, available to Committee staff.

During questioning by Committee staff, Director May acknowledged for the first time the existence of building records revealing the names of each individual NIST employee that entered the building where the explosion occurred. After obtaining the building records, Committee staff was able to track the movements of Mr. Bartley and who he interacted with leading up to the explosion. Despite telling Committee staff that four officers are on duty at all times at NIST, the building records reveal that only two officers were on duty during the explosion. The Committee continues to investigate misconduct and mismanagement at NIST Police Services.

EPA: PEBBLE MINE

During the course of the Committee's ongoing investigation into EPA's actions to limit the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska, the Committee learned information concerning an EPA regional administrator's involvement in spearheading the EPA's actions to stop construction of the mine. When the Committee spoke with EPA officials, explaining the Committee's need to interview the regional administrator and explaining the Committee's ability to compel testimony, the EPA responded that it would make the regional administrator available to the Committee voluntarily to answer questions from Committee staff and for testimony at a congressional hearing.

EPA: REGULATORY OVERREACH

During the Committee's ongoing oversight of the EPA's regulatory and policy agenda, the Committee sent letters on three separate matters in May of this year, requesting documents concerning the agency's coordination with outside environmental groups, proposed Waters of the United States rule, and the agency's efforts to solicit public comments on EPA regulations during the notice and comment period for proposed rulemakings. In the face of the agency's continued slow rolling of its response to each of the three letters, Committee staff spoke with agency officials, explaining the Committee's authority to compel testimony from agency officials directly relevant to each of the three inquiries. Following the Committee's conversations with the EPA explaining its authority, the agency began producing documents responsive to the Committee's requests. Additionally, the EPA agreed to make an agency official directly relevant to the Committee's inquiries available voluntarily for a briefing.

In September 2015, the Committee wrote to the EPA concerning its plans to issue a proposed rule for ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards and requesting interviews with two agency officials relevant to the Committee's inquiry. During follow-up conversations with the EPA concerning the Committee's request for interviews and following significant push back from the EPA to making the individuals available, Committee staff explained the Committee's authority to compel testimony. Following these discussions, the Committee expects that the EPA will voluntarily provide a briefing on the matter with individuals relevant to the Committee's inquiry.

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

As evidenced by the many examples discussed in this letter, the Committee's deposition authority has been a critical tool used to further the Committee's oversight. The Committee's authority to compel testimony has proven to be a key resource in obtaining compliance from Executive Branch departments and agencies with outstanding document and information requests, as well as with obtaining access to government officials essential to the Committee's inquiries for questioning by Committee staff.

As the Obama Administration comes to an end in the next year, the administration is working vigorously to finalize more expansive regulations than ever to fulfill its environmental agenda. Because of the administration's tireless efforts, it is even more imperative for the Committee to conduct robust oversight of the administration's environmental initiatives by exercising oversight of agencies directly within the Committee's jurisdictional authority, including NOAA, NIST, and the EPA.

Further, a recent article in the Washington Post outlining a few of the Committee's oversight initiatives this year acknowledged that the Committee has taken on an ''aggressive role in oversight.'' The Committee's ability to compel testimony has proven to be a central component of the Committee's ability to advance its investigations, while also enhancing Congress' role as an institution to serve as a check on the administration's policies.

Thank you for the opportunity to share the Committee's experience utilizing deposition authority. If you have any questions, please

do not hesitate to contact me or my staff about this matter.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin the second session of the 114th Congress, there is a long list of important issues that we could be talking about today.

We could be talking about ways to support job creation, to grow the economy, to improve gun safety, to strengthen national security, to pass an immigration reform bill, and many other important priorities.

Instead, we are talking about H.R. 3762, the latest attempt by House Republicans to defund Planned Parenthood and to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

As our economy continues to recover, we should be focused on expanding opportunity and helping more Americans get ahead. Instead, we are starting the new year by debating a bill that, if it ever became law, would put the health care of 22 million Americans in jeopardy and would further restrict women's access to vital healthcare services.

This is yet another blatant political move by Republicans to appeal to and to appease their right-wing base. Republican leaders have said it themselves. Senate Republican Whip JOHN CORNYN called this a ''political exercise.'' He said, ''I think we all recognize the President isn't likely to sign this bill so it's not going to become a law.'' Then, why on earth are we wasting the American people's time with this terrible bill?

This month we have heard that Speaker RYAN ''will push to turn the House into a platform for ambitious Republican policy ideas.'' The 62nd vote to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act. The 11th vote to attack women's health. Really? That is the platform for ambitious Republican policy ideas? I think the American people should sue Republicans for malpractice.

When Speaker RYAN took the gavel last fall, there was so much talk about a new chapter and fresh ideas. Instead, we are starting 2016 with more of the stale and politically motivated bills we have become accustomed to in this Republican-controlled Congress. We are constantly being told by Republicans that they have better ideas and that they have a better approach to health care. Really? Where is it?

I would remind my Republican friends that, in 2011, you passed a bill that actually tasked you to come up with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. You came up with nothing. Just last year you passed another bill to come up with an alternative, and, once again, you came up with nothing.

Now here we are again with a bill that repeals the Affordable Care Act and that tasks the Republicans to come up with an alternative. I am curious. Where is your alternative? Maybe it is in your notes. Is it hidden in some secret room in the Capitol? Maybe Donald Trump has it. Perhaps we should alert the Capitol Police. Better yet, maybe we could call the FBI to locate the Republican plan on health care.

I remind my friends that you are in charge. You run this place. You can bring whatever you want to this House floor. Maybe you should bring a bloodhound to the House floor to try to find your alternative healthcare plan.

Governing is something that my friends on the Republican side are not very good at. They are very good about saying no to everything, but they can't say yes to anything. The Republican plan on health care is, essentially, a sound bite. Their prescription is ''take two tax breaks and call me in the morning.''

Not only have the Republicans done nothing to expand health care for the American people—and, again, they are in charge—but they have actually consistently tried to undermine health access for millions of Americans, to take health care away from people in this country.

□ 1400

If the Republicans had it their way and actually repealed the Affordable Care Act, millions of young people under the age of 26 would be thrown off their parents' health plans, being a woman would once again be a preexisting condition, and much more of the progress made by the ACA would be rolled back.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what we often hear from Republicans, the Affordable Care Act is not killing the economy. I know facts get in the way of their arguments, but the fact is that America has seen a record 69 straight months of job growth and all signs point to this historic growth continuing.

In September 2012, when unemployment was at 8.1 percent, the Republican presidential nominee, Mitt Romney, claimed that the unemployment rate would stay at 8 percent if President Obama were reelected President. Well, President Obama was reelected President, and Mitt Romney was wrong. What actually happened? The unemployment rate has steadily dropped each year and is now at a 7-year low of 5 percent, with employers adding about 210,000 jobs a month through last November as more Americans get back to work.

One of the frequent Republican claims that we have heard is that businesses would shift to part-time workers to avoid the Affordable Care Act's requirement to provide healthcare coverage to full-time employees. A new study released this week shows that the ACA resulted in little change in the number of hours worked, including the first 6 months of 2015 when the employer mandate first took effect for larger companies.

As Politico noted, this study ''pokes a major hole in a beloved conservative talking point—that ObamaCare will force employers to cut employees' hours.'' The truth is that researchers found no major changes in the probability of people working fewer hours in 2013, 2014, or 2015.

We have also heard Republicans' claim that the ACA's expansion of Medicaid would decrease employment among low-income workers, but another study released this week showed no major changes in the way low-income workers fit into the labor market during the first 15 months of Medicaid expansion under ACA. Contrary to conservative talking points, the new coverage didn't push low-income adults to switch jobs, move from full-time to part-time work, or rush to find new jobs.

In fact, the expansion of Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act has made a tremendous difference in increasing access to health care for America's most vulnerable families. Since October of 2013, more than 12.3 million Americans have been able to get coverage thanks to the expansion of Medicaid. As a result of marketplace coverage and Medicaid expansion, hospital uncompensated care costs were reduced by an estimated $7.4 billion in 2014, resulting in huge savings for consumers across this country.

That is the difference between us. Democrats believe health care is a right and my Republican friends believe it is a privilege.

To make matters worse, the bill before us today would also defund Planned Parenthood, which would put millions of low-income women—and men, I would add—at risk of losing access to critical health services. The fact is that one in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year.

Additionally, Planned Parenthood clinics often serve as one of the few affordable care options available for many women and men. Cutting off access to the critical health services Planned Parenthood provides to some of our most vulnerable citizens is simply wrong. It is unconscionable. Sixty-three percent of voters, including 72 percent of independents, agree. This whole effort to defund Planned Parenthood fits the Republican pattern of targeting poor people, and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous.

While our Nation's community health centers do incredible work, the Republican claim that community health centers by themselves could suddenly pick up all the slack if Planned Parenthood is defunded is just not true, and my Republican friends

know that. The idea that our community health centers could overnight suddenly step up and step in and cover millions of new patients is absurd. In fact, in 21 percent of the counties with a Planned Parenthood health center, Planned Parenthood is the only safety net family planning provider.

Finally, let me just also voice my strong objection to the provision in this rule which extends for another year the unrestricted authority for four House committees to conduct staff depositions at any time, on any subject, for any reason. Some committees have barely used this authority in the past year, and, when they have, it has often been abused with the threat of subpoena held over people's heads.

The power to compel American citizens to provide testimony under oath should be rarely used and specifically authorized. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are tired of the partisan witch hunts that we have grown accustomed to under this Republican leadership in this House.

We are starting the new year, not by working in a bipartisan way to do the people's business. Unfortunately, we are starting the new year debating the same old same old, bills that put politics ahead of people. Mr. Speaker, that is truly sad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is intrusive, it is expensive, and it is full of broken promises. Its biggest failure is the simple fact that it makes life more difficult for hardworking Americans. In my district, I have heard countless horror stories from parents, from seniors, from businessowners, all of which underscore that there is simply nothing affordable about the perversely named Affordable Care Act.

There is the story of Morris from Rowlett, Texas, who is the sole breadwinner for his family. Now, the least expensive plan that Morris could find on healthcare.gov costs him $854 per month, plus a $12,700 deductible. ObamaCare is preventing Morris from investing in things that really matter, like his son's college education.

Take Heather from Pottsboro, who on a $700-per-month income simply can't afford the $287 per month that ObamaCare costs her. With health problems of her own, ObamaCare is preventing Heather from taking care of her 13-year-old daughter and a father with multiple sclerosis.

Then there is Bryan, a small-business owner in my district who has seen a 50 percent increase in his monthly healthcare payments and deductible under ObamaCare. On top of that, Bryan can't grow his business beyond 50 employees because he can't afford to comply with the employer mandate or face its penalties.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the stories that demonstrate the very real problems that ObamaCare is creating for hardworking Americans and why a better name for this law would be the Unaffordable Care Act. It is why I stand in support today of a reconciliation bill that will dismantle ObamaCare and defund Planned Parenthood for the next year.

I promised my constituents that I would do more than just vote to repeal ObamaCare, that I would help send a bill to the Oval Office that actually will get rid of this terrible law. Today, I am keeping that promise.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the reconciliation bill, just another budget measure being used as a vehicle to defund Planned Parenthood.

This is the 11th Republican attack on women's health in this Congress, including four prior votes to defund Planned Parenthood. While House Republicans have already passed 10 antiwomen health measures and are now voting on their 11th, they have not passed a single measure that helps women get the reproductive health care that they need.

So here we are—Happy New Year and with a new House Speaker—facing the same old story: Republican attacks on women's access to health care in the very first week. The news this morning reported Republicans are saying this bill will show the American people the difference between the political parties in this election year. For me, that is a shameful admission. The difference is clear: My Republican colleagues remain willing to play partisan politics at the expense of women's health care. The women of America are watching, and they don't like what they see.

Last fall, House Republicans threatened to shut down the government if must-pass omnibus legislation did not defund Planned Parenthood. Now, that effort was stopped, but only by promises to include a defunding provision in this budget reconciliation bill and by the creation of a select panel to investigate Planned Parenthood.

Never mind the fact that three House committees have already investigated Planned Parenthood following the release of selectively edited videos manufactured by an antiabortion group and that none of these committees found any evidence of wrongdoing.

Apparently, uninterested in the facts, Republicans have continued to make inflammatory and baseless claims. They also push forward on their new select investigative panel, meaning even more taxpayer dollars will be spent targeting the Nation's reproductive healthcare providers instead of improving America's access to critical healthcare services.

Having established this select panel, House Republicans have now refused to wait for the panel to hold even its first meeting before voting, once again, to defund Planned Parenthood. In this atmosphere, it is hard to imagine that any investigation will be fair and objective. Members have already declared the organization guilty as charged, and there is no reason to believe that they will be more openminded with regard to others who provide safe and legal reproductive healthcare services in this Nation.

Facts matter. The truth matters. Despite our objection to the creation of the select panel, as its ranking member, I will work to ensure that the investigation is as fair and transparent and as objective as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The relentless attacks on Planned Parenthood and other healthcare providers must stop and they will stop. Planned Parenthood serves almost 3 million American women, and there is no evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood to possibly justify the defunding of the Nation's leading provider of reproductive health care whose work helps to avoid thousands and thousands of abortions because they provide planned parenthood.

We should stop this latest effort to defund Planned Parenthood—and we will because this bill is going nowhere—and instead take affirmative steps to improve women's access to health care in this great Nation. Enough is enough.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairwoman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying motion to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, mark a significant achievement for Americans who value life and economic liberty.

After years of work and dozens of votes in the face of acerbic rhetoric hurled at us from across the aisle, this House will send to the President's desk legislation to remove the heavy hand of the Federal Government from Americans' health care and end the stream of taxpayer dollars that flows to an organization that brutally kills precious unborn lives.

When the so-called Affordable Care Act was passed in 2010, Republicans warned that the law would cause significant increases in the cost of health care and health insurance, reduce full-time jobs and work-hours available, and strain the safety net until it breaks.

The American people were sold a bill of goods that has proven to be only a list of empty promises. Most of us recall clearly these assurances: that we could keep our insurance plans, that we could keep our doctors, and that our out-of-pocket costs would go down.

Mr. Speaker, the letters, emails, and telephone calls from my constituents

tell me clearly that the Affordable Care Act has proven to be anything but affordable for North Carolinians, and the law has limited access to care and wasted billions of taxpayer dollars. It is time to undo this harmful law.

Also included in the Senate amendment is a provision first passed by this House to stop the flow of Federal mandatory funds to Planned Parenthood. While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these actions are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of 500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business.

Money is fungible and the Federal funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services. Fortunately, there are many more options for women's health care than the discredited abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

While Planned Parenthood has only approximately 665 clinics, federally qualified health centers, FQHCs, and rural health centers, RHCs, have more than 13,000 publicly supported locations providing alternatives for women's health care. This means there are 20 federally funded comprehensive care clinics for every one Planned Parenthood. This bill does not change the availability of funds for women's health. It simply establishes a safeguard so that the Nation's largest abortion chain is not the one providing such services.

When Federal taxpayers have legitimate concerns that their hard-earned dollars are flowing to organizations that sanction the dismemberment of unborn children and that our system of law has loopholes allowing these atrocities to continue, we, as their elected representatives, are responsible for ensuring these concerns are heard and responded to.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, our freedom rests on the cornerstone right we all have to life, and I fear we have lost sight of that.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying motion to protect innocent lives and restore our liberty.

□ 1415

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and join in strong opposition to this rule that will bring forward dangerous legislation that harms women, seniors, and families across America.

In our first week back in this session, it is appalling that the Republicans believe defunding Planned Parenthood, rolling back women's access to health screenings, or raising prescription drug prices for seniors is a top priority.

This latest attempt to defund Planned Parenthood and repeal the ACA is nothing short of an attack on women and low-income Americans. Seventy-five percent of Planned Parenthood patients are low-income and often have nowhere else to go. Eliminating funding will have devastating consequences on the health of young women and men, Latinas, and LGBT Americans.

This isn't just dangerous public policy. It is completely out of touch with the vast majority of Americans.

When I meet with my constituents across Phoenix, I hear families worried about affording college, students struggling to pay their tuition and the amount of debt they have, and hardworking Americans who can't afford the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. But I also hear relief: relief that came from the ACA, relief from young women who no longer have to pay for copays for birth control when they go to the pharmacy, relief that their annual exams no longer come with cost sharing, relief from seniors whose prescription drug costs are lower because we got rid of the Medicare doughnut hole, relief from parents that their child with chronic disease can't be denied insurance coverage—all thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

Women and all Americans deserve better than playing the same politics over their bodies and their health care. I urge my colleagues to defeat this dangerous rule and oppose the reconciliation package on behalf of millions of families who can't afford to lose care once again.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a strong member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Committee on Rules colleague for yielding, and I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

This is a monumental vote. For the first time since Republicans took control of this House in 2011, we are in a position to send a bill to the President's desk that would dismantle ObamaCare and eliminate Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, who we know sold body parts from aborted babies. This piece of legislation is about listening to the American people and working to advance their concerns right here in the people's House.

ObamaCare is fundamentally broken. It is not making health care more affordable. In fact, it is doing just the opposite. As The New York Times pointed out just the other day, many Americans find it cheaper to pay the tax penalty and remain uninsured instead of signing up for a healthcare plan they simply cannot afford. That is exactly the opposite of how this law was supposed to work.

My colleagues on the other side say that Republicans want to take away people's health care. Let me tell you what took away people's health care: this law did.

I hear stories every time I go to the grocery store or hold a townhall meeting from people who had a healthcare plan that they liked, a plan they could afford, a plan that worked for them. Now, the President said over and over again, ''If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.'' That was not true.

The people of the United States suffer today because they lost their healthcare plans or they simply can't afford the cost and the new healthcare plan that has been forced on them. If you want to talk about taking away people's health care from someone, that is what this law did. That is what the President of the United States did and what he continues to do with this law.

We need to move past this government-mandated healthcare plan and instead empower the American people and their doctors. The people don't want the Federal Government to tell them what type of health insurance they need or what doctors they should see. That is simply not the role of the Federal Government. We should get rid of this awful law and, instead, move forward with healthcare reform that puts the interests of the patient first, not the interests of the Federal Government.

Let's pass this bill and send it to the President's desk, and then he gets to make a choice. He can stand with the American people or he can stand against the American people. If he chooses to veto this bill, then the American people will have seen a clear choice between two different Americas: an America where the government knows best or an America where the people, the hardworking people who have made our country great, where the people are empowered.

Let's make the President decide. Let's hold him accountable. Let's do the work of our constituents, and let's pass this bill on behalf of every American who lost their healthcare plan or saw their healthcare costs increase. Let's do this for them.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama says this is a monumental vote. Let me get this straight. A bill that is going to the White House that will get the fastest veto that we have ever seen ever happen in this country is somehow a monumental vote? I would suggest to my Republican colleagues, if they think this is a monumental vote, they have low standards.

This is a political sound bite. This is a waste of taxpayer money. This is just a waste of everybody's time. We ought to be talking about how to strengthen this economy, about how to get more people health care, not these political sound bites that really waste precious resources here in the Congress and, by the way, cost taxpayers money. All this wasted debate here, all this wasted time is costing taxpayers money.

Let's find ways to make the Affordable Care Act even better. Let's find ways to make sure that 100 percent of the people in this country have the health care that they need, not be debating a sound bite, by the way, that, if it ever passed, would throw 22 million people off of health care. How can you go back to your districts and be proud of that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Here we go again. Congress reconvenes and the majority is starting out the new year doing the same old thing. We come back from the holidays, a time for family, for reflection, and we begin this new year with a vote to cripple the health care of our families. The vote today would defund Planned Parenthood, and it would repeal essential pieces of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't know how else to put this except to say that the Affordable Care Act works. It actually works for the people that I represent, for Californians, and for Americans, especially those who never had health care before.

Not only has this law been affirmed constitutionally by our Supreme Court, it has survived countless votes to dismantle it in this Chamber and the other. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, the folks in my district have seen massive improvement in their community. From 2012 to 2014, more than 60,000 people at home in my area now have health insurance, and they never had it before.

This is just about partisan politics today. You are right, Mr. MCGOVERN, it is just about partisan politics. Instead of focusing on the issues that are important to our families—immigration reform, addressing climate change, creating jobs—no, here we go back again.

Mr. Speaker, let's cut the partisan politics. Let's do what families need. Let's vote against this.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a new Member from the great State of Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, and I commend the months of hard work from my colleagues to put together this historic piece of legislation. I likewise thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle acts as though words are meaningless. The truth is the President promised the American people that, if they liked their insurance, they could keep it. He promised. He promised also that this would be more affordable health care.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is none of those promises were true. In fact, now we have millions of Americans who have lost their insurance because of this bill. We have millions of Americans now who are in a situation having to decide between drastically increasing health insurance costs that they have to pay or facing penalties and consequences for not participating.

Mr. Speaker, the President also promised that this healthcare law, ObamaCare, would boost the economy. In fact, it has discouraged businesses from hiring more than 50 people and from having more than 30 hours a week for their workers to work.

The President also told the American people that ObamaCare would not increase the deficit. As has already been mentioned here today, that is absolutely wrong. The CBO has clearly identified how the cost is going to increase tremendously.

This reconciliation package remedies the harm and the devastation of the broken promises of this President. It repeals the very foundation of ObamaCare and places a 1-year moratorium on funding Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this is Alice in Wonderland. First the verdict, then the trial. The Republicans have declared the verdict against Planned Parenthood before ever holding the trial. With no shred of evidence aside from a series of blatantly manipulated videos, without a single House committee finding any wrongdoing, without the select committee ostensibly set up to look at Planned Parenthood holding a single meeting, they have decided in this bill to cut off all Federal funding, including Medicaid reimbursement, for one organization.

The legislation we are voting on today targets one organization and cuts it off from all Federal funding, including reimbursement for Medicaid services provided, for no justifiable legislative reason beyond punishment for offering a constitutionally protected medical procedure.

This smacks of a clearly unconstitutional bill of attainder. The prohibition on bills of attainder exists to prevent just this kind of targeted attack on a single group. You cannot use legislation to punish a single organization without any evidence or fair legislative process simply because you don't like it.

While the legislation never mentions the words ''Planned Parenthood,'' we have heard and will hear here today Planned Parenthood's name over and over again from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle during this debate. No one can say this bill is not aimed directly at one organization.

Of course, if the Republicans in Congress had any evidence that Planned Parenthood broke the law, they would have taken it to the Attorney General or the FBI, but they didn't. If they had any faith in the extremists who made these accusations against Planned Parenthood, they would have brought them before Congress to testify, but they didn't. The truth is this attack on Planned Parenthood is knowingly based on a whole series of lies.

The longer the Republicans keep up this pretense in order to stoke the flames with their inflammatory rhetoric, the longer they put patients and providers at risk of unstable people committing murder, as we have seen at abortion clinics. Bulletproof glass and safe rooms should not be necessary for women to access basic health care like cancer screenings or contraception, but if this farcical attack on Planned Parenthood doesn't stop, that would be the norm for women around the country. You want a breast exam, you want contraception, you put your life at risk.

Do not be fooled by claims that this funding will go to other healthcare providers and Planned Parenthood's patients will follow it. It is simply not true. More than half of Planned Parenthood's patients rely on Medicaid. Most States do not have enough providers, particularly specialists like OB/GYNs, taking Medicaid patients to absorb Planned Parenthood's patients.

By voting to defund Planned Parenthood today, you are leaving 2.7 million women, men, and families with no access to health care. Enough is enough. It is time for my Republican colleagues to accept what they know is true. Planned Parenthood has done nothing more than provide compassionate, comprehensive care for millions of Americans in a safe, legal manner.

Stop the rhetoric. Stop the lies. Don't deprive people of abortion services, of healthcare services, of contraception services, of breast exams. Vote ''no'' on this rule, vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, and don't violate the Constitution with a bill of attainder.

□ 1430

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule and final passage of H.R. 3762.

Since I was first sworn in to the House, my top priority has been to repeal this disastrous healthcare law we call ObamaCare. Finally, today we have an opportunity to send to the President's desk legislation that repeals ObamaCare.

Today we are going to end the individual mandate, stop the employer mandate, and repeal dozens of taxes and provisions that prevent people from actually getting affordable health coverage. I have always said we should incentivize health savings accounts, not tax them, and this bill repeals the tax on HSAs.

It is obvious that ObamaCare has done nothing to reduce healthcare costs. I hear from many of the local business owners and constituents in my district every day about their struggle to comply with the law, let

alone provide health coverage for their employees and their families.

Manufacturers, construction companies, and retail store owners are facing dramatic increases to their administrative and healthcare costs. This leaves them in the dangerous position of ObamaCare driving them out of business by making those decisions.

Since signing it into law, the President has delayed or repealed parts of ObamaCare for political reasons. This was a bad law to begin with because it is fundamentally unworkable and unaffordable. It is time to repeal it once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the passage of this bill.

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

I would just say that this debate is astonishing to me. What is so controversial on the Republican side is that millions and millions more Americans have health care. I heard someone over there say that fewer people have health care. They can't produce any validators to support that statement. CBO and a whole bunch of other validators have actually said more people have health care.

If they get their way, 22 million people will lose their health care. That is what this is about. This is about whether or not people in this country deserve health care or whether or not they don't, whether or not you think health care is a right or whether, as my Republican friends say, it is a privilege. We think it is a right.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership, and I thank him for yielding.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we go again and again and again. Once more, politicians are invading the bedrooms of the American women.

I stand with Planned Parenthood. We will not go back.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015. This bill guts ObamaCare, eliminating many of the penalties and programs that have been implemented over the last several years by this administration.

Americans have been saddled with the burden of a healthcare insurance system that restricts what doctor they can see, what services they can receive, and has even limited them to who they can have as their pharmacist.

If the President signs this bill into law, we can return the power of our healthcare system back to the American people. Americans should be in charge of their healthcare system, not Washington, D.C.

With this bill, Congress will eliminate the individual mandate, the employer mandate, and repeal all future appropriated funds to the Prevention and Public Health Fund that has supported the failing ObamaCare law for the last several years.

It repeals the medical device tax, the excise tax on high-cost health insurance plans, and the $2,500 limit on flexible spending accounts. It also repeals ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion eligibility pathway, which has left many States suffering with budget problems, and it restricts Federal funding to Planned Parenthood and its affiliated clinics for a period of 1 year, with appropriate funds being redirected to Community Health Centers to better serve women and their health.

This bill returns to the American people a system that is driven by the market, not by artificial formulas and percentages created by Washington bureaucrats.

As a pharmacist and former owner of three independent pharmacies, I can assure you the only way to lower costs and create an opportunity for everyone to participate is by allowing the free market to work as it was meant to.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill so that we can eliminate this burdensome healthcare plan and bring greater opportunities for Americans to receive affordable health care.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have unveiled their new ideas for moving America forward, which include trying to repeal or undermine for the 62nd time the Affordable Care Act and for the 11th time attacking women's health care, both of which are guaranteed to be vetoed by President Obama.

So one definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different result. There will be no different result today.

The Affordable Care Act will remain the law of the land, and Planned Parenthood will not be defunded. The Republicans know this. Because if the Affordable Care Act were actually to be repealed, over 22 million Americans would lose their health coverage, including 3.5 million Californians, and the Republicans have no plan for how they will fix this immediate healthcare crisis. In addition, millions more will lose healthcare access if Planned Parenthood were to be defunded.

If you want to look at hyperpartisan bills that waste time, squander taxpayer resources, and are going nowhere, look at the GOP agenda. If you want ideas that will move America forward, such as investing in education, reducing carbon pollution, and creating jobs, look at the Democratic agenda. At least we are not insane.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

For months now, Americans have—in horror—watched gruesome undercover videos detailing Planned Parenthood's barbaric practice of harvesting little baby body parts for profit. In one heartbreaking story, a whistleblower described how Planned Parenthood carved up the face of a baby boy whose heart was still beating and then harvested his intact brain.

As a father of four beautiful children by adoption, I listened to this gut-wrenching recollection only to think about millions of destroyed lives that won't be given the chance at life my kids received.

It is time to stop funneling millions of taxpayer funds to this abortion giant that prides itself in snuffing out the lives of innocent babies and then profiting off their little victims.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3762.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman that the overwhelming majority of the American people actually support Planned Parenthood. That is in spite of all the attacks and all the accusations that have no basis and that have been hurled at them by my Republican friends.

I just want to remind my colleagues that Planned Parenthood provides a number of services to patients, such as family planning counseling and contraception. They provide pregnancy tests and Pap tests. They provide lifesaving breast exams.

This is an organization that provides for the health and well-being of millions of people in this country, mostly poor women. Maybe that makes it easier for my friends on the other side to attack this program and this organization—because they primarily provide help to poor women—but that is what Planned Parenthood is about.

And so this is an important organization, a good organization. That is why a majority of Americans support it. My friends are on the wrong side of public opinion on this.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayer money should not be used for abortions, period. Taxpayer money should not be used to support abortion providers, period.

As Americans, we are proud to support life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, in the last fiscal year, $554 million of taxpayer money went to support Planned Parenthood. In the same year, it was responsible for the death of 323,999 innocent babies, even dismembering and selling baby parts. These lost children are a deep scar on our Nation.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have countered that Planned Parenthood does more than provide

abortions. Well, let's take a look at the facts. According to Planned Parenthood's own 2014–2015 annual report, cancer screenings are down 27 percent, family planning and contraceptive services are down 18 percent, and STD prevention and treatments are down 6 percent. Planned Parenthood's services declined in the same year that they received a nearly 5 percent increase in Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, we are accountable for American taxpayer dollars. H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, defunds Planned Parenthood and shifts those same taxpayer dollars to the much larger network of community health clinics that do not provide abortions. This legislation will increase access to healthcare services for women while upholding and strengthening the value of life.

H.R. 3762 also defunds the unmitigated disaster known as ObamaCare. President Obama said you can keep your health plan. Well, we found out millions can't. President Obama called this affordable. Well, it's not. Premiums have gone up.

Americans deserve the freedom to choose the health plan that is right for them, not the one selected by President Obama.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 3762 to protect taxpayer dollars from being spent on abortions while increasing access to healthcare services for women, as we also defund ObamaCare and its legislation.

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

I just have to correct the record. The gentleman said that taxpayer money should not be spent on abortions. It can't be. That is the law. I don't know what he is talking about.

I also should point out to the gentleman that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventative care.

So I get it. It is the political rhetoric that people get carried away with. But let's at least try to stick to facts at least a little bit. Let's also understand—so my colleague has no confusion here—that the law here is that no taxpayer money can be spent for abortions. So let's clear that up.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, to support the rule, but I also rise in strong support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, a crucial piece of legislation with bicameral support.

This bill continues our efforts to protect patients, families, taxpayers, and communities across the Nation. It will lift the burdens of the President's healthcare law and give back the power over healthcare decisions to individual patients and families.

This bill gives us the opportunity to take crucial steps toward a more patient-centered healthcare system. It gives us the opportunity to reduce our Nation's deficit by repealing the majority of the burdensome healthcare taxes and ending harsh penalties.

This legislation also gives us the opportunity to save lives. In light of Planned Parenthood's unethical and potentially illegal activity, I firmly believe our taxpayers should not be forced to pay for such organizations. We must protect the rights of taxpayers and, more importantly, the rights of the unborn.

□ 1445

As I have said before, I remain dedicated to giving a voice to our most fragile Americans who cannot speak for themselves. I am proud this legislation helps us protect those who need protection most.

I urge my colleagues to support this good bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Other than a verbal assault against Planned Parenthood and a verbal assault against the Affordable Care Act, this bill will do nothing. It is going to be vetoed really quickly. Maybe it is red meat for the political base, but if that satisfies your political base, great. I would say they are a cheap date if this is what it takes to satisfy them.

But we ought to be dealing with some serious issues here, and I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would close a glaring loophole in our gun laws allowing suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms.

The bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list. I don't know why that is so controversial, but some of my friends find that to be a controversial issue.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure for many different reasons, but let me just touch on three.

One, Gordon Sullivan was former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and he once observed that hope was not a method.

Irregardless of the good intentions behind the Affordable Care Act, I think that, from an actuarial standpoint, if you really look at it, you would have to say that hope was, indeed, part of the method.

I say that because if you look at the number of young people that were anticipated to sign up, already 7.5 million folks have said: No, I am not signing up, I would rather take the penalty than sign up. And what that creates is a big liability for the taxpayer.

Two, I would make the point that there have been real implications for the small-business person. We have a company back home in Charleston by the name of East Bay Deli. The owner came to me just a number of weeks ago and said: Look, I was going to open up a couple of more shops but, given the cost that I have seen with the Affordable Care Act for my small business, I am not going to do that. Ninety employees that won't have jobs as a consequence.

Finally, our healthcare system has been predicated on a doctor-patient relationship. That Hippocratic Oath, that direct tie between doctor and patient, is part and parcel to the whole system. Yet the Affordable Care Act, again, in the whole, begins to undermine that.

So for many different reasons, those three among them, I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am almost embarrassed to get up here and discuss this legislation and believe that its sponsors really think that it is going to become law. That is what the reputation of the Congress is supposed to be all about.

But even when it is such an important decision, we like to talk about things that we are doing as a matter of life and death, but we don't really mean it. It is just a political expression.

But when you are talking about health care and realize that this is the only industrialized country left that has not seen fit to believe that health care is a matter of right, it goes beyond politics when we pass a bill so that people throughout the United States will be able to enjoy health care, that we don't find one Member of the opposition party joining in that legislation.

It is beyond belief that people can complain that not enough young people are signing up, or that employers are skeptical, or that there are people who lack confidence in this bill, when the majority party in this Congress has condemned this bill with such utter contempt that, for over 50 times, they would come and attempt to repeal it, and then expect that everybody should have confidence in it.

Why are we doing this? How can any party dislike, hate, or disagree with the President so much that they would spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to attack a national healthcare-providing bill and not have the least idea as to whether or not,

first of all, they know it is not going to become law, but not enough common sense and decency to provide an alternative.

We all know that 7 years ago, when President Obama was first elected, that the leaders of the Republican Party said that their first job would be to get rid of President Obama.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman.

I close by saying, everybody here knows this will never become law. It is a political statement. As a politician, there is nothing wrong with political statements. But to have one that is so wrapped up with hypocrisy and hatred is very awkward for us to continue in this body and believe that anything we attempt to do to send to the President would have anyone believing that we are doing it because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

This important legislation would repeal the employer and individual mandates, the ObamaCare slush fund, and the numerous harmful taxes on everything from medical devices to health insurers to the insurance plans themselves.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is an unpopular, failed law. Polls have shown it, elections have demonstrated it, and rising premiums have proven it.

I wasn't in this body when this law passed. I was watching in horror with the rest of the American people as the legislative process was railroaded to push it through.

But let's consider the contrast today to what we have before us, a bill that both the House and the Senate came together to guide through the normal legislative process.

Let's start 2016 the right way and make President Obama own this law in a way that he has not had to do yet. Let's continue to work here in Congress toward a commonsense plan to replace this damaging law.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a picture is always worth a thousand words, and this is a picture of words. It is very clear that the Affordable Care Act has been a lifesaver for many Americans. And this budget reconciliation act is obviously misdirected, wrong directed, and the 62nd time this body has tried to gut ObamaCare.

Thank you, Mr. President, for vetoing it, no matter whether it came from the Senate or the House.

We worked, without ceasing, to get a bill that would cover millions of Americans. It was a deliberative process, and everyone had a right to vote.

The Republicans refused to vote for good health care, and here we are, 13 million Americans benefitted from $1.1 billion in rebates for health insurance; 105 million Americans, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million in Medicare.

Last August, millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's care; 17 million children with preexisting conditions have insurance; 6.6 million young people have insurance; 6.3 million seniors.

And, of course, they want to attack Planned Parenthood, which provides vulnerable women with health care.

I don't know what they view the budget reconciliation act, but I call it the Anti-New Year's Celebration. Now that we have a new year, we have this horrible bill. Vote against it, and vote for a thousand words right here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

I oppose the rule for H.R. 2762 for three reasons: 1. The rule only allows one hour of debate equally divided between the supporters and opponents of the rule; 2. This is not an open rule that would allow for amendments that could have been offered improve the bill; and 3. The President has communicated to the House that he will veto this bill if it is not amended.

The House needs more time to debate this bill because it could mean a return to the days when nearly 20% of Americans had seriously deficient healthcare coverage or none at all.

Unfortunately this rule for the underlying bill is the latest GOP attempt to end the Affordable Care Act guarantee of access to health insurance for millions of Americans and not an attempt to improve the lives of working men and women or their families.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 3762, would result in 22 million Americans losing their health coverage after 2017.

The impact of the bill should it become law is significant and should have more than an hour of debate prior to a vote.

The worse thing about this bill is that the authors are well aware of the public reaction should it become law, and this is why it would not go into effect during 2016, but 2017 after the general election and would remove health coverage for those who are the most vulnerable such as those who have coverage under the Medicaid expansion.

I also object that this is a closed rule that does not allow amendments that could provide support for bipartisan efforts to improve the bill.

Instead of attempting to repeal and undermine this law, we should use our time to work together to make improvements where necessary such as ending the so called "Cadillac Tax" and making sure that health insurance is focused on providing the care prescribed by doctors and not health insurance plans.

Finally, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill because the Administration has made it clear that this bill will be vetoed if presented for signature by the President.

The House has important work it should be doing such as voting on legislation to create new infrastructure to support the 21st century need for universal high-speed broadband access and; closing the gap in STEM employment opportunities and skills that has over 1 million positions that are going unfilled; and strengthening gun safety by increasing the number of agents at the ATF to ensure that all gun dealers are following the law; and promoting greater access to mental health services.

Instead we continue to waste time on fighting the Affordable Care Law in ways that would hurt Americans who need affordable, assessable and available healthcare we could be engaged in productive legislative work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues reject this bad rule and the flawed underlying legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend from Massachusetts if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Right now, just me.

Mr. WOODALL. I am going to ask the good doctor to close us today. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great affection for my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I don't understand their obsession with trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act or their obsession with trying to defund Planned Parenthood. I mean, if they get their way on the Affordable Care Act, they would throw 22 million people out of their health insurance plans; 22 million people would lose their coverage.

Young people who are 26 years old and under would lose their healthcare benefits. Right now they can stay on their family's healthcare plans up to 26. They would lose that.

It used to be that if you are a woman it would be considered a preexisting condition and your insurance rates would be higher. The Affordable Care Act prevents that.

The doughnut hole in the prescription drug plan, the cost to senior citizens, is closing. Ultimately, we will eliminate that doughnut hole because of the Affordable Care Act. That is all good.

Medicare's solvency has been expanded because of this. Millions more people have health insurance as a result. That is a good thing. But they want to take it away.

On Planned Parenthood, I mean, most of what they do is provide preventative care to women. They want to take that away. It is cruel. It is a cruel thing to do.

I can't believe that there isn't bipartisan consensus in this place that health care is something that people need and we ought to make sure they have access to it.

My friends have been in charge of this Congress for a long time. They can't even offer an alternative. They can tell us what they are against, but they can't tell us what they are for. They have done nothing to help expand the ability of people to get health insurance in this country. All they do is

come to the floor and talk about repealing bills that will make it more difficult for people.

I can't understand how you get up every morning and go to work and that is your mission, to make it more difficult for people in this country, to throw 22 million people off the health insurance rolls, to make it more difficult for vulnerable women to get preventative care at Planned Parenthood.

That is the mission. That is how we are beginning this new year. And it really is sad, and it is really disheartening, I think, for a lot of us who came here to try to make a difference in people's lives, to try to help improve the quality of life for people.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this terrible, terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a good doctor who doesn't just talk about health care, but who does get up every morning to provide that health care to Americans.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill passed the House in March of 2010, probably half of the Congress has changed. So for the benefit of people who were not here in March of 2010, who did not see this debate in its full-throated entirety in 2010, I want to just revisit a couple of the salient pieces that led up to the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

People may ask themselves, why doesn't this law enjoy more popularity? In fact, the night it was passed, as reported on CNN, the American people were opposed to the passage of this law by about 52 percent. That number is essentially unchanged almost 6 years later.

And what was the promise of the Affordable Care Act? Well, let me remind people. And don't take my word for it. This is in the inestimable words of Jonathan Gruber, an economics professor from MIT who published a graphic novel about the Affordable Care Act.

> Yay. Hooray. Everyone will be able to afford insurance. You won't have to worry about going broke if you get sick. We will start to bring the cost of health care under control, and we will do this all while reducing the Federal deficit.

Why wasn't it more popular when it was passed?

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are, about 2 weeks after Christmas Eve, and it was Christmas Eve of 2009 when this bill passed the Senate.

And I would remind people in this body, it was not a House bill that passed the Senate. Well, I take that back. It was a House bill. It was H.R. 3590. That was a bill dealing with veterans' housing that had passed this House July of 2009 and had nothing to do with health care.

But because this bill, this law, was a massive piece of tax policy, it had to originate in the House. Except it didn't, but the bill number originated in the House.

So the bill that was passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve in 2009, with a big snowstorm bearing down on Washington, D.C., every Senator wanting to get out of town and get home to their district, the bill that was passed read as follows: ''Strike all after the enacting clause and insert—''

That means it took out all the housing language and put in all the healthcare language and, more importantly, all of the tax policy.

□ 1500

That bill passed the Senate with 60 votes. Of course at that time, Democrats held a 60-vote majority in the Senate, and it allegedly was to come back to a conference committee with the House except that the Senate lost a Democratic Senator in that timeframe. HARRY REID told the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, that he no longer had 60 votes and there was simply nothing more he could do. It was up to the Speaker of the House to pass the Senate bill with no changes because he could not bring it back before the Senate because he no longer had 60 votes.

So the next 3 months, literally, were consumed with arm-twisting, kneecapping, and trying to convince people to vote for something that was against their fundamental best interest. So is it a surprise that it did not enjoy popular support on the day it was passed and it has not achieved popular support even with all the giveaways and even with all the Federal money pumped into it since that time?

The reason, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. At the heart of this—at the heart of this—is a very coercive—really, it is unique in Federal policy. The Federal Government tells you what you have to do. You have to buy a healthcare policy. Then they seek to regulate it under the Commerce Clause.

It was the most convoluted logic anyone had ever seen. But it was coercive, and that coerciveness led to the corrosiveness that has underlain the Affordable Care Act ever since.

No wonder people look at this. It was conceived—it was conceived—in a falsehood and then delivered to the American people under a false promise. Indeed, it has harmed—as we have heard over and over again from people that it has harmed—individuals in individual districts across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the rule and in support of the reconciliation bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 579 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 579 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 579, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 580; and adoption of House Resolution 580, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—175

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Byrne
Cleaver
DeLauro
Hinojosa
Huffman
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Payne
Rigell
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Takai
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1530

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. FARR and BEYER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SESSIONS was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1644, SUPPORTING TRANSPARENT REGULATORY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIONS IN MINING ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee issued a Dear Colleague outlining the amendment process for H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act. An amendment deadline has been set for Monday, January 11, 2016, at 10 a.m. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Natural Resources and as posted on the Rules Committee's Web site. Please feel free to contact either me or the Rules Committee's staff with any questions a Member or staff may have.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 177, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

AYES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Brat
Cleaver
DeLauro
Hinojosa
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Payne
Rigell
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Takai
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1540

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 712, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1155, SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 580) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 712) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 176, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Cleaver
DeLauro
Hinojosa
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Payne
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Takai
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1548

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Cleaver
Comstock
DeLauro
Frelinghuysen
Hinojosa
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Payne
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Takai
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1557

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, my vote did not register. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 579, I call up the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

TITLE I—HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

SEC. 101. THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2015''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) through (5).

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by such section 4002, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

SEC. 102. COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER PROGRAM.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–10, 129 Stat. 87), paragraph (1) of section 221(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after ''Section 10503(b)(1)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b–2(b)(1)(E)) is amended'' the following: ''by striking '$3,600,000,000' and inserting '$3,835,000,000' and''.

SEC. 103. TERRITORIES.

Section 1323(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18043(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NO FORCE AND EFFECT.—Effective January 1, 2018, this subsection shall have no force or effect.''.

SEC. 104. REINSURANCE, RISK CORRIDOR, AND RISK ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) TRANSITIONAL REINSURANCE PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—Section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18061) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) NO FORCE AND EFFECT.—Effective January 1, 2016, the Secretary shall not collect fees and shall not make payments under this section.''.

SEC. 105. SUPPORT FOR STATE RESPONSE TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS AND URGENT MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated, and are appropriated, out of monies in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, $750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') to award grants to States to address the substance abuse public health crisis or to respond to urgent mental health needs within the State. In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may give preference to States with an incidence or prevalence of substance use disorders that is substantial relative to other States or to States that identify mental health needs within their communities that are urgent relative to such needs of other States. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded to a State under subsection (a) shall be used for one or more of the following public health-related activities:

(1) Improving State prescription drug monitoring programs.

(2) Implementing prevention activities, and evaluating such activities to identify effective strategies to prevent substance abuse.

(3) Training for health care practitioners, such as best practices for prescribing opioids, pain management, recognizing potential cases of substance abuse, referral of patients to treatment programs, and overdose prevention.

(4) Supporting access to health care services provided by federally certified opioid treatment programs or other appropriate health care providers to treat substance use disorders or mental health needs.

(5) Other public health-related activities, as the State determines appropriate, related to addressing the substance abuse public health crisis or responding to urgent mental health needs within the State.

TITLE II—FINANCE

SEC. 201. RECAPTURE EXCESS ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDITS.

Subparagraph (B) of section 36B(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) NONAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2015, and before January 1, 2018.''.

SEC. 202. PREMIUM TAX CREDIT AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES.

(a) REPEAL OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 36B.

(b) REPEAL OF COST-SHARING SUBSIDY.—Section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—The following sections of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are repealed:

(1) Section 1411 (other than subsection (i), the last sentence of subsection (e)(4)(A)(ii), and such provisions of such section solely to the extent related to the application of the last sentence of subsection (e)(4)(A)(ii)).

(2) Section 1412.

(d) PROTECTING AMERICANS BY REPEAL OF DISCLOSURE AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (21) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) TERMINATION.—No disclosure may be made under this paragraph after December 31, 2017.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

(2) COST SHARING-SUBSIDIES AND ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—The repeals in subsection (b) and (c) shall take effect on December 31, 2017.

(3) PROTECTING AMERICANS BY RESCINDING DISCLOSURE AUTHORITY.—The amendments made by subsection (d) shall take effect on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 203. SMALL BUSINESS TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) SHALL NOT APPLY.—This section shall not apply with respect to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 204. INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) Zero percent for taxable years beginning after 2014.'', and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''$695'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''$0'',

(B) by striking ''and $325 for 2015'' in subparagraph (B), and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D).

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

SEC. 205. EMPLOYER MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''($0 in the case of months beginning after December 31, 2014)'' after ''$2,000''.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 4980H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''($0 in the case of months beginning after December 31, 2014)'' after ''$3,000''.

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

SEC. 206. FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 504(a), 1902(a)(23), 1903(a), 2002, 2005(a)(4), 2102(a)(7), or 2105(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 704(a), 1396a(a)(23), 1396b(a), 1397a, 1397d(a)(4), 1397bb(a)(7), 1397ee(a)(1)), or the terms of any Medicaid waiver in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is approved under section 1115 or 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315, 1396n), for the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal funds provided from a program referred to in this subsection that is considered direct spending for any year may be made available to a State for payments to a prohibited entity, whether made directly to the prohibited entity or through a managed care organization under contract with the State.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term ''prohibited entity'' means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics—

(A) that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code;

(ii) is an essential community provider described in section 156.235 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), that is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and related medical care; and

(iii) provides for abortions, other than an abortion—

(I) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(II) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself; and

(B) for which the total amount of Federal and State expenditures under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act in fiscal year 2014 made directly to the entity and to any affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics of the entity, or made to the entity and to any affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics of the entity as part of a nationwide health care provider network, exceeded $350,000,000.

(2) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given that term under section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)).

SEC. 207. MEDICAID.

The Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1108(g)(5), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2017'';

(2) in section 1902—

(A) in subsection (a)(10)(A), in each of clauses (i)(VIII) and (ii)(XX), by inserting ''and ending December 31, 2017,'' after ''January 1, 2014,'';

(B) in subsection (a)(47)(B), by inserting ''and provided that any such election shall cease to be effective on January 1, 2018, and no such election shall be made after that date'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(C) in subsection (l)(2)(C), by inserting ''and ending December 31, 2017,'' after ''January 1, 2014,'';

(3) in each of sections 1902(gg)(2) and 2105(d)(3)(A), by striking ''September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''September 30, 2017'';

(4) in section 1905—

(A) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by inserting ''(50 percent on or after January 1, 2018)'' after ''55 percent'';

(B) in subsection (y)(1), by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B) and all that follows through ''thereafter''; and

(C) in subsection (z)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''each year thereafter'' and inserting ''through 2017''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the semicolon at the end of subclause (IV) and all that follows through ''100 percent'';

(5) in section 1915(k)(2), by striking ''during the period described in paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''on or after the date referred to in paragraph (1) and before January 1, 2018'';

(6) in section 1920(e), by adding at the end the following: ''This subsection shall not apply after December 31, 2017.'';

(7) in section 1937(b)(5), by adding at the end the following: ''This paragraph shall not apply after December 31, 2017.''; and

(8) in section 1943(a), by inserting ''and before January 1, 2018,'' after ''January 1, 2014,''.

SEC. 208. REPEAL OF DSH ALLOTMENT REDUCTIONS.

Section 1923(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–4(f)) is amended by striking paragraphs (7) and (8).

SEC. 209. REPEAL OF THE TAX ON EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND HEALTH PLAN BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 49801.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 210. REPEAL OF TAX ON OVER-THE-COUNTER MEDICATIONS.

(a) HSAS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 223(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''Such term'' and all that follows through the period.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 220(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''Such term'' and all that follows through the period.

(c) HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS AND HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to amounts paid with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(2) REIMBURSEMENTS.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to expenses incurred with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 211. REPEAL OF TAX ON HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) HSAS.—Section 223(f)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''10 percent''.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Section 220(f)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''15 percent''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions made after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 212. REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (i).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF TAX ON PRESCRIPTION MEDICATIONS.

Subsection (j) of section 9008 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended to read as follows:

''(j) REPEAL.—This section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2010, and ending before January 1, 2016.''.

SEC. 214. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales in calendar quarters beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 215. REPEAL OF HEALTH INSURANCE TAX.

Subsection (j) of section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended to read as follows:

''(j) REPEAL.—This section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2013, and ending before January 1, 2016.''.

SEC. 216. REPEAL OF ELIMINATION OF DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES ALLOCABLE TO MEDICARE PART D SUBSIDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 139A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This section shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining whether any deduction is allowable with respect to any cost taken into account in determining such payment.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 217. REPEAL OF CHRONIC CARE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''10 percent'' and inserting ''7.5 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 218. REPEAL OF MEDICARE TAX INCREASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to 1.45 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by such individual with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b).''.

(b) SECA.—Subsection (b) of section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax equal to 2.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to remuneration received after, and taxable years beginning after, December 31, 2015.

SEC. 219. REPEAL OF TANNING TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking chapter 49.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to services performed on or after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 220. REPEAL OF NET INVESTMENT TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking chapter 2A.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 221. REMUNERATION.

Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.''.

SEC. 222. ECONOMIC SUBSTANCE DOCTRINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (o) of section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(b) PENALTY FOR UNDERPAYMENTS.—Paragraph (6) of section 6662(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(c) INCREASED PENALTY FOR NONDISCLOSED TRANSACTIONS.—Subsection (i) of section 6662 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(d) REASONABLE CAUSE EXCEPTION FOR UNDERPAYMENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6664(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(e) REASONABLE CAUSE EXCEPTION FOR NONDISCLOSED TRANSACTIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6664(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(f) ERRONEOUS CLAIM FOR REFUND OR CREDIT.—Subsection (c) of section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeals made by this section shall apply to transactions entered into, and to underpayments, understatements, or refunds and credits attributable to transactions entered into, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 223. BUDGETARY SAVINGS FOR EXTENDING MEDICARE SOLVENCY.

As a result of policies contained in this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) $379,300,000,000 (which represents the full amount of on-budget savings during the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025) for extending Medicare solvency, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 579, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. 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 material on H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a big day. For the first time—for the first time—since the law was enacted, Congress is one vote away from sending a broad repeal of ObamaCare to the President's desk. This marks a significant step in the fight for patient-centered health care for all Americans. It will lay the foundation for how Congress can begin to roll back the disastrous policies that are destroying the sacred doctor-patient relationship.

The legislation before us today is critical to our larger effort to rid America's healthcare system from undue Washington interference and bureaucratic dictates and pave the way for real, positive, patient-centered

health reform that puts patients and families and doctors in charge of healthcare decisions.

This bill repeals the most corrosive components of ObamaCare. It eliminates nearly a trillion dollars in onerous ObamaCare taxes and eliminates the individual and employer mandate penalties, key pillars of the ObamaCare scheme.

Under ObamaCare, millions of Americans have been added to a Medicaid system that fails to provide its beneficiaries with adequate access to physicians and other providers. We end that.

Expanding Medicaid is not the answer. Reforming Medicaid so that States have greater flexibility to care for those in need is the answer.

This legislation also repeals the premium subsidies and tax credits which have failed to control and, in fact, have increased health coverage costs. The current law has made healthcare coverage less affordable and less accessible for millions of Americans.

All of this would be done on a timeline to allow for a new, positive solution that will make the purchase of health insurance financially feasible for all Americans and do so in a way that gives individuals, families, and employers the power to choose the type of coverage that they want for themselves, not that Washington forces them to buy.

H.R. 3762 also halts Federal funding for abortion providers that are prohibited under this legislation. It increases—increases, Mr. Speaker—the funding for community healthcare centers to help direct more resources to women's direct care. Taken together, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would reduce the deficit by $516 billion over the next decade.

Seven separate committees and the full House and Senate have contributed to this effort. The entire reconciliation would not have been possible had the House and Senate not first agreed to a budget resolution conference agreement. The budget gave Congress the authority to pursue the reconciliation process and, through that, the opportunity to put this repeal of ObamaCare on the President's desk.

Ultimately, however, the American people are less interested in process and procedure. They want results, and they want to know who is fighting to improve their way of life, who is working to provide relief to the biggest challenges facing individuals and families and job creators today.

No matter how you slice it, ObamaCare is harming the American people. Premiums and deductibles and other out-of-pocket costs are going up, not down, as the President had promised. Millions of Americans have been kicked off the coverage that they had. That is less access and fewer choices at a higher cost. That is exactly the opposite direction we need to be going, and the American people know it.

We all want a healthcare system that is affordable and accessible and responsive to our individual needs, full of choices and innovative treatment options and of the highest quality. That is not too much to ask, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly achievable, but only if we pursue patient-centered solutions that are focused on embracing those principles in health care that we all hold dear.

I look forward to this debate and the opportunity to share with the American people how we solve this challenge, the challenge in America's healthcare system, by putting them in charge of their healthcare decisions, not Washington.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, this measure. Let's take this final step in reconciliation to send an ObamaCare repeal bill to the President's desk.

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

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

This is a sad and shameful way to begin the new year 2016 here in the United States Congress.

This bill is entitled Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, the freedom of health insurance companies to once again deny health care to people based on preexisting conditions.

It may be a new year, Mr. Speaker, but here we go again. We are in this Congress, on the floor of this House for the 62nd time with this effort to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and, to add insult to injury, to deny millions of women access to healthcare choices by targeting Planned Parenthood.

While the calendar has changed, the Tea Party Republican agenda remains the same. Despite all the pressing issues we face in this country at home and abroad, the only thing and the first thing our Republican colleagues decide to bring to the floor of the House as the most pressing business to start 2016 is to take away access to affordable care from 22 million Americans and deny access to affordable care for millions of American women.

That 22 million figure, Mr. Speaker, that is not my figure. That is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that has looked at this legislation and concluded that, as a result of this bill, 22 million Americans will lose access to their affordable health insurance. It will be the freedom to be uninsured, the freedom to not have any opportunity to have coverage when your family has healthcare needs.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at this chart, you can see that the Affordable Care Act has already made a dramatic difference in bringing down the number of uninsured in the United States of America, yet here we are in a new year, and the first act of this Republican Congress will be to turn back the clock and change that figure.

I really hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues will begin to focus on more important issues in the days ahead. Everybody knows that this will take about a nanosecond for the President of the United States to veto because the President of the United States is not going to allow 22 million Americans to lose their access to affordable health insurance, and the President is not going to allow millions of Americans and millions of American women to lose access to reproductive choice and a range of healthcare options here in the United States.

It is disturbing, shameful, and sad that this is the way we are starting the new year. I hope we get on to more important business, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who was a leader of one of the multiple committees involved in this.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

Under the leadership of Committee on the Budget chairman, Dr. PRICE, and our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, we will soon deliver an ObamaCare dismantle bill to the President's desk.

By passing this legislation:

We will fulfill our promise to use every possible tool to stop the President's expensive healthcare law;

We will eliminate the unpopular mandates of the backbone of the Affordable Care Act;

We will protect Americans from tax penalties for failing to purchase an expensive Washington-approved product that just so many people at home can't afford;

We will end the tax penalties facing America's job creators who don't offer health insurance that meets Washington bureaucrats' very expensive tastes;

We will deliver real relief from a dozen Democrat tax increases that drive American jobs overseas and punish American workers;

We will protect taxpayer dollars by repealing an ObamaCare slush fund and ensuring that your taxpayer subsidies don't go to people who aren't eligible for them, and if they do, they are returned to the Treasury;

We will—and this is important to me—demonstrate our strong commitment to women's health. Instead of funding Planned Parenthood and its gruesome practices, we will fund high-quality community health centers, and we will help ensure more women have access to quality health care.

We are here today with a bill that cuts taxes, spending, and the deficit because this Congress did its job.

In closing, while our Democrat friends often accuse us of relentlessly and tirelessly pursuing the repeal of the President's healthcare law, the reason is we are fighting for our families and our patients and our local businesses who have been harmed by it.

Yes, the President will surely veto the bill, even though this bill has strong popular support. My belief is that exercising your constitutional right and power to legislate is never wasted if you are fighting for principles your constituents believe in.

Give the American people a clear moral choice. Let the President explain why his healthcare law is raising costs on so many American families and businesses. Let him stand on the wrong side of history by defending unethical medical practices that, frankly, many Americans find abhorrent.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me expanding access to affordable health care for 22 million Americans who didn't have it is being on the right side of history.

I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a distinguished member of the panel which, I am sorry to say, was set up as part of a witch hunt against Planned Parenthood, but I am glad she is there.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership has a funny way of wishing the working families of America Happy New Year. Under this bill, the first substantive legislation of 2016, women and their families will be hit with a one-two punch to their access to health care.

First, with the latest attempt to repeal the ACA, House Republicans would remove the tax credits that help millions of Americans afford quality health insurance. When families lose that insurance, women would also lose their free annual wellness exams they get from their providers under the ACA.

Just to pile on, at the same time millions of women would lose their free wellness exams, this bill would inhibit their ability to get affordable wellwoman and family-planning services from Planned Parenthood. More than 3 million American women and men get essential health care from Planned Parenthood every year, and even more would need to if the ACA were repealed.

In many parts of the country, Planned Parenthood is the only provider that offers access to reproductive health services within hundreds of miles. There are no health clinics that would take over that gap. Eliminating Federal funding to the organization would limit women's access to cancer screenings, breast exams, and so much more, and all because of an unfounded vendetta against Planned Parenthood.

Happy New Year, women and families of America.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PRICE for yielding.

I rise today in strong, strong support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

We have all heard the stories and the statistics, seen the charts. ObamaCare is wreaking havoc on our country, on small-business owners, on working families, and even on students. It is a flawed law that has led to higher costs for consumers, fewer full-time jobs for workers, and less access to trusted healthcare providers for patients.

That is why we in Congress have been relentless in our efforts to put an end to ObamaCare and its harmful consequences. It is why we have worked to protect hardworking Americans who are still paying the price for the President's government takeover of health care, and it is why we are here today.

The bill before us will eliminate key provisions in the President's healthcare law that are hurting families, small businesses, and schools. Under this proposal, the tax penalty levied against individuals who fail to purchase government-approved health insurance will be gone. The tax penalty levied against small businesses and schools that fail to provide costly, government-approved health insurance will be gone. The onerous and arbitrary limits on personal health savings accounts and flexible spending accounts will be gone. The punitive tax on medical innovation will be gone.

These and other provisions in the bill will dismantle a fatally flawed law as well as reduce Federal spending and rein in our Nation's deficits by roughly half a trillion dollars. These are priorities the American people sent us to Washington to address, and we owe it to the men and women we represent to do just that.

We have a responsibility to support this bill and to send it to the President's desk. I believe the President has a responsibility to sign it. If he does, it wouldn't be the first time the President has helped roll back his own healthcare law. In fact, on more than 15 separate occasions, the President has signed legislation repealing provisions in the law, not to mention the dozens of changes to the law his administration has carried out unilaterally.

The legislation is an opportunity for the President to work with us to move the country in a better direction and show the American people that their priorities are our priorities.

It is also an opportunity to demonstrate once again we are serious about reducing the size and cost of the Federal Government, serious about dismantling a healthcare law that is doing more harm than good, and serious about paving the way to real reform that expands access to affordable coverage. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman TOM PRICE and all of our colleagues who serve on the House Committee on the Budget as well as those who serve on the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce. Their hard work has made it possible to send this important legislation to the President's desk. I am grateful for their efforts. Let's get on with it.

□ 1615

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member on the Select Investigative Panel on Planned Parenthood. She will be there looking after the interests of American women, I am pleased to say.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is a committee where I serve as the ranking Democratic member. We call it the Select Committee to Attack Women's Health.

Now, that select committee was formed last fall after hearings were held and at which the Republicans accused in inflammatory language that somehow Planned Parenthood had violated the law.

So these three committees that have already investigated Planned Parenthood have found absolutely nothing wrong with their activities. Yet, a select committee was appointed.

The kind of language that was used is exactly the language that the murderer at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado used. This kind of inflammatory language is used on one of the number one health providers for poor women in this country, and it is being attacked unnecessarily.

Now, I serve as the ranking member on that select committee. We will do everything we can to not only defend Planned Parenthood, but to stop these relentless attacks on women's health care in this country. It is shameful. Enough is enough.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a bill to restore America's healthcare freedom—yes, we do—one that will finally get to the President's desk.

This legislation seeks to protect folks in Michigan and all across the country from the rising costs, fewer choices, lost coverage, and countless broken promises that have defined the President's healthcare law.

Importantly, it would also give Congress time to enact better solutions focused on growing patient choice and improving patient care, lowering costs, providing States like Michigan greater flexibility, and promoting bottom-up 21st-century healthcare innovations.

The current healthcare law relies on outdated programs of the past and forces a one-size-fits-all approach on our States that is unresponsive to patient needs. Folks in Michigan deserve better. The American people deserve better. And you know what? We can do better.

I helped coauthor one commonsense plan to replace the health law. It is the Patient CARE Act. It is a pragmatic

solution—in fact, the only bicameral proposal that has been offered—that repeals the law and replaces it with patient-focused reforms that reduce healthcare costs and increase access to affordable, high-quality care.

We empower the American people to make the best healthcare choices for themselves and their families. It allows Governors the flexibility to best provide for their citizens, all while driving down costs and improving quality.

Under the proposal, no one can be denied coverage based on a preexisting condition. This proposal has other consumer protections as well. Insurance companies would be prohibited from imposing lifetime limits on a consumer. Dependents up to age 26 would be able to stay on their parents' plan, and guaranteed renewability would ensure that sick patients would be able to renew their coverage.

We also provide a refundable tax credit for the most vulnerable consumers to buy health coverage or healthcare services of their own choosing, not expensive insurance that Washington would force them to buy or face a penalty.

Michiganders covered under Medicaid today would also benefit. The reforms in the Patient CARE Act would make the Medicaid program more sustainable for taxpayers, and better management tools will make the program more efficient, fair, and accountable for everyone who depends on it.

This plan and the countless solutions offered by my Republican colleagues in Congress shines a spotlight on a better vision for health care, one focused on patients, families, doctors, and insurance.

This health law may have been enacted only a few years ago, but its government-centered premise is not a new one. These obsolete ideas have failed people time and time again. The public deserves a fresh, forward-looking approach that embraces 21st-century innovation.

So we have got a solution to restore America's healthcare freedom, to put ObamaCare in the rearview mirror and replace it with better healthcare solutions like the Patient CARE Act. It is time to put patients first. Let them make the choices, not the government.

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

With all due respect to Mr. UPTON and putting aside the merits of this bill, this is the 62nd time we are voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We have never seen a vote in this House on any kind of so-called substitute to the Affordable Care Act. Our Republican colleagues have been full of talk, and we haven't seen any action.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you how disappointed I am that we are not starting the new year here with fresh, new, bipartisan initiatives to create jobs and to move our economy forward.

I just feel like this is for auld lang syne. This is our 62nd vote to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. And, Mr. Speaker, I expect you to break out in a few verses of ''Auld Lang Syne'' anytime now.

Is it for auld lang syne that 22 million Americans might actually lose their health insurance if the President would somehow sign this into law?

Is it for auld lang syne that the Republicans and you, Mr. Speaker, are proposing that we attack women's health once again and take away the primary care physician for poor women, 4 out of 10 who say is their only source of health care?

Is it for auld lang syne that Planned Parenthood visitors—men and women—who have incomes of 150 percent or below the Federal poverty level will lose their health insurance?

Is it for auld lang syne that the 62nd repeal vote is taking place so that half of the health centers are in rural or medically underserved areas?

Let's get to work, Mr. Speaker, on fresh, new ideas and not auld lang syne.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PRICE for his leadership. I am very proud of the work that the committee has done to get us to this point—one vote away from this bill getting to the President's desk—because then the President will finally have a chance to right one of the wrongs which bears his name and to stop the horrific and unethical medical practices occurring at Planned Parenthood.

This reconciliation bill repeals a number of onerous taxes created by the Affordable Care Act. Taxes have slowed the economic recovery, which means ObamaCare literally keeps people in my district, whom I care deeply about, from getting jobs.

This bill represents the economic development bill the last speaker spoke of. And ObamaCare increases health insurance costs for most Americans. So instead of spending more on their families over Christmas, people in Indiana and all over this country paid more to insurance companies instead, all because of ObamaCare.

This repeal bill will save Americans $516 billion over the next 10 years, money they can spend as they see fit instead of how Washington Democrats dictated at the end of 2009. These are important steps to returning our healthcare system to us, where decisions are made by Americans and their doctors, not the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, in districts such as mine, many of the plans sold on the ObamaCare government exchange are classified as small or extra small, meaning that, in many cases, less than 10 percent of the doctors in the area are accessible to these families. This means that many Indiana families have had to give up their doctor and, in some cases, travel an hour or more just to get basic medical attention.

Timothy Gerking of Danville, Indiana, has seen his insurance costs for a family of three increase from $400 a month in 2012 to over $1,200 a month in 2016, along with higher deductibles and copays. How is he supposed to save for college for his kids? How is he supposed to plan for retirement if he is paying $14,000 a year in premiums?

This is all despite the President's promise that ''if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.'' That was an outright lie to the American people then, and ObamaCare is still one of the most insidious laws ever produced today.

The President now has a chance to correct the wrong that he and the Democrats have done to millions of Americans. I hope that opportunity is taken by him when it gets to his desk.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), a friend and colleague and the Democratic whip, who understands that providing health care to 22 million Americans who didn't have it is a good thing.

Mr. HOYER. The ranking member took the words right out of my mouth. There are 22 million Americans covered now that weren't covered before.

Mr. Speaker, The Wall Street Journal reported on Monday, ''House Speaker Paul Ryan, starting this month, will push to turn the Chamber into a platform for ambitious Republican policy ideas.''

My friend, Mr. UPTON, talked about policy ideas, but Mr. VAN HOLLEN correctly observed they are not on this floor. You haven't brought them to this floor. All you have brought is a negative. Bring a positive. That, presumably, is what your Speaker ought to be talking about.

Many have been wondering what new, ambitious ideas Republicans would put forward to kick off this new session of the 114th Congress. Well, today we have the answer, the 62nd effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which everybody knows is not going anywhere.

We have seen this fresh, new idea before. It is coupled with a vote to defund Planned Parenthood, which will deny millions of Americans access to affordable health care.

So not only by repealing the Affordable Care Act will we deny health care to people, but by doing what they are doing to Planned Parenthood, millions of people will not have access to the health care they are relying on.

What we have before us is not anything new. In fact, it is a repeal of health reform that goes even further than the Republicans brought to the House floor in October, this time also ending tax credits and subsidies that enable those with modest incomes to afford health insurance and repealing the expansion of Medicaid.

The reason there is not another bill on the floor is because people would then see how draconian the policies are. These are components of the Affordable Care Act that have enabled millions of previously uninsured Americans to gain coverage since 2010.

Senate Republicans took a bad bill and made it worse. I am disappointed that Speaker RYAN would bring it to the floor as his first major act of this new session of Congress.

This reconciliation bill would cause an estimated 22 million Americans, as the ranking member has pointed out, to lose their health care, would increase premiums by approximately 20 percent, would provide employers with much uncertainty, and worsen the outlook for deficits over the long term.

Only in the first 10-year window do you have a savings. The CBO says, if you go to the second 10 years, this bill is a loser and exacerbates the deficit.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this 62nd vote to repeal or undermine America's access to affordable, quality health care.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a fellow physician who is the chair of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank Dr. PRICE for the work his committee has done.

I practiced medicine in rural Tennessee for 30 years. I didn't talk about health care. I actually provided it for patients. It was a major reason that I ran for Congress.

The premise of the Affordable Care Act was to increase access and decrease costs. Everybody in this building agrees on that. What we got was a 2,500-page bill that few people read that defined what you bought and then fined you when you didn't buy it, even if you couldn't afford it. That is what has actually happened.

Healthcare decisions should be made between families, patients, and their doctors, not by big insurance companies and certainly not by Federal bureaucrats.

So what is happening to middle class working people in this country today? Their out-of-pockets and copays have skyrocketed. In the hospital that I worked in, 60 percent of the uncollectible debt is now owed by people with insurance. That is because they cannot afford the out-of-pockets and copays.

□ 1630

We Republicans have had many ideas. Dr. PRICE has a bill. I coauthored a bill with the Republican Study Committee to replace this, and I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you will see that on this floor to be debated if we are successful in doing this.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, we were told just a couple of months ago on the floor of this Congress that there is a new day in Congress. Well, it doesn't feel like a new day. It feels a lot like Groundhog Day.

I feel like Bill Murray from that early 1990s movie. I wake up, I shower, I get on a plane, I come to Washington, I plan on voting how to create jobs or help lift people's wages. Instead, I am voting on taking away health care from 22 million people.

The next week, I wake up, I shower, I get on a plane, I fly to Washington. What do I do? I vote on taking away health insurance for 22 million people.

Sixty-two times this body has voted to repeal health care. But we have also now made a new one of a dozen times we have now devoted to defund Planned Parenthood which, with this body's Speaker, in my home State of Wisconsin, means 62,000 women last year would not have gotten access to health insurance.

It is no wonder that with bad, recycled ideas like that, the public has such disdain for Congress. It is not a new day in Congress. It is just Groundhog Day.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a fellow healthcare professional, who is a member of both the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand Planned Parenthood's annual report, and in these pages, you will find the true war on women.

By their own numbers, taxpayer funding for this organization is up, while preventative healthcare services are down and abortions continue to stand at over 320,000 a year.

I am proud to support today's reconciliation bill to defund Planned Parenthood and to redirect those dollars to true preventative healthcare services for women, because Americans, and women, in particular, deserve better than this.

We may not be able to change the President's heart on this issue—goodness knows we have tried—but we can put him on record. If this President truly thinks that my constituents' tax dollars should fund this scandal-ridden abortion giant, that is on his conscience, but he should at least be forced to put a pen on paper and explain the belief to the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is reckless and has zero chance of becoming law. But most significantly, it is heartless. What it says from Republicans here to millions, an Unhappy New Year. You could take healthcare insurance away from 22 million people. To them, these 22 million, from Republicans, an Unhappy New Year.

It will repeal funding for Medicaid expansion in 30 States and the District of Columbia, leaving 14 million low-income Americans without health care. To those 14 million Americans, from House Republicans, an Unhappy New Year.

It would eliminate the tax credits for low-income families and individuals, a key part of what makes ACA affordable. It would eliminate the individual and employer mandates, undermining the patient protections and access measures that helped dramatically reduce the rate of uninsured in this country.

The Republicans are also using this bill to continue their ideological obsession with depriving women access to affordable family planning services and lifesaving cancer screenings by defunding Planned Parenthood.

This bill deserves not only the veto that is coming, but a ''no'' vote on the floor of this House.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a fellow physician and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank Chairman PRICE for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important day in the House of Representatives because the House is preparing to send a package directly to the President. There will be no Senate filibuster. We have gotten around that issue. This bill goes to the President directly, and he can either sign it or veto it. But this bill repeals the very foundation of ObamaCare, and it stops Planned Parenthood funding. It is as simple as that.

This package is also important to me because I have a provision in there that I authored that repeals this employer mandate. This has been a really bad piece of legislation that was in place, this employer mandate, because it has forced small businesses to limit hiring or to resort to part-time employees. This is just a terrible thing, at a time when unemployment has been high and people are looking for work.

This bill will help undermine and get rid of the foundation of ObamaCare which, I know as a physician, has accelerated the negative trends in health care, of which there are many. I can't get into all of them now, but that is not the affordable, patient-centered health care that the American people deserve.

We can do much better. We will do much better. This is the first step.

Let's put this on the President's desk. Let's call his hand, and let's either force him to veto this, which we will try to override it, or sign it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the President is going to mull over this decision for very long. He is going to veto this because the President doesn't want to deny 22

million Americans access to affordable care, which is exactly what the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office tells us is what this will do, and he doesn't want to deny access to health care to millions of women and families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, here we are again. It is a new year and a new session of Congress, but House Republicans are yet again up to their old partisan tricks.

Today, House Republicans have chosen to spend the first week of 2016 attacking women's health with a radical GOP reconciliation bill which would defund Planned Parenthood and strip away affordable family planning services and lifesaving care for millions of women across the country.

Overall, this is the 11th time the House majority has voted to attack women's health in this Congress, including 4 prior votes to defund Planned Parenthood. Meanwhile, it is also the 62nd repeal vote of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, this reconciliation bill is futile. It is political. It is unfortunate. We have a lot of work to do to help working families in this country, and today's bill reverses great progress in healthcare coverage and access and increases the deficit.

In fact, CBO estimates that this extreme legislation would increase the uninsured by about 22 million Americans after 2017. We also know that, if defunded, Planned Parenthood's 2.7 million patients would be left without care, resulting in dangerous consequences.

Just look at what is happening in States that have already implemented this radical agenda. In Indiana, such policies led to an HIV epidemic, and in Texas, it left tens of thousands of women without access to contraceptive care and increased incidences of life-threatening at-home abortions.

We can't allow the rest of the country to go down this dangerous path, all because of the ideological and political whims of politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on about the consequences of this bill, but driven by an extreme agenda, Republican policies are harmful, and they have to be rejected. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), who has been a champion for patient-centered health care and is the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the lie of the year for 2013 was that dubious phrase, ''If you like your health care, you can keep it.'' We know that the deception has become obvious. And what we do know is that 7 million Americans lost their employer-sponsored health insurance because of the ObamaCare bill.

We also know how harmful this has been to seniors; $700 billion was raided, raided from Medicare, the Medicare trust fund, by the way.

What we know from our constituents is that when they go to the exchanges and shop, they end up with a product that—we are even hearing from the insurance companies. There is one of them that says they never should have been there and they are probably going to pull out next year and the product is too expensive to afford and too expensive to use. Premiums are up by double digits in a single year. Out-of-pocket costs are soaring.

This is why having an ObamaCare insurance card does not give you access to affordable health care. It does not give you access to affordable health care. It is, indeed, unaffordable.

We know the injury will continue to hardworking Americans. That is why we stand united today in supporting the reconciliation bill and the repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, the same fraudulent bill being brought out here again.

The gentleman from Michigan says that they have a plan. They have a plan. We have been waiting 5 years for you to bring that plan to the floor and let us have a vote on it.

There is no plan that you are willing to bring to the floor because you do not care about the American people and their health security. Taking it away from 22 million people and assaulting women with this bill is simply clear evidence that you do not care what happens.

Now, you may think this is good election year politics. But back in the States, the Republicans—even the Governor of Kentucky, a Republican, has decided, you know, I don't want to take it away from people who are on Medicaid.

We tried this in Washington. We already know that if you leave in place the requirement that insurance companies give insurance to people, no matter what their healthcare state is, you are going to sink the individual market. We lost it in the State of Washington, and you are sentencing the whole country to that. Besides, you have said you want the repeal vote to be on the 22nd. You know it is going nowhere.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the good, hard work that his committee did for bringing this bill to the floor.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, this is something that we have been talking about doing for a long time, but now we have the opportunity to have a vote on the House floor that will send a bill to President Obama's desk that actually guts ObamaCare and defunds Planned Parenthood.

This is something very important to people all across the country. But this is something that allows us through the reconciliation process, which is a rare opportunity.

There have been a lot of really good bills that this House has passed to address problems, whether it is getting the economy back on track, whether it is pushing back on so many of the radical agenda items, through regulatory actions, through executive actions that this President has done to try to circumvent the Constitution and Congress, and they go over to the Senate, and Senate Democrats filibuster the bill. And because of their archaic rules that require 60 votes just to bring a bill up, so many of those bills don't even come up for debate, Mr. Speaker.

So the budget process of reconciliation gives us one opportunity a year, if we are able to come together and agree on a budget, which this House and Senate did. We came to agreement, in fact, on a budget that gets to balance in the 10-year window for the first time since 2002. And it also gives us that one opportunity to move a bill through, not just the House, but through the Senate with a majority vote, rather than 60 votes.

Why that is so important, Mr. Speaker, is it allows us to finally put on President Obama's desk this important question. This President needs to be confronted with this, and he will now be confronted with the question about addressing his failed healthcare law that has denied health care to millions of people, that has resulted in double-digit increases for so many others. In my home State of Louisiana, we are seeing over 20 percent increases because of this failed law.

And then also, to defund Planned Parenthood. That bill will now go to his desk with this important vote.

□ 1645

It is a historic vote. I would encourage the President to sign this bill. It would be an important landmark moment in his Presidency. If he vetoes it, it shows the country just what is at stake if you have a President that is willing to do this for the American people.

I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I look forward to this vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, yes, that would be important to show that we have a President that doesn't want

to eliminate affordable health care for 22 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Democrats in Congress begin the new year with a renewed commitment to working families across this great country and a commitment to standing up to the special interests that hold so much sway here in Washington, D.C. In contrast, House Republicans begin the new year with the first vote that is a vote against women, a vote against women's health, and a vote to target Planned Parenthood all rolled into one.

Now, women across this country will not forget the coordinated smear campaign against Planned Parenthood last year that was based upon false, manufactured videos full of distortions and misinformation.

We will not forget how Republicans in Congress acted in concert with the shady group and used the controversy to eliminate family planning support and vital cancer screenings for women across the country. It is especially troubling that my GOP colleagues begin the year targeting folks who really need the help the most: working families, young women, and women of color.

While Republicans choose to start the year this way, what I hear from women, parents, moms, and dads at home is that they want greater economic security and greater personal security. That is what Congress should be focused on in 2016, not an attack on women's health.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote to repeal the President's healthcare law. It is a law that the American people have opposed from the very beginning when it was passed without bipartisan support. The American people opposed it even when the President promised that they could keep their coverage and their doctor. They also opposed it when that promise was broken. They opposed it when the law taxed their health insurance and the medical devices that help them live longer, healthier lives.

Today the American people still oppose the President's healthcare law because it makes them pay higher premiums for policies with deductibles that are too expensive. That is why today, 6 years after it was passed, we are voting to send a repeal of this law to the President's desk. This repeal will save the government $500 billion over the next 10 years and empower people to make their own healthcare choices.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone listens carefully when our colleagues say that it will save money over the next 10 years, because the Congressional Budget Office says this will actually lose the taxpayer money over the longer term. We all hope to live and have our children live in the longer term.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Ranking Member, through the Chair, this is nonreconciliation if I have ever seen it.

The Affordable Care Act pulling back from Medicaid expansion, do you know what that means? Have you examined what that will do? It will take away essential tax credits that the law provides to help the middle class and middle class families purchase health insurance.

Here we are repealing the ACA for the umpteenth time. In addition to cutting off funding for Planned Parenthood, the new version of the bill which came back from the Senate would also prohibit Medicaid from paying for services at Planned Parenthood. Because Federal law strictly prohibits Federal Medicaid dollars from being used to pay for abortions, regardless of how you try to get that message out and convey this nonfact, that is not the fact. This addition would specifically prohibit payments to Planned Parenthood for healthcare services like preventive health exams.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I contend that that is un-American. Read my lips. Cancer screenings. I contend that that is un-American. And you have nothing in your budget, and you have nothing in your so-called plan—which dematerialized before it materialized—that would take care of these folks.

And the subject of birth control, since you like to talk about it all the time, that, to me, is un-American. That, to me, reduces freedom in the greatest country on the planet.

So what will we come up with? In a bill that came before us without regular order—you tout all the time that we need regular order, we have got to go through the process and get the bill in front of us—this did not go through the process. This committee that you had was a joke. You know it and I know it.

So what a spirit of reconciliation, what a horror—what a horror—being projected on the American people. It is too bad. It is not a good way to start the new year, and I am not hopeful for the future.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a productive member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman PRICE, for your tremendous leadership on this and many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, the first ObamaCare repeal bill that Congress sends to the President's desk since the law's enactment in 2010.

This bill effectively repeals mandates and taxes at the very heart of the law and saves taxpayers nearly half a trillion dollars over the next decade, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Our action here in the House today is an important step toward replacing ObamaCare with patient-centric solutions that lower healthcare costs, protect jobs, and allow Americans to keep their doctors and their health care if they like them.

To be clear, there is more work that needs to be done to make full repeal and replacement a reality, but our congressional efforts today provide important momentum to help make that a reality in 2017 with a new President.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3762.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The House is yet to take another vote in 60 seconds to demonstrate its relentless fixation on systematically destroying the Affordable Care Act. More specifically, we must vote on a budget reconciliation package that, if enacted, will take away healthcare access for millions of Americans.

This isn't a new exercise. In addition to the 61 unproductive votes, futile lawsuits have been brought in courts, and meritless attacks have been mounted with the goal of destroying the progress we have made. And we have made progress improving a system that didn't work for American families before the Affordable Care Act.

Since the enactment of the law: over 17 million uninsured Americans have gained insurance; young people can stay on their parents' policies until age 26; healthcare costs are growing more slowly today than in past decades; annual checkups are not subject to deductibles; an insurance company can't charge you more for just being a woman; we are in the process of closing the prescription drug doughnut hole; and if you want to change jobs or start a business or start a family, you have healthcare options even if you have a preexisting condition.

That is the progress we have made. Despite that progress, the legislation before us turns the clock back on all of that progress. I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the work that the chairman has done. I know he is chairman of the Budget Committee, but before he stood on this floor, he was a doctor. He is still a doctor today, and I know the passion that he brings to bring the right type of reform for a medical system that actually works in this country. That is why today is so important not just to him, but to all of us.

We have worked hard—I would say relentlessly—to make that day happen. Yes, we fought to delay, defund, and actually repeal ObamaCare. This law is a failure. We know it, and I know all of you on the other side of the aisle know it as well. Twelve co-ops have failed. State exchanges are failing. No matter where you stood on this issue, you went home and you heard from your constituents.

Now, if you voted for it, you are going to have to answer to the President's promises, because he just didn't promise a few in this room. He promised all Americans. Do you remember what he said? He said: ''If you like your healthcare plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period.'' He also said, Mr. Speaker: ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period.'' Mr. Speaker, he also said ObamaCare would ''lower premiums by up to $2,500 for a typical family per year.''

Those are direct quotes—it is just that not one of them came to fruition.

Now, I know what I will hear on the other side of the aisle, and they probably won't mention this, but on this floor, Republicans and Democrats joined together to dismantle the employer and individual mandates. In a bipartisan fashion, we delayed the medical device tax. In a bipartisan fashion—a lot delivered from the other side—we delayed the Cadillac tax, cut funding to the healthcare rationing board, and stopped the taxpayer bailout of insurance companies.

Many of our attempts have been successful in undoing key parts of this law. But today, for the very first time, we send a bill repealing ObamaCare to the President's desk.

Also, after watching the horrific videos of Planned Parenthood employees casually discussing the sale of infants' organs, we knew something had to be done. Something had to be done to make sure taxpayers were not forced to support organizations that engage in such inhumane practices. Today we send a bill to the President's desk that ends taxpayer funding for abortion coverage and abortion providers like Planned Parenthood.

No matter where you go in this country, no matter whom you talk to, no matter what party they belong to, they know things are wrong in this country. People are hurting under ObamaCare, human life is being disregarded, and now Congress will put it to the President and hold him accountable for the terrible policies this administration has pursued.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any delusions. For the sake of the American people and too many unborn children, I hope the President signs this bill. But the President has made his position very clear. No matter how wrong he is, he will veto any bill that repeals ObamaCare or defunds Planned Parenthood. If he does, we will vote to override.

I, and I know many of my colleagues, have worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to persuade them to join with us. We asked them to join us and stand with the American people against ObamaCare and against taxpayer funding of the abortion industry. But no matter how the override vote ends up, what we are doing today is still important. When a Republican President takes office next year, Mr. Speaker, we can use reconciliation again. We won't have to worry about a veto from the White House, and we can overcome any attempts by the Democrats to filibuster and obstruct.

You see, from the foundation of this bill and from the work of many colleagues in the medical community and doctors that serve as Members of Congress, we will create a patient-centered healthcare system that gives power to the people, not to bureaucrats in Washington.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why today is important, because with this bill we can do it—this year or the next, but we will.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, who said that they have worked hard and relentlessly to make this day happen—a day that would eliminate affordable health care to 22 million Americans.

□ 1700

I want to make sure all of our colleagues understand that this is not a fact coming from the Democrats. There is the saying that you are entitled to your own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

That is a fact that came from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In fact, they were responding to a letter from Mr. PRICE, the chairman of the Budget Committee. The letter reads:

> Dear Mr. Chairman, At your request, CBO and the staff of the joint committee have estimated the budgetary effects of this bill.

It goes on to say:

> And analyze the bill.

It is their conclusion on page 9 of the letter to the chairman:

> Enacting H.R. 3762 would increase the number of people without health insurance coverage. Relative to current law projections—

That means relevant to the current law with the Affordable Care Act in place.

> would reduce by about 22 million people in most years after 2017.

That is a fact. That is signed by the director of CBO, Keith Hall, who, as everybody in this body knows, was selected on a bipartisan basis by the chairman of the House Budget Committee and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, both Republicans. That is a fact.

It is a sad state of affairs when we are ''celebrating'' the fact that they ''worked relentlessly'' to get to the point to eliminate affordable care to 22 million Americans.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), somebody who understands the importance of affordable health care and is also a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his statement in pointing out that this is not really a legislative issue. This is a Republican partisan issue where people have waited for years for this moment to destroy a bill to put 22 million people out of reach of medical care.

They are striking over $1 trillion from the bill. They are being critical of the bill. They didn't say their moment in the Sun was to provide a better bill. No. They say, if you go back home, you are going to hear complaints.

Well, President Obama went back home to the American people and was campaigning for ObamaCare and they reelected him. Now we are saying that these 22 million people—do you think they are not going to get health care?

You bet your sweet life on this country they are going to get care, not the quality care that ObamaCare would provide for them, but they will be going to emergency rooms. They will get more sick. They will end up in the hospitals. It will cost us much more than the so-called trillion dollars we have.

Well, thank God we do have a government where the President can say no. Thank God we also have a Constitution that says you don't have enough votes to override what is constitutionally and morally the right thing to do.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire once again the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a wonderful member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just mentioned that this is a partisan issue. This was a partisan issue back in 2009 when it was passed. This was forced through against the will of the American people. That is why you have seen over the past several elections that the American people want a repeal of ObamaCare and that we start over with patient-centered free-market health care.

The fact is that I was at a Cracker Barrel a couple of weeks ago. I was talking to the waitress. The waitress

approached me and she said: You know, ObamaCare was supposed to help me. She said: My premiums have gone up. They have doubled. My out-of-pocket expenses have gone from $500 to $5,000. She said: ObamaCare is not helping me.

This is a story that we have heard time and time again. ObamaCare hasn't helped the American people. It has put a greater burden on the American people. Doctors are supposed to provide health care, not ObamaCare, not the Federal Government. This should be a relationship between the American people and the doctor that they choose, the doctor that they were promised that they could keep.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this reconciliation package is the right thing at the right time for our country. We need to start over. We need to fix our healthcare system rather than prolonging and continuing to enforce a Big Government agenda on the American people.

I ask the Members of this House to support this legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which would push health coverage beyond the reach of millions of Americans.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that enacting this legislation could result in roughly 22 million more people living without health insurance. These people are single parents struggling to cover basic necessities, young adults trying to launch their careers and start families, and hardworking couples for whom the cost of insurance won't fit in the monthly budget.

Without affordable health coverage, these Americans will be living with perpetual fear, fear that they will need to choose between paying for housing or food and getting treatment, and fear that any medical emergency could lead them into bankruptcy.

To make things worse, this bill defunds Planned Parenthood, which would undermine access to reproductive health services and preventive care for women. That is not only wrong, it is counterproductive.

It is unfortunate that, at the start of a new year, we are debating a regressive proposal that would make the lives of some of our most vulnerable friends and neighbors even less secure.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will acknowledge that this bill is irresponsible and join me in voting ''no.''

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a fellow Georgian and a freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his great work on this important legislation.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015. This legislation will dismantle ObamaCare and defund Planned Parenthood.

This bill guts ObamaCare's individual and employer mandates and repeals the costly Cadillac and medical device taxes. It protects society's most innocent—the unborn—and also provides additional funding for community health centers so that women can continue to have access to the quality care they deserve.

We need to expand patient choice. We need to give the American people choice. We need to make health care more affordable by offering patient-centered and cost-effective reforms. Most of all, we need to give a voice to the voiceless.

This is a historic moment. After passing the House today, the bill will go straight to the President's desk and President Obama will be forced to vote on repealing ObamaCare and defunding Planned Parenthood for the first time. He will have to choose between dismantling a costly and disastrous law and preventing disregard for human life or protecting his own political legacy.

Colleagues in the House, please join me and vote in favor of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, after drafting and passing a trillion-dollar deficit-busting tax and budget bill last month, my Republican colleagues now want to get some of that money back on the backs of middle- and low-income Americans.

These are the very people that have been struggling to recover from the Great Recession. These families and small businesses that are having trouble staying afloat would now lose access to affordable health care. It is irresponsible.

I don't get it. The Affordable Care Act gives millions a hand up, not a handout, in order to afford affordable health care. Families are put in the driver's seat in the health insurance market and are seeing good results.

This is something we have been doing in Oregon for some time. Market-based principles and personal responsibility is actually the heart of the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why we would want to create greater uncertainty for small businesses, trying to do the right thing by their employees, by eliminating the small business tax credit, like my Republican colleagues want to do today.

Rather than waste time on distractions like this, we should be coming together to build certainty around the basic American right of a shared-responsibility healthcare system.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a diligent and productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is hurting people by reducing choices, increasing costs, and making it harder for people to access quality, affordable healthcare. That is why I am proud to stand here today to support a bill that dismantles key provisions of ObamaCare and paves the way for better healthcare solutions.

The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act stops the government from forcing its citizens to buy expensive healthcare plans they don't want or need. It saves Americans money by eliminating many of the ObamaCare taxes.

Additionally, this bill stops taxpayer funding for abortion providers such as Planned Parenthood. This one abortion provider receives over half a billion taxpayer dollars a year even though it has been involved in the harvesting and selling of baby body parts.

It is time to stop all tax dollars flowing to abortionists and redirect it to healthcare providers who care for women without taking innocent life.

Congress is listening to the people's calls. Now it will be up to the President to decide, does he support the people and women's health or does he support Washington mandates and tax dollars going to Planned Parenthood.

I urge the President to do the right thing and sign this into law.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), for his leadership. I also thank my good friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I now understand what the issue is. We are talking apples and oranges. My friends on the other side of the aisle don't care about the fact that, in 2013, 18 percent of Americans were uninsured; in the State of Texas, 28 percent; California, 23 percent; and Georgia, 22 percent.

Now we have found that we are at a point where we have lowered that amount and we have lowered the uninsured rate in this country to 11.9 percent. Those are vulnerable Americans and women and families.

We also don't seem to understand that, when our constituents come to us and talk about premiums, all we need to do is do the constituency service and kind of assure them and show them the direction into the marketplace because, in shopping around, you can lower your premium.

But the real issue is whether or not we care about making sure that those with preexisting conditions can actually get health insurance, that those in Medicare can actually protect the Medicare system and make it insolvent in 2030 instead of 2017.

The other question is: Does this bill even have a plan? Is there an alternative healthcare plan that the Republicans have put in the budget reconciliation? No, they have not.

Then they want to take away Planned Parenthood. This is not about disliking Planned Parenthood. It is telling women that they do not have a choice to choose their own doctors. That is what they are doing when they defund Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, it is apples and oranges. They are talking one thing. I am talking about saving lives and helping Americans keep their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

In 1949, Harry Truman became the first sitting President to propose universal healthcare for all Americans as part of the ''Fair Deal.''

On March 23, 2010, President Obama aided by a Democratic Congress delivered on this promise.

Before the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 50 million people in the United States had no health insurance coverage, with many losing insurance as a result of the recent recession.

This is the 62nd vote by the GOP since its enactment to end the Affordable Care Act law.

In 2013, key provisions of the Affordable Care Act began to take effect and have significantly improved the lives of millions of Americans.

In 2013, the states with the highest percentage of uninsured were: Texas with 28.8 percent; Louisiana with 24 percent; Nevada with 23.3 percent; California with 23.2 percent; Florida with 22.8 percent; Georgia with 22.5 percent; Arkansas with 21.9 percent; Mississippi with 21.7 percent; and Oklahoma with 21.4 percent.

In 2013, when Gallup first began tracking health insurance coverage just before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, the number of persons not insured has declined by 5.2 points.

Gallup reported that the percentage of uninsured Americans increased from nearly 14 percent in 2008 to over 17 percent in 2011, and peaked at 18.0 percent in 2013.

According to Gallup the uninsured rate among U.S. adults declined to 11.9 percent for the first quarter of 2015, but this fact has not deterred efforts by the GOP of the House to end this important lifesaving law.

Mr. Speaker, this steady decline in the number of Americans without health insurance means that today only about 10 percent of our citizens do not have coverage.

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the Districts of many members on both sides of this argument. Texas, my own state, leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents.

The highest concentrations of the uninsured are the poor and unemployed.

The uninsured rate among Americans has dropped sharply since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, which provides: access to healthcare to the poor through expansion of Medicaid; prevents health insurance companies from denying healthcare coverage based on pre-existing conditions; stops health insurance companies from discriminating against women by charging them higher rates for coverage, and extends the time children can remain on their parents' health insurance to age 26.

The Affordable Care Act provides to states at no cost options for residents to enroll in healthcare programs through Medicaid.

Unfortunately, some states like my state of Texas have rejected this important component of the Affordable Care Act for those in the state in most need of healthcare.

Instead of focusing on protecting and caring for the health of our constituents, we are allowing partisan games to interfere with serving the best interest of our Districts.

At the end of healthcare insurance enrollment for 2015, more than 8.5 million consumers signed-up for health coverage through the HealthCare.gov platform or had their coverage automatically renewed.

Of the about 6 million Marketplace consumers whose coverage was renewed, about 3.6 million actively renewed and 2.4 million consumers automatically renewed their health insurance coverage.

The 2015 health insurance enrollment period had 29 percent new participants and 71 percent return participants.

In my state of Texas 1,096,868 individual plans were selected by visitors to the HealthCare.gov platform.

In 2015, unfortunately Texas remains the state with the highest health uninsured rate among the 50 states, with 25.7 percent or over 4.2 million residents without health insurance.

Instead of focusing on the issues that the American people want addressed, we are having the same discussion to repeal the Affordable Care Act in the efforts of my colleagues to repeal, obstruct and undermine this law.

What is even more frustrating is that while there is so much energy in trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there has been no plan or suggestions posed on how to replace it.

I want to once again highlight the benefits of the Affordable Care Act so we can once and for all end the attempts to try and repeal this law that benefits so many Americans.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans are seeing lower costs, better coverage, and patient protections that Republicans want to repeal:

The average premium for employer-provided family health coverage went up 3 percent in 2014, continuing the trend of lower annual increase, which means that over the 5 years the healthcare law has been in place it has saved employers over $1,800 dollars in premiums for employee family health insurance coverage.

Medicare spending growth per beneficiary was approximately flat in fiscal year 2014, a significant contributor to extending the solvency of the program.

The Medicare Trustee now projects because of the Affordable Care Act that the Medicare Trust Fund will be solvent until 2030 instead of 2017.

Health insurance consumers have saved 9 billion since 2011 because Obamacare requires insurance companies to spend 80 cents on every premium dollar on consumer healthcare and empowers States to review and negotiate premium increases.

129 million Americans, including 17 million children, are no longer at risk of losing health insurance coverage because of their health.

76 million Americans with private coverage are eligible for expanded preventative services coverage, which includes 30 million women and 18 million children.

Since the Affordable Care Act went into effect insurers have paid customers over $1.9 billion in rebates because they did not spend 80 cents on each dollar of premium on healthcare.

Nationwide, nearly 11.7 million consumers selected a plan or were automatically enrolled in Marketplace coverage.

In 2014, of the 5 million uninsured Texans: 874,000 are eligible for Medicaid/CHIP; 1,046,000 are in the coverage gap; 1,756,000 are eligible for tax credits; 1,264,000 are ineligible because of their income or access to employer benefits.

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self-employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage became easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges.

In Texas, 1,205,174 consumers selected or were automatically re-enrolled in quality, affordable health insurance coverage through the Marketplace as of February 2015.

The Federal Marketplace Signups and Tax Credits in Texas meant that: 85 percent of Texas consumers who were signed up qualified for an average tax credit of $239 per month through the Marketplace. 68 percent of Texas Marketplace enrollees obtained coverage for $100 or less after any applicable tax credits in 2015, and 92 percent had the option of doing so.

In Texas, consumers could choose from 15 issuers in the Marketplace in 2015—up from 12 in 2014.

Texas consumers could choose from an average of 31 health plans in their county for 2015 coverage—up from 25 in 2014.

468,797 consumers in Texas under the age of 35 are signed up for Marketplace coverage (39 percent of plan selections in the state); and

348,593 consumers 18 to 34 years of age (29 percent of all plan selections) are signed up for Marketplace coverage.

Texas has received $1,000,000 in grants for research, planning, information technology development, and implementation of its Marketplace.

Open enrollment for 2016 coverage runs from November 1, 2015 to January 31, 2016.

There are now one stop marketplaces where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice.

There are also opportunities for small employers to form pools to use their collective bargaining potential to find the best deals for employee health plans.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it has work that should be taken up to increase financial security for workers, their families and communities as the economy continues to recover, and not play partisan political games.

I urge my Colleagues to put partisan politics aside and join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a champion of the pro-life community.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his great work on this bill.

Subsidized by over $500 million taxpayer dollars each year, Planned Parenthood dismembers or chemically poisons a baby to death every 2 minutes, killing over 7 million innocent children since 1973.

Planned Parenthood is Child Abuse, Incorporated. Now undercover videos have exposed in numbing candor several high-level Planned Parenthood leaders gleefully talking about procuring children's internal organs for a price, all while altering gruesome dismemberment procedures to preserve intact livers, hearts, and lungs from freshly killed babies.

Far too many politicians, Mr. Speaker, including our Nobel Peace Prize-winning President and much of the media, continue to ignore, trivialize, and even defend these gross human rights abuses.

So know this: We will not be deterred in exposing this Planned Parenthood scandal no matter how aggressive and misleading the cover-up.

End taxpayer funding to those who commit these cruel and inhumane acts in this subsidy for Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act and urge all of my colleagues to vote to dismantle Obamacare by repealing the most damaging aspects of this egregiously flawed law.

The legislation before us today will send a strong message on behalf of the millions of Americans who lost or were forced to switch their healthcare coverage and/or doctors, as well as those facing additional charges, higher copayments, and larger annual fees as a result of Obamacare.

I have supported, and the House has passed, legislation to repeal Obamacare in its entirety many times but today's vote is different. Through the reconciliation process, which allows for expedited consideration and a simple majority vote in the Senate, today's bill will be placed on the President's desk. The President will have to decide if he stands on the side of the American people or continues the misguided policies squeezing middle class families.

In particular, the bill repeals the individual mandate—where American are coerced into purchasing expensive insurance packages many do not want or need, and many cannot afford.

Unfortunately for the millions who cannot afford to purchase Obamacare insurance, the penalties are expensive too.

According to a Kaiser Family Foundation report issued last month, this year the penalty for noncompliance will spike 47%, up from $661 in 2015 to a whopping $969.

The report also states that for 7.1 million uninsured Americans, the penalty is still cheaper than the least expensive insurance option available to them through Obamacare. Since the law did little to address affordability and the increasing cost of obtaining coverage, the federal government—the IRS, no less—will now take money out of the pockets and pocketbooks of Americans, further penalizing the uninsured.

The President and Obamacare supporters promised otherwise, but health insurance still remains out of reach for many Americas. Additionally, those who had quality affordable coverage that they were comfortable with have seen unwelcome changes that they likely would not have had to face—but for Obamacare.

The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act will also—fully and permanently—repeal two misguided tax increases harming businesses, innovation and middle-class Americans: the excise tax on employer-sponsored health insurance, aka "the Cadillac tax," and the medical device tax.

This legislation moves us a step forward in the process of repealing Obamacare's mandates, tax hikes and slush funds and begins undoing the damage inflicted on individuals, businesses, our economy and our national debt. But we can do more to address these inadequacies of our healthcare system and provide alternative reforms and solutions.

We have the ability to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable, high-quality health care. I am a longtime supporter of a number of positive reforms that can replace Obamacare including: reforming the private health insurance market so patients and their doctors are in charge of medical decisions; encouraging healthy behaviors; incentivizing innovation; ensuring insurance portability and the availability of high-risk pools; reforming Medicare to be a model of efficiency; modernizing the tax code to make health insurance more affordable; and strengthening the health care safety net so no one is left out.

Finally, the bill before the House today defunds Planned Parenthood. Subsidized by over $500 million taxpayers' dollars each year, Planned Parenthood dismembers or chemically poisons a baby to death every two minutes—killing over 7 million innocent children since 1973.

Planned Parenthood is "Child Abuse Inc."

Now, undercover videos have exposed in numbing candor, several high level Planned Parenthood leaders gleefully talking about procuring children's internal organs for a price all while altering gruesome dismemberment procedures to preserve "intact" livers, hearts and lungs from freshly killed babies.

Far too many politicians including our Nobel Peace Prize winning President and much of the media continue to ignore, trivialize—even defend—these gross human rights abuses.

So know this: we will not be deterred in exposing this Planned Parenthood scandal, no matter how aggressive and misleading the cover-up.

End taxpayer funding to those who commit these cruel and inhumane acts.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we ended the 2015 Congress working together with a tax extender package that I voted for that gave relief to the medical device folks in an omnibus bill.

But we are back, and there you go again trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, taking health care away from people and taking Planned Parenthood, which gives people who are poor and live in areas where there is not other healthcare opportunities—taking away from them the opportunity for preventive health care.

□ 1715

The last time this was tried in Tennessee, there was a 1,400 percent cut in women getting preventative care. That is just not right. We just came through Hanukkah and Christmas, and we ought to think a little bit about what Hanukkah and Christmas were about and what Moses and Jesus would be about. I think they would be about saving lives and about giving everybody an opportunity to live, not patient-centric health care, but people living and getting health care like every other civilized, industrialized country in the world provides for its people.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a conscientious U.S. Member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for America because we will finally send this bill to the President's desk.

The ''Unaffordable Care Act'' is bad for the American people because it is contributing to the bankruptcy of our country while doing little to provide Americans with better health care.

Mr. Speaker, I have constituents who used to have health insurance but who no longer do because their premiums are too high. Now they have no insurance, and the only thing to show for it is a fine from the IRS. Medicaid expansion is a blueprint for single-payer, government-run health care. As an engineer, I can assure you that, if you start with a bad blueprint, you will get bad results.

Instead of expanding Medicaid for able-bodied, working-age adults, the administration should work with us to fix the broken traditional Medicaid program, which is intended for those who most need it: the elderly, the disabled, and children. In 2014, there were 38.2 million nondisabled Americans between the ages of 18 and 64 who were not working at all. More than they need Medicaid expansion, they need progrowth economic policies that will foster good jobs so they can simply work and provide for themselves and their families.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, 62 times we have now voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Let me contrast what we are about to do in the next few minutes with the manner in which Democrats handled the Medicare part D prescription drug benefit. We voted against it. We opposed it. We became the majority, and we improved it. That is the reality of legislating. We closed the doughnut hole. We took a very difficult piece of legislation—largely resisted on their side as well—and became the majority and asked: How can we singularly improve this legislation so that it has broad appeal for the American people? Today, people take it for granted. They just accept the idea that the prescription drug bill works for all members of the American family. Instead, this is the 62nd time of repealing this for the purpose of political

messaging, with no alternative ever provided—not once.

I hope the media members will use the contrast that I have just outlined about the prescription drug legislation in Medicare part D with what the Republicans are doing, once again today, with no hope other than that of trying to win political points in messaging.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if he has any further speakers.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

We finished the debate, really, where we began, which is, on this first day back of 2016, we are really revisiting the battles of the past, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and others have said.

We heard from the Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, that they had worked hard for this day. We know from the nonpartisan Director of the Congressional Budget Office that, apparently, what our Republican colleagues worked so hard to do was to take affordable health care away from 22 million Americans. At the same time, we have heard all sorts of misinformation and distortions on this floor about Planned Parenthood, which is an organization that provides women and their families with health care, that provides cancer screenings, and that provides family planning.

On national television, when asked whether there was any evidence that Planned Parenthood had broken any law, even Republican Chairman CHAFFETZ of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, who investigated Planned Parenthood, said: ''No, I'm not suggesting that they broke the law.'' In fact, that was the finding of other committees here. Yet, our Republican colleagues have now set up a witch hunt, special committee to go after Planned Parenthood. Ironically, they claim to be doing an investigation, but here on the floor, they have, obviously, already reached a conclusion and have decided to defund an organization that helps provide health care to American women and families.

So, rolled into one bill, you have something that would deny access to health care to 22 million Americans and, at the same time, deny important health services to millions of American women and their families.

When our Republican colleagues pose this question and say that the President is going to be faced with a tough choice, I can assure them it is not a tough choice for the President, because it is not a tough choice when it comes to whether or not we take affordable health care away from 22 million Americans. That should be an easy choice for all of us. We are not going to do it. It also shouldn't be a tough choice as to whether or not we defund Planned Parenthood and the services they provide to American women and families. That is not going to be a tough choice for the President.

The Republican leader was absolutely right when he talked about the consequences of the 2016 elections, because we are fortunate that, today, we have a President who will not sign that bill but who will, instead, veto that bill. Our colleagues are absolutely right. If you had a different President, including, as far as I know, all of them on the Republican side, they would be signing this bill. So this is an important statement of what our Republican colleagues think is the top priority on the first day of 2016, which is to get rid of affordable health care for 22 million Americans.

Let's talk about that with the American public because I believe that the American public wants to do what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) said: Where we find problems and where we need to make adjustments, we should do it, but we shouldn't turn back the clock and deny affordable health care to tens of millions of Americans.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It seems, whenever we have a serious issue to talk about on the floor, the distortions and the utter false statements come out, and that is a shame because the American people deserve better.

ObamaCare is harming real people, not just from an economic standpoint across this great land but from a healthcare standpoint. As a physician, I can tell you that I hear about it daily from my colleagues. We hear from the other side of folks who tout the numbers of increase and of folks who have gained insurance. The fact of the matter is, of the folks who have gained insurance and of those who had insurance, many of them now have coverage, but they don't have care. If you earn $30,000, $40,000, or $50,000 and if your deductible is now $5,000 or $10,000 or $12,000, you may have coverage, but you don't have care. In fact, individuals are denying themselves treatment right now because they can't afford the deductibles because of this law. That is the real world out there. That is the harm that this law is doing.

We heard over and over and over that we want to remove healthcare coverage from 22 million people. That is utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely not true. In fact, my friend from Maryland quoted the CBO report, and he quoted it accurately, but he skipped over—kind of glossed over—the part that said that this would be relative to current law projections. That is right. We want to repeal this law, and we want to replace it with positive, commonsense, patient-centered solutions that put patients and families and doctors in charge of health care, not Washington, D.C., solutions that respect the principles of health care: accessibility for everybody, affordability for everybody, choices, and higher quality care—the things that ObamaCare has destroyed. That is why the majority of the American people don't like this law and oppose this law. It is because it destroys the principles of health care that the American people hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step and the next step in the process of repealing ObamaCare and of making certain that we move forward with positive, patient-centered solutions in which patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions and not the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3762, the Senate-Passed GOP Reconciliation Bill, appropriately dubbed the "Taking Health Coverage Away from Millions of Americans and Attacking Women's Health Care Act."

This measure marks the 62nd House vote to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act.

It is the 11th time the House has voted this Congress to attack women's health care.

Make no mistake: champions of these damaging, reactionary policies are putting politics over people and undermining the fundamental notion that health care is not a privilege, but a right.

It is unfortunate that, instead of using this time to advance legislation that improves our health care system, we are again engaging in another futile attempt to cut off funding for Planned Parenthood and put women's health at risk, disinvest in public health and chronic disease prevention, and roll back coverage gains, consumer protections, and reforms advanced by the Affordable Care Act.

This Reconciliation measure flies in face of patient access and good governance.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this damaging legislation will lead to an estimated 22 million Americans losing their health insurance after 2017.

Among its many nefarious provisions, H.R. 3762 is designed to halt Medicaid expansion.

This would devastate millions of hard-working adults and their families across the country, particularly those in high need communities.

H.R. 3762 would eliminate Planned Parenthood's ability to receive reimbursement for all health care services provided under Medicaid.

Health centers like Planned Parenthood are the bedrock of our health care safety net

Medicaid patients deserve to choose their health care provider and should not have their choice limited by politically motivated agendas.

Texas is a case study in what happens when Planned Parenthood is attacked and access is rolled back.

In short, this measure takes away affordable health care coverage and puts politics ahead of common sense.

Our constituents deserve better.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3762 and get back to work on behalf of the American people.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015, which would repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and defund Planned Parenthood. Republicans eyeing election year points are waging yet another political battle with President Obama, without regards to current health coverage and protections for millions of families and businesses and limiting health care access for millions of women.

The ACA is here and will remain throughout the tenure of President Obama as a key accomplishment of his administration. Despite dire predictions, the results of the ACA are remarkable. Our nation's uninsured rate is the lowest it's been in decades; more than 19 million Americans today have health coverage because of the ACA. Up to 129 million Americans who have pre-existing conditions no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher premiums because of their health status. Additionally, thanks to the ACA, health care prices have been rising at the slowest pace in nearly 50 years.

No one pretends the ACA is perfect; I've long claimed it is in need of refinement. Congress needs to work together to improve the ACA and pass legislation that continues to make health care more affordable for Americans. It's unacceptable that we leave behind some of our most vulnerable individuals because many Republican governors refuse to expand Medicaid and extend coverage to those most in need.

The obsessive targeting of Planned Parenthood funding is another reason I will vote against H.R. 3762. The amazing Planned Parenthood staff and volunteers in my community provide critical reproductive health services to more than 70,000 Oregon women annually. This legislation is yet another concerted assault against the provision of essential service to women, especially women of color and low-income status.

This legislative merry-go-round must stop. We must instead focus on solutions that instead build on the promise of healthcare reform; not just to save money, but to improve the lives of Americans of all ages.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my strong disappointment in House Republicans for starting off the New Year with the same failed policies from 2015. The bill before us today, the so-called Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, is simply more of the same. We've been here 61 times before, making today the 62nd vote to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. Enough is enough.

Ultimately, we are wasting time on a bill destined for a veto and have many reasons to celebrate its imminent failure. This bill is designed to take health insurance from 22 million uninsured Americans. It would cut the subsidies provided to low and middle income Americans living with diabetes and other diseases that allow them to purchase private health insurance.

It would also eliminate the Prevention and Public Health Fund (PPHF), which provides investments in public health efforts to prevent and detect diseases like diabetes and cancer. In the first 6 years of the Fund's inception, $5.25 billion in resources have been sent to states, tribal, and community organizations to support community-based prevention. The Fund should be strengthened, not eliminated.

This bill is also designed to repeal the ACA's Medicaid Expansion. As representative of a state that has opted not to expand its Medicaid program, I know full well the consequences of non-expansion. The 139,000 working Alabamians who fall in the so-called coverage gap make too much to qualify for Medicaid and too little to qualify for subsidies. My states' decision not to expand this critical program is having a devastating—almost fatal—impact on rural health clinics and hospitals across my district. This provision to repeal Medicaid Expansion would have a devastating impact on the 30 states that have expanded their Medicaid program under the Affordable Care Act, including 14 states with Republican governors.

The bill is also designed to take away family planning, wellness exams, and life-saving cancer screenings from millions of American women. The issue of access to reproductive care is very personal to my constituents as some women have to drive two counties to deliver a baby. For women in Sumter County, that's as far as Tuscaloosa, which is an hour away. We shouldn't be in the business of restricting access to family planning and reproductive care in our communities that are already struggling from high teen pregnancy, infant mortality, and STD rates.

While I am pleased to see an effort to repeal the burdensome Cadillac tax and the medical device tax, I cannot support this dangerous bill in its entirety. I will continue to work with my colleagues to repeal the Cadillac and medical device taxes through other legislative vehicles.

Before passage of the ACA, we were spending more money per patient than any country in the world. Under the law, health care prices have grown at the slowest rate in 50 years. This is economic progress that all Americans benefit from. While the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, there are millions of Americans who now have access to quality healthcare and are leading healthier lives because of it.

My constituents and the nurses and doctors who care for them deserve better. They deserve a Congress that works together to fix what's wrong with our health care system rather that rolling back the progress made by the Affordable Care Act. In 2016, we should be a Congress that finds solutions that benefits all Americans. Health care should not be a privilege.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it's ironic that during our first sessions of the new year today, the House gets down to business with fake business—defunding Planned Parenthood and the 62nd vote to repeal Obamacare. Never mind the inevitable veto by a Democratic President—the Republican Governor of Kentucky, Matt Beven has already vetoed his own campaign promise to repeal the Medicaid expansion. A Washington Post editorial commended Bevin for "good sense." It's also sound policy and good politics to claim federal funds that your constituents have paid for to improve the health care of half a million low-income Kentuckians.

Defunding Planned Parenthood, or federally funded health care for the 60 percent of their Medicaid patients who depend on Planned Parenthood, would have the same effect as defunding the Medicaid expansion in Kentucky. Both would take away from the neediest living in underserved communities for spiteful political reasons.

Republicans began 2016 with more of the same, by targeting medical care for the poor. Americans deserve better than the same old foolishness in the new year.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 579, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse

Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Cleaver
DeLauro
Hinojosa
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Payne
Rush
Titus

□ 1754

Ms. KUSTER changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1927, FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–389) on the resolution (H. Res. 581) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 materials on H.R. 1155.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 580 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1155.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1758

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we begin 2016, we face the same difficulty we have faced since the beginning of the Obama administration. Because the administration and the entrenched Washington regulatory bureaucracy insist on piling burden upon burden on the backs of workers, Main Street families, and small-business owners, America is still struggling to create enough new jobs and economic growth to produce the prosperity we need.

□ 1800

To turn this problem around, we must not only stem the tide of unnecessarily costly new regulations; we must also get rid of the deadwood in the accumulated, existing regulations that impose almost $2 trillion in annual costs on our economy.

How can America's job creators create enough new jobs while Washington regulations divert so many of their resources in other directions? The SCRUB Act addresses this problem head-on with new, innovative ways to clear away the clutter of outdated and unnecessarily burdensome regulations.

For years, there has been a bipartisan consensus that this is an important task that must be performed. But, as with so many things, the hard part has always been the details. Different approaches have been tried by different Presidential administrations, and some solutions have been offered by Congress. But, to date, no sufficiently meaningful results have been produced.

In many ways, this is because past approaches never fully aligned the incentives and tools of all the relevant actors—regulatory agencies, regulated entities, the President, the Congress, and others—to identify and cut the regulations that can and should be cut.

On their own, regulators have little incentive to shine a spotlight on their errors or on regulations that are no longer needed. Regulated entities, meanwhile, may fear retaliation by regulators if they suggest ways to trim the regulators' authority. And the sheer volume of the Code of Federal Regulations, which now contains roughly 175,000 pages of regulations,

presents a daunting task for any Congress or President to address.

The SCRUB Act represents a real step forward in our attempts to eliminate obsolete and unnecessarily burdensome Federal regulations without compromising needed regulatory objectives. By establishing an expert commission with the resources and authority to assess independently where and how regulations are outdated and unnecessarily burdensome, it overcomes the disincentives for agencies and even regulated entities to identify problem regulations.

In addition, by providing a legislative method to immediately repeal the most problematic regulations, the SCRUB Act assures that we will take care of the biggest problems quickly. Further, by instituting regulatory CutGo measures for the remaining regulations the commission identifies for repeal—when Congress approves the repeal—the bill assures that the rest of the work of cutting regulations will finally happen.

I urge my colleagues to support the SCRUB Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Members, my colleagues, I rise, I am sorry to say, in strong opposition to H.R. 1155, the so-called SCRUB Act, because it threatens to drown agencies in additional layers of red tape and makes it nearly impossible to establish any new rule, no matter how pressing, or to issue any guidance on existing rules.

Under this bill, an agency must treat every regulation the same, regardless of the urgency of the situation or the subject matter of the regulation. H.R. 1155 achieves this result in several respects.

First, the bill would establish a regulatory CutGo process, forcing agencies to prioritize between existing protections and responding to new threats to our health and safety. This draconian, one-size-fits-all retrospective review process would obligate an agency to determine the costs of a new regulation and eliminate an existing regulation in order to pay for it.

Next, the SCRUB Act is a dangerous solution in search of a problem. In principle, retrospective review of existing regulations is certainly not a bad idea. It is hard to argue against the notion that agencies should periodically assess whether the rules they promulgated are as good as they can be or whether they are even necessary in light of changed circumstances.

However, each agency already conducts oversight through retrospective review of agency rules, narrowing the delegations of authority to agencies, controlling agency appropriations, and conducting oversight of agency activity.

And finally, we must acknowledge that the real intent of this legislation is to hobble the ability of the agencies to regulate.

Proponents of this legislation rely on unsubstantiated rhetoric that regulations inhibit economic development. Supporters of so-called regulatory ''reform'' measures like the SCRUB Act claim that regulation imposes such costs on businesses that it stifles economic growth and job creation.

In support of this contention, they repeatedly cite a widely debunked study by economists Mark and Nicole Crain that claims Federal regulation imposes an annual cost of $1.75 trillion on business. The Crain study, however, has been extensively criticized for exaggerating the costs of Federal rulemaking on small businesses.

In recognition of these concerns, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, an alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, research, faith, and other public interest groups, strongly oppose this legislation. In addition, the White House has released a Statement of Administration Policy that threatens to veto this legislation.

Accordingly, I sincerely urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing H.R. 1155.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, 175,268. That is the number of pages of Federal regulations on the books that are breaking down the backs of small businesses, farmers, and families across our entire country.

Some of the folks across the aisle may say that there aren't any unnecessary regulations, there aren't regulations that cause an undue burden on families, there may not be any that are outdated. Let me give you a list of a couple that I came across just in the last couple of years.

I spoke to some dairy farmers in my congressional district. Not too long ago, according to the EPA, if they stored more than 1,320 gallons of milk, they had to prepare the same kind of hazardous spill requirement that these large oil companies do with oil spills.

Just a few years ago, we had the Department of Labor try to say whether my nephews or anyone's kids or grandkids could perform common chores on the family farm.

We also had the EPA trying to implement ambient air quality standards that are so unrealistic that literally the Mark Twain National Forest in southeast Missouri would be considered in some areas a nonattainment zone. And I can tell you right now that I would rather breathe the oxygen in southeast Missouri than in any of the big coastal cities on the East or the West side.

We have also seen this administration act with the stroke of a pen to try and implement rules that could not be passed by legislation in Congress, such as cap-and-trade when the Democrats controlled the House in 2010. Now the President is trying to implement those environmental policies, which would ultimately double and triple the utility rates of people on fixed incomes in southeast Missouri.

We had an issue where the National Park Service implemented a rule saying that a local Baptist church in south-central Missouri could not perform their water baptism service along the Current River, an act that they had been doing for decades. This was a rule that came up.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, there are multiple rules—and I could go on and on—that are unnecessary, outdated, and causing an undue burden on businesses. This is the opportunity where citizens across the country can come before this commission and request rules to be seen and to be looked at that would actually make government smaller, more efficient, and accountable.

I am asking this body to help support the SCRUB Act so we can reform government regulation at the Federal level like we have done at the State level when I was there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1155, the SCRUB Act, a one-way ratchet with the sole aim of prioritizing costs over benefits through the reckless elimination of rules without consideration of their benefit.

This legislation would shift the costs of rules from corporations to consumers, while posing substantial burdens and delays to agencies, thereby undermining public health and safety.

Title II of H.R. 1155 prohibits agencies from issuing a single new rule until the agency first offsets the cost of the new rule by repealing an existing rule specified by the commission. These regulatory CutGo provisions would apply to every new agency rule, no matter how important or pressing, for every regulatory agency.

For instance, any expert regulatory agency seeking to promulgate a new rule to safeguard vehicles from ignition switch failures, to keeping our water clean from chemical contamination, or to protect our hospitals in the event of an outbreak of an infectious disease would first have to eliminate an existing rule, which would trigger a new rulemaking process altogether to rescind that rule, causing years in delays.

Furthermore, title II lacks any mechanism for agencies to issue emergency rules that protect the public and environment from imminent harm. These procedures are dangerous and would tie the hands of agencies responding to public health crises requiring timely regulatory responses.

Additionally, agencies are unable to simply rescind rules. Instead, the APA requires that agencies follow the same notice and comment procedures to eliminate a rule as would be required to issue the same rule in the first place.

Thus, under the bill's requirements, prior to promulgating a new rule, agencies would likely need to prepare two

sets of proposals: one for a new rule and one for eliminating an existing rule required by the commission through regulatory CutGo. This process may take anywhere from a few months to several years, especially when the underlying rule involves complex issues.

Lastly, the SCRUB Act is a dangerous solution in search of a problem. Each branch of government already conducts effective oversight through retrospective review of agency rules, narrowing the delegations of authority to agencies controlling agency appropriations and conducting oversight of agency activity.

Congress also has the specific authority under the Congressional Review Act to disapprove any rule that an agency proposes.

□ 1815

Rather than meaningfully streamlining the rulemaking process, regulatory CutGo would ossify the regulatory system by causing years of delay in the rulemaking process, creating additional layers and burdens in the regulatory system.

In total, the SCRUB Act would essentially function as a choke hold on Federal agency rulemaking; therefore, we should change the name of the SCRUB Act to the ''Scrooge Act.'' It delays any new action by an agency and drains agency resources and taxpayer dollars in a time of widespread budget austerity.

Lastly, I would comment that imposing the same regulatory burden on a dairy farmer as is imposed on an oil producer or an oil company sounds to me like the oil companies have been having a great day with the rules around here of late if they have got to do what we require a dairy farmer to do.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, here in Washington, it is often difficult to see the true breadth and effect of the nearly $2 trillion regulatory burden imposed by Federal regulations, but in my Pennsylvania district, you see these burdens in everyday life.

Across the spectrum of businesses, the struggle with regulatory compliance is an ever-present drag on creating jobs, economic growth, and innovation. I hear the same stories from small, family-owned restaurants, to mechanics, shop owners, and even landscapers. Due to decades of regulation from Washington, they are forced to focus as much time or more on compliance instead of running their businesses. These are real costs in dollars that are lost to needless and, in many cases, outdated red tape.

The SCRUB Act will start the process of unraveling years of convoluted, sometimes contradictory, regulations and eliminating the costs that come with them. It is a bill that will modernize our Code of Federal Regulations for the 21st Century by eliminating regulations from the last one. Just as important, it is a bill that will lessen the amount of money spent by our government in enforcing regulations that are no longer needed.

I am proud to cosponsor this piece of legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Harvard Business School's United States Competitiveness Project has outlined eight actions it recommends that Congress take to make America the most economically competitive place in the world to do business, not just to increase corporate profits, but to increase wages for working people across America.

Among those eight steps, which include immigration reform, responsible Federal budgeting, tax reform, and investing in infrastructure and research, is simplifying Federal regulation. The idea is not to lower standards but to regulate more intelligently, keeping in mind costs and benefits, and focusing on outcomes rather than compliance methods.

I am in lockstep agreement with the Harvard Business School and with House Republican leadership and with many of my Democratic colleagues on the objective of simplifying and streamlining Federal regulation. But what frustrates me today is that the House Republican leadership's so-called SCRUB Act has no chance of passage, and they know it. Because it requires costs to be arbitrarily cut, with no policy goal, and makes it hard to do even good rulemaking in the future, it has virtually no support among Democrats, including, most notably, the President of the United States, who would have to sign the bill for it to become law.

If we want to be serious about regulatory reform, we should bring up a bill that has bipartisan support, will pass this Chamber, and has a chance at the President's approval as well.

The amendment that will be offered later by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY), my colleague, that I cosponsored, is based on the Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015. The bill is strongly bipartisan, counting new Democrats, moderate Republicans, and even Freedom Caucus members among its cosponsors.

It would empower, like the SCRUB Act, an independent, bipartisan commission to sift through the regulatory accumulation of the past decades to recommend changes and eliminations and to present those recommendations to Congress for an up-or-down vote.

Now, we have heard the Republican leadership say that Congress, in 2016, will be about drawing contrasts. Apparently, that means that, rather than seeking to work together in areas on which we agree, we will have a series of these message bills, like the SCRUB Act, that are more about making a political point than making policy. So we will talk about the SCRUB Act instead of passing the Regulatory Improvement Act; and therefore, we will not provide the economy and our workers the regulatory relief that we all want to provide them and we agreed that they need. And that, drawing contrasts to win elections instead of working on solutions for our constituents in areas in which Republicans and Democrats agree, is what people hate about Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan approach.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in support of H.R. 1155, the SCRUB Act, and would like to thank my colleague from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is aimed at decreasing the regulatory burden facing our Nation's small businesses. Small businesses account for 7 out of every 10 new jobs created in America today—7 out of 10.

Unfortunately, overly burdensome regulations particularly impact small businesses. Oppressive Federal regulations are holding our small businesses back from growing and creating more jobs, and we all know we need more jobs created in this country.

As chairman of the Committee on Small Business in the House, I hear from small-business folks every week from all over the country who are struggling under the weight of excessive regulations.

In the West End of Cincinnati, for example, the Wegman Company is finding it next to impossible to comply with ObamaCare and SBA loan requirements. They say that reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens would allow them to focus their energy and time and resources on growing and expanding their business and creating the jobs that are sorely needed in Cincinnati.

The SCRUB Act will create a bipartisan, blue-ribbon commission to closely examine the mountain of costly existing Federal regulations and target those that ought to be repealed. In particular, the commission will prioritize reviews of major rules, some that are more than 15 years old and that impose disproportionately high costs on America's small businesses.

H.R. 1155 will provide a commonsense way to identify and repeal outdated regulations that unnecessarily and disproportionately burden small businesses. I urge my colleagues to support the SCRUB Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I have certain sympathy to what my friend from California talked about. There are areas of being able to move forward to be able to fine-tune the regulatory system. The problem with the approach that is taken here—it has no chance of being enacted into law and includes sort of a mindless approach in a formula basis that has no reality basis going forward.

We have used government regulation to be able to fine-tune legislation. Can it be done better? I have no doubt.

One of the things I feel very strongly about, it is not a case of having a mindless formula, having a group of unelected bureaucrats. I find that my friends on the other side of the aisle had spasms of angst and fury about unelected bureaucrats advising Congress dealing with the Affordable Care Act to try and help maintain targets for Medicare savings, but they have referred to unelected bureaucrats in this regard.

One of the things that I think is important is that we not implement a theory here that would engage us in more rulemaking, more expenses. This would effectively dramatically increase the amount of time and energy, reducing the flexibility to be able to move forward.

It would be much more productive if we were focusing on the principle of performance-based regulation. Establish what it is that we are trying to do; provide the actors and actresses in the private sector and in government with achievable benchmarks to guide the behavior that we are trying to achieve.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. A performance-based regulatory system would have less overall regulation, give people a target to shoot for that wouldn't have to be as contentious, and actually be able to get the job done. This would be a much more productive approach rather than legislation that isn't going to go anywhere and, frankly, shouldn't go anywhere.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the fourth branch of government is the bureaucrats. We don't know who most of them are, but they are everywhere. And what they do is, with a certain group of bureaucrats, they regulate. Congress has allowed them to do that, by law, and they make all kinds of rules about everything.

Usually they will take a law, and then they will regulate or form rules about that law; and because of that, we have about 175,000 pages of regulation. Come a long ways since the Ten Commandments—10 words, basically. Now they have got 175,000 pages of regulations, rules by Federal bureaucrats on American businesses and American individuals.

Do we really need 175,000 rules? Maybe a few thousand less would be better.

The SCRUB Act tries to organize all of these rules because a lot of them are important. A lot of them are good, and a lot of them are bad. A lot of them are dumb, and a whole lot of them are very expensive to Americans.

Now, let's just use one example. The Lacey Act was written in about 1900, and the Lacey Act says, if a crime is committed in another country regarding importing into the U.S., it is a crime in the U.S. if it is a crime in another country.

So Abner Schoenwetter was charged with a crime under the interpretation of the Lacey Act because he had the audacity to import into the United States the Caribbean spiny lobster from Honduras that were too small, and he shipped them in paper boxes, cardboard boxes, instead of plastic boxes.

Now, never mind that the Honduran Government did not enforce this law. In fact, the Honduran Government said, in a brief to the U.S. Government from the Attorney General of Honduras: Don't prosecute him. We don't enforce this law.

But no, he is prosecuted under the interpretation of the Lacey Act for bringing in those little bitty lobsters and bringing them in paper rather than in plastic. So you know the result? He got 8 years in prison for this.

Are you kidding me? I mean, I am a former judge. Do we really need to be spending America's money and time on prosecuting people for using paper instead of plastic? And that is what happened to him.

So the SCRUB Act will go through and try to regulate the regulators and regulate the regulations.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the driver of the SCRUB Act is not the dairy farmer, but it is the oil company and those as rich and powerful as those are.

So, in summary, H.R. 1155 is yet another antiregulatory bill on the big corporation wish list, saddling American taxpayers with a $30 million check for a bill that wouldn't create one job beyond the membership of the commission itself.

This bill has serious flaws, and I would urge my colleagues to reject it. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 1155.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

During this debate, my friends from the other side of the aisle have raised several false alarms about the alleged harms of this bill.

□ 1830

The alarm bells that should be ringing for all Americans, however, is the alarm bell about the damage the dead weight of Washington regulation is piling on American jobs and wages.

All rhetoric aside, the question that needs to be asked is, at the turn of this new year, where do American jobs and wages stand? The Investor's Business Daily reports that we have just concluded 8 years of zero real wage growth for American workers and families. That means zero wage growth for the entire Obama administration—0.0.

What about jobs? Ninety-four million Americans above the age of 16 are out of the workforce—completely out of the workforce. Labor force participation has fallen sharply for working-age Americans. And we would have created about 6 million more jobs if the so-called Obama recovery had just been as good and as strong as the average recovery since World War II. The Obama recovery, instead, is the worst recovery from recession in a postwar era. The near $2 trillion of annual regulatory costs crushing our economy's ability to create new jobs and higher wages is a critical part of this problem.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to help deliver new jobs and better wages to America's workers and families.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first start by thanking the leadership of JASON SMITH in bringing this bill before us.

I rise in support of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, also known as the SCRUB Act, which we have been talking about.

The bill addresses an important issue facing American taxpayers: ever-growing regulation. Each year the Federal agencies add regulation after regulation piling up into an already complex and crowded regulatory system. The Code of Federal Regulation now exceeds 175,000 pages, and every year the Federal Government promulgates thousands of new regulations. It is hard to keep up with all the regulation time and time again.

In just the fall of 2015, the semiannual Unified Regulatory Agenda contained 2,000 more regulations, including 144 regulations expected to cost over $100 million each. This ever-growing stack of regulations has considerable impacts on the economy.

I want to be clear. This happens no matter what the administration is—Democrat, Republican, Bush, Obama, it doesn't matter. It is a natural tendency of the executive branch to want to do what Congress is supposed to do, and there are just things that get implemented that need to be scrubbed out of the system so we can get to some sanity and some reasonableness, so that people can understand what their government is expecting of them.

I think there is room and there is place for regulation, but it is a limited

one. It needs to be well understood, and it is reasonable to search, cut, find, and get rid of these burdensome regulations.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

I must say, the previous speaker representing the majority on the Judiciary Committee reminded me of the meaning of the word chutzpah. To complain about job growth when your party hands a new, Democratic President the deepest and worst recession since the Great Depression; when you leave the country with 10.2 percent unemployment, and that President and these Democrats in this Congress reversed all that. Unemployment is less than half of that, 5 percent. We have had 64 consecutive months of positive—net positive—private-sector job growth, the longest stretch in American history. And you want to say it could have been better if we hadn't had so much regulation? What an extraordinary narrative—and a false one and a dangerous one.

The name of this bill is the SCRUB Act. The best thing we can do with this bill is to scrub it from the floor of the House of Representatives. It is dangerous because it will lift protections on public health and public safety.

You don't like regulation. Some regulation is burdensome, and certainly we ought to have regular reviews to make sure we reduce or eliminate those. We already do. Agencies are already required to do so under the executive orders signed by this President.

In fact, those efforts are yielding results. The Administrative Conference of the United States reports that agencies have identified ''tens of billions of dollars of cost savings and tens of millions of hours of reduced paperwork and reporting requirements through modification of existing regulations'' because of those reviews already in place. The Department of Labor, for example, modified its chemical hazard labeling requirement, reducing costs to industry by $2.5 billion over the last 5 years.

I am particularly troubled by the bill's creation of a CutGo scheme which seems deceptively appealing. That is a plan in which agencies would be required to eliminate an existing regulation before they could possibly promulgate a new one. That forces agencies into an arbitrary and untenable position of having to choose between preserving existing public health and safety protections or moving to protect against new threats. The bill provides no safe harbor exceptions for any rules, no matter how important, potentially jeopardizing the very public health and safety mission of Federal agencies.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the real intent behind this bill and another the House will consider tomorrow is not about improving regulatory processes but to create delays ad infinitum to grind the regulatory process to an absolute halt for the benefit of certain corporate interests in America at the public's expense. In addition to not giving the administration any credit for its herculean efforts to streamline current regulations, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle conveniently fail to mention any of the health or safety benefits of regulation. OMB estimates the annual net—net—benefit of major rules issued during this administration is approximately $215 billion. But that is an inconvenient fact. That is a difficult thing to talk about, that there actually could be benefits to public health by cleaner air and cleaner water.

Further, my colleagues have provided no evidence that regulation somehow serves as the hobnail boot on the neck of the economy, as they would have us believe. I mentioned it is quite the opposite in terms of unemployment, in terms of job growth, and in terms of GDP growth.

Mr. Chairman, it is this legislation that is unnecessary and burdensome and, I suggest, a threat to public health and safety. We ought to scrub it from the calendar. Short of that, I certainly urge my colleagues to oppose it, as I will.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, The Washington Times cited the Federal Register. In 1 year alone, there were 81,611 pages of new regulations. I think it is time that we go back and look at those.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for his passion on this topic.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, since 2008, the term of the current administration, for the first time since records have been kept, we have a net reduction in small businesses, according to the National Federation of Independent Business.

I am going to say that again. We have, for the first time in recorded history, a net reduction in small businesses in this country.

There is a study that was done in 2012 by the National Association of Manufacturers. It says for small manufacturers—for small manufacturers—the cost per employee of complying with regulations is $35,000. There is another study that was done for the SBA that determined that $15,000 per family—per household—is the cost of complying with regulations in the United States. This is absolutely a burden on our families. It is a burden on our economy.

Now, at the same time, the administration is out there talking about the promotion of free trade agreements around the country. Explain to me how we are going to be able to compete on a level playing field with these other countries if we are tying the American workers' hands behind their backs and throwing them out there on the field?

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what bill is being described here by some of the previous speakers. This bill sets up a bipartisan commission. You heard numerous examples of regulations that are outdated that might have made a ton of sense in the 1940s and the 1950s. It is 2016. We need to take a fresh look at this.

A study was done that determined that this bill could result in the reduction or a cost savings of $48 billion annually by taking a fresh look at regulations. Government is not going to save this country. Government didn't make this country the greatest country in the world. It was competition, it was innovation, and it was hard work by the American workforce.

Take this regulatory burden off of our workforce, Mr. Chairman, and let's put these people back to work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. The SCRUB Act would establish a $30 million commission to duplicate work agencies are already supposed to be doing. The bill would entrust this commission with extraordinary powers that could be subject to abuse. This bill is opposed by Citizens for Sensible Safeguards, a coalition of more than 150 consumer, labor, and good government groups. In addition, the administration announced last night that if this bill were presented to the President, his advisers would recommend that he veto it.

President Obama has already issued two executive orders to eliminate unnecessary regulations. On January 18, 2011, President Obama issued Executive Order No. 13563, requiring each agency to implement plans for reviewing its existing rules. It requires each agency to ''periodically review its existing significant regulations to determine whether any such regulations should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed.''

In addition, President Obama issued Executive Order No. 13610 on May 10, 2012, requiring agencies to report twice a year to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs on the status of their retrospective review efforts.

In November 2014, the Administrative Conference of the United States issued a report highlighting the impact of these mandated reviews. The report concluded: ''Implementing President Obama's executive orders on retrospective review of regulations, agencies identified tens of billions of dollars of cost savings and tens of millions of hours of reduced paperwork and reporting requirements through modifications of existing regulations.''

Congress also has the authority and the responsibility to conduct oversight to review existing agency rules and to recommend or mandate reforms. Yet this bill attempts to reduce bureaucracy by creating a new commission

that would cost taxpayers $30 million—let me say that again—$30 million to do what agencies and Congress are already doing.

One of the most troubling aspects of this bill is the broad authority it would give to the commission. The commission would have virtually unlimited authority to subpoena witnesses or documents. Specifically, section 101(c) of this bill states: ''The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to the duties of the Commission. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.''

□ 1845

Most agency inspectors general do not have such broad authority to compel witness testimony, yet this unelected commission would have this authority. The commission would have jurisdiction over every existing regulation.

This means that it could compel an individual to testify on any subject. A schoolteacher could be compelled to testify about education rules or a senior citizen could be compelled to testify about Medicare or Social Security rules.

Three prominent law professors with the Center for Progressive Reform sent a letter opposing this bill last month. The letter said:

''H.R. 1155 would create a convoluted, complex, and potentially very expensive new bureaucracy to review existing agency rules and make recommendations for the repeal or weakening of those rules with little meaningful oversight, transparency, or public accountability to ensure that these recommendations do not subvert the public interest.''

This may be a well-intended bill, but it could have dangerous consequences. I urge Members to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy, dated January 5, 2016.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1155—SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Smith, R–MO, Jan. 5, 2016)

The Administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective, and tailored to further statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner. The retrospective review of regulations has been an ongoing priority of this Administration. Starting in 2011, the President institutionalized the retrospective review of regulations in Executive Orders 13563 and 13610, requiring agencies to report twice a year on the status of their efforts. H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act, would make the process of retrospective regulatory review less productive. Further, the bill also would create needless regulatory and legal uncertainty; increase costs for businesses and State, local and tribal governments; and impede common-sense protections for the American public. Accordingly, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1155 in its current form.

Although outside input and perspective on what rules may be ripe for potential reform or repeal is crucial, retrospective review is most effective when led by the agencies. The bill's creation of a stand-alone commission to review the entire Code of Federal Regulations is likely to produce a haphazard list of rules that, under the procedures in the bill, must be repealed if approved by a joint resolution. There appears to be no mechanism for making thoughtful and modest modifications to rules to improve their implementation and enforcement, which is often the best course of action for making regulations work better. Moreover, the bill's ''cut-go'' approach is problematic: it would interfere with the ability of agencies to issue regulations that are essential for the protection of public health, safety, and the environment.

The Administration recognizes that the applicability of ''cut-go'' in H.R. 1155 is narrower than in other bills being considered in the Congress. Nonetheless, it is essential that agencies have the flexibility to promptly issue new, vital rules. This ability should not be constrained by a Commission's recommendation, or Congressional approval of a list of repealable rules. While retrospective review is an Administration priority and an essential tool to relieve unnecessary regulatory burden, it is important that retrospective review efforts not unnecessarily constrain an agency's ability to provide a timely response to critical public health or safety issues, or constrain its ability to implement new statutory provisions.

For these reasons, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1155 in its current form. If the President were presented with the current version of H.R. 1155, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM). I appreciate his passion on this issue.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act.

While the full title is a mouthful, I can assure you that the idea behind this bill is simple and clear: removing obsolete and burdensome regulations so our economy can grow.

This legislation creates a commission to identify outdated rules, streamlines and updates our regulatory system, and enforces executive agencies to repeal unnecessary regulations to offset the cost of new ones.

As a career small business person, I know firsthand what it is like to operate and grow a business under the burden of excessive regulation. I have met a payroll every week for the last 20 years.

I would propose to you, Mr. Chairman, if more of my Democratic colleagues had signed the fronts of paychecks, this Federal Government would produce fewer regulations on businesses today.

According to a report by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the cost to the economy of regulations is a staggering $2 trillion a year. And we wonder, Mr. Chairman, why manufacturers choose to move their operations outside the United States.

Instead of hiring more workers, raising wages and benefits, and investing in technology, many businesses are forced instead to divert investments toward complying with evermore government regulations. This has to change.

As I travel in my district, I am often asked how do we reignite the economy. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is relatively simple. We have the finest entrepreneurs and the finest small-business people in the entire world here in the United States.

Simply get out of our way, get off of our backs with excessive regulations, get out of our back pockets with excessive fees and taxes, and we will grow our businesses, will hire more employees, and we will create opportunities for our citizens to live their versions of the American Dream.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) for putting this proposal forward. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure so our businesses can be free from outdated regulations that no longer make sense for America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 1155. I think, if all of us are honest in this House, every one of us, certainly myself included, I would be the first to say I hear on a regular basis from the people of Georgia of how they are literally being strangled economically because of the overburdened Federal regulations that are upon them.

It is an issue that we must absolutely address. It is an issue that we have dealt with time and again in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Now we have an opportunity to do something about it. That is why I support H.R. 1155.

The SCRUB Act, in essence, will establish a blue-ribbon commission to identify outdated and unnecessary regulations that are placing a burden on our businesses and individuals. This commission will be comprised of experts from the private sector, academia, as well as government agencies.

I hope we have heard what has already been said here today. There are 175,000 pages of regulations amounting to some $2 trillion a year of burdens upon our economy, upon businesses, and upon individuals in this country. It amounts to, as was stated previously, some $15,000 per household if it were spread out.

How can we tolerate this any longer? We can't. That is the bottom line. The commission that will be established

here will help go through all of these 175,000 pages of regulations and help end a culture of suffocation and regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have supported the SCRUB Act in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in the past, and I am pleased to do so again today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1155.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my counterpart aware that I have one additional speaker and then I am prepared to close.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I rise today as an original cosponsor of the SCRUB Act that relieves the burdensome impact of unnecessary Federal regulation on Americans.

This legislation establishes a systematic process to reduce regulatory costs. It comes at a time when the President continues to limit Americans' economic freedom by issuing new decrees from Washington.

According to the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Obama administration issued a staggering 82,036 pages of proposed rules just in 2015, eclipsing its own 2010 record. In 2015, that equaled a total of 3,408 rules and regulations.

The weight of Federal regulations is a millstone around the necks of entrepreneurs and small businesses struggling to survive amid economic uncertainty. The SCRUB Act provides a means to cut unnecessary regulations and help the economy recover. It incorporates elements of my own bill, the Regulatory Review and Sunset Act.

Like my bill, the SCRUB Act requires the review of existing regulations to identify those in need of repeal. Under the review process, it prioritizes those regulations with a major economic impact and that impose a disproportionate economic burden on small businesses.

It requires recommendations on regulatory repeal to be presented to Congress for approval. If Congress gives the okay, repeal must happen.

Republicans and Democrats alike support eliminating the costs of unnecessary and obsolete regulations to help economic recovery. The SCRUB Act provides a meaningful, bipartisan mechanism to achieve this goal.

Again, I want to thank the chairman. I urge passage.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the Members on the other side of the aisle talk about the costs of regulations. I think we always have to keep in mind there is a reason for regulations.

Sadly, in many instances, there have been abuses where public health safety is concerned. We have to make sure that we draw that balance. I think President Obama has done a lot in that regard and has probably done more than many of his predecessors.

It is important to remember that these regulations have enormous benefits. In October, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs reported that the net benefits of major rules issued during the Obama administration, from 2009 to 2014, is some $215 billion. Agencies have also reduced the cost of regulations by streamlining existing rules.

In 2014, the Administrative Conference of the United States reported that more than 90 percent of agency retrospective reviews resulted in amendments to the Code of Federal Regulations. For example, the Department of Labor modified the chemical hazard labeling requirements, which saved manufacturers around $2.5 billion over 5 years.

We do not need to waste $30 million on a new commission to review rules when agencies are already performing this function without additional taxpayer funding.

I urge all Members to vote against this bill.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge passage of this bill. I want to congratulate our colleague, Congressman JASON SMITH, for his good, diligent work on this. A lot of Members have had a deep-seated interest in this. There has been, I think, a good discussion about this.

In general, I think what we are proposing is very fair and it is very balanced. We are asking for a bipartisan group of people to go back and review things. I think it would be naive at best to think that things that were added as regulations in the 1940s or the 1950s are automatically—automatically—by default necessary today.

Sometimes you have to go back and look. And we are asking to do this in a bipartisan way. That is not a heavy lift. It is not unreasonable. It is very balanced in its approach. I think it is the right thing to do.

Is there a proper role of regulation? Of course. It doesn't mean that everything needs to be regulated. I worry about the men and women, the young entrepreneurs, that are trying to get things done because they run into hurdles they never knew were there. We handcuff people. There are unintended consequences. The economy is different today than it was in the 1930s or the 1940s.

It is reasonable to go back and try to scrub out some of these regulations and do so in a bipartisan way, but, yet, there is opposition to that. Nevertheless, I think we put together a good bill. I urge Members to vote for it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1155

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 ''Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015'' or as the ''SCRUB Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—RETROSPECTIVE REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION

Sec. 101. In general.

TITLE II—REGULATORY CUT-GO

Sec. 201. Cut-go procedures.
Sec. 202. Applicability.
Sec. 203. OIRA certification of cost calculations.

TITLE III—RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF NEW RULES

Sec. 301. Plan for future review.

TITLE IV—JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 401. Judicial review.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Definitions.
Sec. 502. Effective date.

TITLE I—RETROSPECTIVE REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION

SEC. 101. IN GENERAL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission, to be known as the ''Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission'', that shall review rules and sets of rules in accordance with specified criteria to determine if a rule or set of rules should be repealed to eliminate or reduce the costs of regulation to the economy. The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 5 years and 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act or 5 years after the date by which all Commission members' terms have commenced, whichever is later.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) NUMBER.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members who shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Each member shall be appointed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TERM.—The term of each member shall commence upon the member's confirmation by the Senate and shall extend to the date that is 5 years and 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act or that is 5 years after the date by which all members have been confirmed by the Senate, whichever is later.

(3) APPOINTMENT.—The members of the Commission shall be appointed as follows:

(A) CHAIR.—The President shall appoint as the Chair of the Commission an individual with expertise and experience in rulemaking, such as past Administrators of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, past chairmen of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and other individuals with similar expertise and experience in rulemaking affairs and the administration of regulatory reviews.

(B) CANDIDATE LIST OF MEMBERS.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate shall each present to the President a list of candidates to be members of the Commission. Such candidates shall be individuals learned in rulemaking affairs and, preferably, administration of regulatory reviews. The President shall appoint 2 members of the Commission from each list provided under this subparagraph, subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C).

(C) RESUBMISSION OF CANDIDATE.—The President may request from the presenter of the list under subparagraph (B) a new list of one or more candidates if the President—

(i) determines that any candidate on the list presented pursuant to subparagraph (B) does not meet the qualifications specified in such subparagraph to be a member of the Commission; and

(ii) certifies that determination to the congressional officials specified in subparagraph (B).

(c) POWERS AND AUTHORITIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) MEETINGS.—The Commission may meet when, where, and as often as the Commission determines appropriate, except that the Commission shall hold public meetings not less than twice each year. All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public.

(2) HEARINGS.—In addition to meetings held under paragraph (1), the Commission may hold hearings to consider issues of fact or law relevant to the Commission's work. Any hearing held by the Commission shall be open to the public.

(3) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from any agency information and documents necessary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that agency shall furnish that information or document to the Commission as soon as possible, but not later than two weeks after the date on which the request was made.

(4) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to the duties of the Commission. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(B) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under subparagraph (A), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the Commission to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(C) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(D) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—All process of any court to which application is made under subparagraph (B) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(d) PAY AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(1) PAY.—

(A) MEMBERS.—Each member, other than the Chair of the Commission, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(B) CHAIR.—The Chair shall be paid for each day referred to in subparagraph (A) at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) DIRECTOR OF STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall appoint a Director.

(2) PAY.—The Director shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director, with the approval of the Commission, may appoint, fix the pay of, and terminate additional personnel.

(2) LIMITATIONS ON APPOINTMENT.—The Director may make such appointments without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and any personnel so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS–15 of the General Schedule.

(3) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Following consultation with and upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of any agency may detail any of the personnel of that agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this Act.

(4) GAO AND OIRA ASSISTANCE.—The Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(5) ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER PARTIES.—Congress, the States, municipalities, federally recognized Indian tribes, and local governments may provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(g) OTHER AUTHORITY.—

(1) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PROPERTY.—The Commission may lease space and acquire personal property to the extent funds are available.

(h) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct a review of the Code of Federal Regulations to identify rules and sets of rules that collectively implement a regulatory program that should be repealed to lower the cost of regulation to the economy. The Commission shall give priority in the review to rules or sets of rules that are major rules or include major rules, have been in effect more than 15 years, impose paperwork burdens that could be reduced substantially without significantly diminishing regulatory effectiveness, impose disproportionately high costs on entities that qualify as small entities within the meaning of section 601(6) of title 5, United States Code, or could be strengthened in their effectiveness while reducing regulatory costs. The Commission shall have as a goal of the Commission to achieve a reduction of at least 15 percent in the cumulative costs of Federal regulation with a minimal reduction in the overall effectiveness of such regulation.

(2) NATURE OF REVIEW.—To identify which rules and sets of rules should be repealed to lower the cost of regulation to the economy, the Commission shall apply the following criteria:

(A) Whether the original purpose of the rule or set of rules was achieved, and the rule or set of rules could be repealed without significant recurrence of adverse effects or conduct that the rule or set of rules was intended to prevent or reduce.

(B) Whether the implementation, compliance, administration, enforcement or other costs of the rule or set of rules to the economy are not justified by the benefits to society within the United States produced by the expenditure of those costs.

(C) Whether the rule or set of rules has been rendered unnecessary or obsolete, taking into consideration the length of time since the rule was made and the degree to which technology, economic conditions, market practices, or other relevant factors have changed in the subject area affected by the rule or set of rules.

(D) Whether the rule or set of rules is ineffective at achieving the purposes of the rule or set of rules.

(E) Whether the rule or set of rules overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other Federal rules, and to the extent feasible, with State and local governmental rules.

(F) Whether the rule or set of rules has excessive compliance costs or is otherwise excessively burdensome, as compared to alternatives that—

(i) specify performance objectives rather than conduct or manners of compliance;

(ii) establish economic incentives to encourage desired behavior;

(iii) provide information upon which choices can be made by the public;

(iv) incorporate other innovative alternatives rather than agency actions that specify conduct or manners of compliance; or

(v) could in other ways substantially lower costs without significantly undermining effectiveness.

(G) Whether the rule or set of rules inhibits innovation in or growth of the United States economy, such as by impeding the introduction or use of safer or equally safe technology that is newer or more efficient than technology required by or permissible under the rule or set of rules.

(H) Whether or not the rule or set of rules harms competition within the United States economy or the international economic competitiveness of enterprises or entities based in the United States.

(I) Such other criteria as the Commission devises to identify rules and sets of rules that can be repealed to eliminate or reduce unnecessarily burdensome costs to the United States economy.

(3) METHODOLOGY FOR REVIEW.—The Commission shall establish a methodology for conducting the review (including an overall review and discrete reviews of portions of the Code of Federal Regulations), identifying rules and sets of rules, and classifying rules under this subsection and publish the terms of the methodology in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission. The Commission may propose and seek public comment on the methodology before the methodology is established.

(4) CLASSIFICATION OF RULES AND SETS OF RULES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After completion of any review of rules or sets of rules under paragraph (2), the Commission shall classify each rule or set of rules identified in the review to qualify for recommended repeal as either a rule or set of rules—

(i) on which immediate action to repeal is recommended; or

(ii) that should be eligible for repeal under regulatory cut-go procedures under title II.

(B) DECISIONS BY MAJORITY.—Each decision by the Commission to identify a rule or set of rules for classification under this paragraph, and each decision whether to classify the rule or set of rules under clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A), shall be made by a simple majority vote of the Commission. No such vote shall take place until after all members of the Commission have been confirmed by the Senate.

(5) INITIATION OF REVIEW BY OTHER PERSONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may also conduct a review under paragraph (2) of, and, if appropriate, classify under paragraph (4), any rule or set of rules that is submitted for review to the Commission by—

(i) the President;

(ii) a Member of Congress;

(iii) any officer or employee of a Federal, State, local or tribal government, or regional governmental body; or

(iv) any member of the public.

(B) FORM OF SUBMISSION.—A submission to the Commission under this paragraph shall—

(i) identify the specific rule or set of rules submitted for review;

(ii) provide a statement of evidence to demonstrate that the rule or set of rules qualifies to be identified for repeal under the criteria listed in paragraph (2); and

(iii) such other information as the submitter believes may be helpful to the Commission's review, including a statement of the submitter's interest in the matter.

(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Commission shall make each submission received under this paragraph available on the website of the Commission as soon as possible, but not later than 1 week after the date on which the submission was received.

(i) NOTICES AND REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) NOTICES OF AND REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES.—The Commission shall publish, in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission—

(A) notices in advance of all public meetings, hearings, and classifications under subsection (h) informing the public of the basis, purpose, and procedures for the meeting, hearing, or classification; and

(B) reports after the conclusion of any public meeting, hearing, or classification under subsection (h) summarizing in detail the basis, purpose, and substance of the meeting, hearing, or classification.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Each year, beginning on the date that is one year after the date on which all Commission members have been confirmed by the Senate, the Commission shall submit a report simultaneously to each House of Congress detailing the activities of the Commission for the previous year, and listing all rules and sets of rules classified under subsection (h) during that year. For each rule or set of rules so listed, the Commission shall—

(A) identify the agency that made the rule or set of rules;

(B) identify the annual cost of the rule or set of rules to the United States economy and the basis upon which the Commission identified that cost;

(C) identify whether the rule or set of rules was classified under clause (i) or clause (ii) of subsection (h)(4)(A);

(D) identify the criteria under subsection (h)(2) that caused the classification of the rule or set of rules and the basis upon which the Commission determined that those criteria were met;

(E) for each rule or set of rules listed under the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (B), (D), (F), (G), or (H) of subsection (h)(2), or other criteria established by the Commission under subparagraph (I) of such subsection under which the Commission evaluated alternatives to the rule or set of rules that could lead to lower regulatory costs, identify alternatives to the rule or set of rules that the Commission recommends the agency consider as replacements for the rule or set of rules and the basis on which the Commission rests the recommendations, and, in identifying such alternatives, emphasize alternatives that will achieve regulatory effectiveness at the lowest cost and with the lowest adverse impacts on jobs;

(F) for each rule or set of rules listed under the criteria set forth in subsection (h)(2)(E), the other Federal, State, or local governmental rules that the Commission found the rule or set of rules to overlap, duplicate, or conflict with, and the basis for the findings of the Commission; and

(G) in the case of each set of rules so listed, analyze whether Congress should also consider repeal of the statutory authority implemented by the set of rules.

(3) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than the date on which the Commission members' appointments expire, the Commission shall submit a final report simultaneously to each House of Congress summarizing all activities and recommendations of the Commission, including a list of all rules or sets of rules the Commission classified under clause (i) of subsection (h)(4)(A) for immediate action to repeal, a separate list of all rules or sets of rules the Commission classified under clause (ii) of subsection (h)(4)(A) for repeal, and with regard to each rule or set of rules listed on either list, the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of subsection (h)(2). This report may be included in the final annual report of the Commission under paragraph (2) and may include the Commission's recommendation whether the Commission should be reauthorized by Congress.

(j) REPEAL OF REGULATIONS; CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF COMMISSION REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2)—

(A) the head of each agency with authority to repeal a rule or set of rules classified by the Commission under subsection (h)(4)(A)(i) for immediate action to repeal and newly listed as such in an annual or final report of the Commission under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) shall repeal the rule or set of rules as recommended by the Commission within 60 days after the enactment of a joint resolution under paragraph (2) for approval of the recommendations of the Commission in the report; and

(B) the head of each agency with authority to repeal a rule or set of rules classified by the Commission under subsection (h)(4)(A)(ii) for repeal and newly listed as such in an annual or final report of the Commission under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) shall repeal the rule or set of rules as recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 201, following the enactment of a joint resolution under paragraph (2) for approval of the recommendations of the Commission in the report.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No head of an agency described in paragraph (1) shall be required by this Act to carry out a repeal listed by the Commission in a report transmitted to Congress under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) until a joint resolution is enacted, in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (B), approving such recommendations of the Commission for repeal.

(B) TERMS OF THE RESOLUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (A), the term ''joint resolution'' means only a joint resolution which is introduced after the date on which the Commission transmits to the Congress under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) the report containing the recommendations to which the resolution pertains, and—

(i) which does not have a preamble;

(ii) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: ''That Congress approves the recommendations for repeal of the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission as submitted by the Commission on _____'', the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date; and

(iii) the title of which is as follows: ''Approving recommendations for repeal of the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission.''.

(3) REISSUANCE OF RULES.—

(A) NO SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR RULE TO BE REISSUED.—A rule that is repealed under paragraph (1) or section 201 may not be reissued in substantially the same form, and a new rule that is substantially the same as such a rule may not be issued, unless the reissued or new rule is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the joint resolution approving the Commission's recommendation to repeal the original rule.

(B) AGENCY TO ENSURE AVOIDANCE OF SIMILAR DEFECTS.—An agency, in making any new rule to implement statutory authority previously implemented by a rule repealed under paragraph (1) or section 201, shall ensure that the new rule does not result in the same adverse effects of the repealed rule that caused the Commission to recommend to Congress the latter's repeal and will not result in new adverse effects of the kind described in the criteria specified in or under subsection (h).

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to the Commission to carry out this Act, not to exceed $30,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the earlier of the date that such sums are expended or the date of the termination of the Commission.

(l) WEBSITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a public website that—

(A) uses current information technology to make records available on the website;

(B) provides information in a standard data format; and

(C) receives and publishes public comments.

(2) PUBLISHING OF INFORMATION.—Any information required to be made available on the website established pursuant to this Act shall be published in a timely manner and shall be accessible by the public on the website at no cost.

(3) RECORD OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—All records of public meetings and hearings shall be published on the website as soon as possible, but not later than 1 week after the date on which such public meeting or hearing occurred.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The Commission shall publish on the website all public comments and submissions.

(5) NOTICES.—The Commission shall publish on the website notices of all public meetings and hearings at least one week before the date on which such public meeting or hearing occurs.

(m) APPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Commission shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT OFFICER.—The Commission shall not be subject to the control of any Advisory Committee Management Officer designated under section 8(b)(1) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(3) SUBCOMMITTEE.—Any subcommittee of the Commission shall be treated as the Commission for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(4) CHARTER.—The enactment of the SCRUB Act of 2015 shall be considered to meet the requirements of the Commission under section 9(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

TITLE II—REGULATORY CUT-GO

SEC. 201. CUT-GO PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 101(j)(2)(A) or section 202, an agency, when the agency makes a new rule, shall repeal rules or sets of rules of that agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii), such that the annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy is offset by such repeals, in an amount equal to or greater than the cost of the new rule, based on the regulatory cost reductions of repeal identified by the Commission.

(b) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE.—An agency may, alternatively, repeal rules or sets of rules of that agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) prior to the time specified in subsection (a). If the agency so repeals such a rule or set of rules and thereby reduces the annual, inflation-adjusted cost of the rule or set of rules to the United States economy, the agency may thereafter apply the reduction in regulatory costs, based on the regulatory cost reductions of repeal identified by the Commission, to meet, in whole or in part, the regulatory cost reduction required under subsection (a) of this section to be made at the time the agency promulgates a new rule.

(c) ACHIEVEMENT OF FULL NET COST REDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), an agency may offset the costs of a new rule or set of rules by repealing a rule or set of rules listed by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) that implement the same statutory authority as the new rule or set of rules.

(2) LIMITATION.—When using the authority provided in paragraph (1), the agency must achieve a net reduction in costs imposed by the agency's body of rules (including the new rule or set of rules) that is equal to or greater than the cost of the new rule or set of rules to be promulgated, including, whenever necessary, by repealing additional rules of the agency listed by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii).

SEC. 202. APPLICABILITY.

An agency shall no longer be subject to the requirements of sections 201 and 203 beginning on the date that there is no rule or set of rules of the agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) that has not been repealed such that all regulatory cost reductions identified by the Commission to be achievable through repeal have been achieved.

SEC. 203. OIRA CERTIFICATION OF COST CALCULATIONS.

The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget shall review and certify the accuracy of agency determinations of the costs of new rules under section 201. The certification shall be included in the administrative record of the relevant rulemaking by the agency promulgating the rule, and the Administrator shall transmit a copy of the certification to Congress when it transmits the certification to the agency.

TITLE III—RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF NEW RULES

SEC. 301. PLAN FOR FUTURE REVIEW.

When an agency makes a rule, the agency shall include in the final issuance of such rule a plan for the review of such rule by not later than 10 years after the date such rule is made. Such a review, in the case of a major rule, shall be substantially similar to the review by the Commission under section 101(h). In the case of a rule other than a major rule, the agency's plan for review shall include other procedures and standards to enable the agency to determine whether to repeal or amend the rule to eliminate unnecessary regulatory costs to the economy. Whenever feasible, the agency shall include a proposed plan for review of a proposed rule in its notice of proposed rulemaking and shall receive public comment on the plan.

TITLE IV—JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 401. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) IMMEDIATE REPEALS.—Agency compliance with section 101(j) of this Act shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CUT-GO PROCEDURES.—Agency compliance with title II of this Act shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) PLANS FOR FUTURE REVIEW.—Agency compliance with section 301 shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission established under section 101.

(3) MAJOR RULE.—The term ''major rule'' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose—

(A) an annual cost on the economy of $100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local, or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions;

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

(D) significant impacts on multiple sectors of the economy.

(4) RULE.—The term ''rule'' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) SET OF RULES.—The term ''set of rules'' means a set of rules that collectively implements a regulatory authority of an agency.

SEC. 502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–388. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 13, insert after ''paperwork burdens'' the following ''or unfunded mandates''.

Page 11, line 12, insert after ''enforcement'' the following: '', imposition of unfunded mandates,''.

Page 12, line 9, insert after '' excessive compliance costs'' the following: '', imposes unfunded mandates,''.

Page 25, insert after line 4 the following:

(n) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''unfunded mandate'' has the meaning given the term ''Federal mandate'' in section 421(6) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(6)).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is relatively simple in that it adds consideration of unfunded mandates to the Commission's review of existing rules.

Each year, Washington imposes thousands of rules and regulations. Rather than following the rules themselves and asking for funds for new programs, regulators pass the cost along to others by requiring the private sector, as well as State and local governments, to pay for new Federal initiatives through compliance costs.

□ 1900

These costly mandates make it harder for companies to hire and for cash-strapped States, counties, and cities to keep streets safe and parks clean.

My amendment asks the commission to consider in its review whether unfunded mandates imposed in existing regulations are economically defensible and the least burdensome policy option available.

Federal agencies often advance Federal Government initiatives without using Federal taxpayer dollars by imposing regulations on local governments or the private sector. This simple amendment ensures that costs passed to State and local governments or to the private sector are both necessary and minimal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws in the underlying legislation. This amendment would simply add unfunded mandates as another basis for the commission to prioritize the review of certain rules. The underlying legislation contains no exceptions for rules, no matter how important.

The commission the bill creates could recommend the repeal of rules

such as the ones the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives finalized this week that strengthen background check requirements for buying firearms. Such important public safety rules could be jeopardized by this bill.

I oppose the underlying bill, and I oppose this amendment, which does not improve the bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for offering this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will ensure that costly, unfunded mandates are given full consideration by the commission established by this underlying bill.

Over the past 10 years, unelected bureaucrats in Washington have issued over 36,000 new regulations. Think about that. Over the past 10 years, unelected bureaucrats have issued over 36,000 new regulations. That is a lot. Each of these shift the costs and burdens of this administration's Big Government agenda onto the backs of everyday working people, small businesses, and local governments.

These unfunded mandates cost jobs, hurt working Americans, and place ankle weights on the U.S. economy. It is past time to slow down this runaway train. I urge my colleagues to support the Foxx amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, in response to my colleague from Maryland, let me say that unfunded mandates take many forms that may not be included when regulatory costs are counted. That is why strong, bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate passed the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act in 1995.

Similarly, my amendment ensures that costs passed from Federal agencies to State and local governments and private businesses are properly counted and considered. If mandates under review are economically defensible and represent the best policy option available, then the commission will not recommend they be repealed.

The issue of unfunded mandates is frequently overlooked in the debates about reforming our regulatory system and carrying out Federal policies. It is all too easy for Washington bureaucrats to write off concerns expressed by a handful of local governments or of a small subset of private businesses, but these decisions have real costs and real effects on the individuals, families, and communities we each represent.

While my amendment is a small change, it ensures that costs passed down to businesses and to State and local governments are truly the best means to achieve desired policy ends; so I thank my colleagues for their consideration and ask for their support.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, insert after line 12 the following:

(I) Whether or not the rule or set of rules limits or prevents an agency from applying new or emerging technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness of government.

Page 13, line 13, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(J)''.

Page 17, line 24, strike ''(G), or (H)'' and insert ''(G), (H), or (I)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those occasions in which we walk up to the mike, and we always say it is a simple amendment. This one really is a simple amendment. Many of us here, particularly myself, have a fixation on information and technology as a dramatically more efficient, safe, and healthy way to regulate. So, if you are going to have a commission looking at agencies, looking at the levels of regulations, looking at the mechanics out there, can it also take a look and make sure it has adopted the most technically appropriate and efficient technology for that regulation?

A couple of years ago, when sitting on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, a division of the EPA and these businesses came in, and they brought in stacks of paper that they had to fill out and fax in. Okay. It is absurd in today's world, but that is the way the regs they were up against were written. If you are going to have a commission looking at what is wrong out there, at what can be made more efficient, and at what is inappropriately burdensome, let's also take a look and ask: What can actually be made less burdensome through the use of technology?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment establishes additional criteria for the commission's one-sided review of all Federal regulations, authorizing it to identify rules for repeal that may limit or prohibit agencies from adopting technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness in order to lower regulatory costs.

Although this criteria, itself, may be unobjectionable on its face, it does nothing to change the commission's cost-only, deregulatory, and dangerous mandate under title I of H.R. 1155. Furthermore, rather than allowing agencies to modify or improve existing rules to accommodate for technological changes, this amendment would only create a basis for eliminating rules.

For instance, this amendment would authorize the commission to identify for elimination a rule protecting workers against discrimination, regardless of the rule's benefits, if the costs associated with the rule could be mitigated by adopting new technologies to improve efficiency. In other words, no matter how important and beneficial a rule prohibiting discrimination may be, it could be eliminated if the commission determines that it somehow encumbers agency efficiency. That is laughable.

As the administration notes in its Statement of Administration Policy, which threatens to veto this bill should it reach the President's desk, this bill lacks any ''mechanism for making thoughtful and modest modifications to rules to improve their implementation and enforcement,'' which is often the best course of action before we scuttle a rule or as we try to make the regulation work. Accordingly, I must oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I quickly inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, let's try something that is, actually, fairly novel around here because, in this particular case, this is just a few words. Let's actually read it: ''Whether or not the rule or set of rules limits or prevents an agency from applying new or emerging technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness of government.''

Oh, come on. How do you oppose that? I understand you may not like the bill, itself, but as an amendment, if we are really trying to push our government into this century of utilization of information and technology, you would at least like this amendment.

Look, this is simple. This is actually something we should be weaving in and out of what we do here in order to try to drive the use of technology and information to make us more efficient and more respectful of our taxpayers. As to the quality of information, how do you even know that the way a regulation is being done is actually being done in the most efficient, technologically sound, and rational way? I believe the simple language here helps drive the commission to actually reflect that.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, insert after line 12 the following:

(I) Whether the rule or set of rules harms wage growth, including wage growth for minimum wage and part-time workers.

Page 13, line 13, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(J)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will give us greater insight into the impact of Federal regulations on the wages of American workers.

We already know from countless studies that the accumulation of regulations increases the cost of goods, which reduces the buying power of families and individuals to purchase the items they need and want. An area that we need to study more, though, is what impact regulations have on the wages of most Americans. Given the negative impacts of regulations on prices, it is reasonable to conclude that regulations could be a major contributing factor to flattening wages, especially—and I say this clearly—for lower income individuals.

According to the U.S. Census, the median wage in the U.S. is the same today as it was in 2007. That is 8 years of no income gain for families and workers in Michigan and across the country. The University of California's economists have also found that, since 2009, the average income of the top 1 percent grew by 11.2 percent in real terms while the bottom 99 percent saw their incomes decrease by 0.4 percent. During that same time, there have been over $100 billion in new regulatory costs, according to the Mercatus Center.

Many employers I speak to would rather hire more workers or give their current staffs a raise. Instead, they are forced to spend limited resources on making sense of the thousands of pages of new regulations that are coming out of Washington. Employers are spending more on compliance than ever before, leaving little left in their budgets to increase the take-home pay of employees.

Some of my colleagues here in Congress believe that more bureaucratic red tape and mandates from the Federal Government will actually increase wages and reduce inequality. While these regulations may sound good in theory—some of them—the hard truth is that, over time, they limit economic growth and career advancement opportunities. Most alarming is that these negative economic impacts affect lower wage workers the very most—immobilizing them from finding work, from rising in their careers, and from increasing their wages.

□ 1915

Fortunately, the SCRUB Act is an innovative approach; and I commend its sponsor, Representative JASON SMITH, for his work.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, will enhance this important bill by instructing the commission to review the impact of regulation on wages as part of their retrospective review.

I encourage all my colleagues to support my amendment and the bill so we can unleash individuals and industry from regulatory burdens and create an environment where wages and economy can grow for everyone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to point out some serious concerns about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, which would direct the commission to examine the role that regulations have on wage stagnation and income inequality by examining the negative impact regulations have on wages.

It is my belief that this amendment is based on the false premise that all regulations have some negative impact on workers and their wages. It should be clear that this one-sentence amendment does not encompass the full story about the critical impact that workplace regulations can have on improving the health, safety, and income of workers.

For example, the rules and regulations that have been offered and put into effect by the Department of Labor under this administration have improved worker safety, increased workplace opportunity, and increased wages. The benefits are indisputable and far outweigh the costs. For example, the home care workers rule would extend overtime and minimum wage protection to 2 million home care workers. The proposed overtime rule would extend overtime pay protections for more than 5 million American workers who currently would be putting in dozens of overtime hours for no extra pay at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the description of this amendment shows an apparent concern for the problems that working families face, and the gentleman from Michigan has talked very extensively about it: wage stagnation and income inequality. If that is what we are going to address, there are ways of addressing it.

For example, we could bring to the floor for a vote the Raise the Wage Act, which would increase the minimum wage to $12 an hour by 2020 and would give over 30 million Americans a raise.

We could support the Department of Labor's proposed rule that increases the overtime salary threshold, which would update the overtime rule to ensure that 5 million more Americans would be eligible to earn overtime for hours worked over 40 hours a week. Since the 1970s, worker output has increased by 74 percent, while the hourly compensation of the typical worker has only increased 9 percent. Workers simply aren't receiving a fair share of the wealth they create, and the overtime rule would help address this disparity.

We could cosponsor the WAGE Act that would protect hardworking Americans' fundamental right to join together and bargain for better wages. To date, 67 House Democrats support the Workplace Action for a Growing Economy, the WAGE Act, legislation that would strengthen protections for workers who want to raise wages and improve workplace conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support these alternatives, but to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concerns expressed by the ranking member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, my friend from Virginia. I appreciate the fact he sits in on all of our Workforce Protections Subcommittee hearings that I have the privilege of chairing.

We have looked at regulatory changes that the gentleman speaks to. He, as well as the rest of my colleagues on that subcommittee, have heard very clear testimony that while they are based on wonderful desires, we all want safe workplaces, we all want people making better pay, having better benefits, living wages. Yet, all of those come with costs, and, in fact, basically every one of those regulatory ideas would cost jobs and job security. I have seen that very clearly with several of those in the great State of Michigan as they have been implemented.

Mr. Chairman, we should have commonsense, effective regulations that truly punish bad actors, but regulations cannot come at the overwhelming costs we are seeing now with anemic growth and stagnant wages. Sadly, we don't know how much wages have truly been hit by these regulations, which is why my amendment is needed.

I ask for support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOOLENAAR). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 25, strike line 5, and all that follows through page 27, line 13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike title II of H.R. 1155, which would require agencies to undertake a regulatory CutGo process to repeal rules identified by the commission with little to no consideration of the rules' benefits prior to issuing the new rule.

These regulatory CutGo provisions would apply to every new agency rule, no matter how important or pressing, for every regulatory agency. Alarmingly, title II would also require agencies to undertake a notice and comment process for all rules eliminated through CutGo because, as I noted earlier, agencies are unable to simply rescind the rules. Thus, this bill would substantially delay or even prevent new regulations through this burdensome and time-consuming requirement.

As several of my colleagues' amendments demonstrate, the bill's regulatory CutGo procedures are unsafe, dangerous, and would tie the hands of agencies responding to public health crises requiring timely regulatory responses. In fact, this bill lacks any mechanism for consideration of public policy and safety, which would leave no option for agencies to issue emergency rules to protect the public and environment from imminent harm.

The bill's proponents claim that title I of H.R. 1155 would allow the commission to consider whether the costs of the bill are not justified by the benefit to society. As Professor Levin testified during the subcommittee's consideration of a previous version of this bill, the catchall language of subsection (h)(2)(I) would allow the commission to recommend the repeal of ''any rule promulgated by any agency if it deems the rule's requirements to be unnecessarily burdensome.'' In short, the commission would be completely free to disregard any benefit of the regulation by proceeding under this language or the bill's other advisory language.

Furthermore, H.R. 1155 is silent on what methodology the commission must follow, requiring only that it must have one, which leaves the window wide open for absolutely no consideration of the benefits of regulation.

While consideration of the cost of regulations is sometimes important, there is overwhelming consensus that the benefits of regulation vastly exceed the costs. In both the Republican and Democratic administrations, the benefits of our regulatory system of regulatory protections have made our country safer, stronger, healthier, and cleaner.

The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has observed that these benefits ''include, among other things, ensuring that workplaces, air travel, foods, and drugs are safe; that the Nation's air, water, and land are not polluted; and that the appropriate amount of taxes is collected.''

The GAO reported in 2007 that while ''the costs of these regulations are estimated to be in the hundreds of billions of dollars, the benefits estimates are even higher.'' In 2012, the Office of Management and Budget likewise concluded that even by conservative estimates, the benefits of major regulations exceeded the costs on a 2-to-1 basis over the past decade. Between fiscal years 1999 and 2009, the benefits of regulations produced a net benefit of $73 billion, vastly exceeding the regulations' costs.

This evidence overwhelmingly refutes the bald assertion that regulatory costs are burdensome, eliminate jobs, or harm our economic competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, to oppose this misguided bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Title II of the bill contains one of the bill's most important innovations, a CutGo process for the repeal of regulations Congress approves for repeal.

This process is modeled on the CutGo process pioneered in Congress itself to control Federal spending. By allowing regulatory repeals to occur on a CutGo basis, the bill both stabilizes total Federal regulatory costs and avoids forcing all repeals to occur immediately. This creates the opportunity for regulatory agencies applying their expertise and working with the entities they regulate to administer a smoother process of regulatory repeal with ample opportunities to prioritize the order of repeals and cooperatively consider any needed replacement regulations.

The CutGo process also avoids one of the major flaws of the regulatory lookback process applied under executive order by the Obama administration. Although the process has resulted in some cost reductions under individual regulations, the net result of the process has been an alarming increase in total costs imposed by all Federal regulations. That is a giant step backwards, and it is a result the SCRUB Act's CutGo provisions will emphatically prevent.

I would like to say for the record, a report by the National Association of Manufacturers states that the total cost of Federal regulation in 2012 was $2.028 trillion. The annual cost burden for an average U.S. firm is $233,000, or 21 percent of the average payroll. With that kind of number, no wonder we have the problems that we have. Listen to this figure: A small manufacturer with fewer than 50 employees will pay an estimated close to $35,000 per employee per year to comply with Federal regulations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply want to say that I concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has studied this and spent a considerable amount of time with this.

We would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment. This amendment removes title II of the bill, which is one of the bill's truly most important provisions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment, which is cosponsored by the Subcommittee on Government Operations' Ranking Member GERRY CONNOLLY, would strike title IV of this bill.

Title IV provides for judicial review of agency compliance with certain requirements of the bill, including regulatory CutGo procedures.

The agency rulemaking process already provides interested parties with ample opportunity for participation.

When an industry or special interest does not like the result of the rulemaking process, this bill gives them another bite at the apple.

Judicial review provides opponents of rules with the opportunity to delay regulations by tying them up in court. No rules would be exempt.

Corporate and special interests with deep pockets could use judicial review to delay critical regulations that would protect public health, safety, and the environment.

Let me give you an example. In August of last year, the EPA finalized its Clean Power Plan rules. According to EPA, by 2030, the plan will cut carbon pollution from the power sector by nearly a third, yielding substantial health benefits to Americans.

EPA estimates that, because of these regulations, Americans will avoid 90,000 asthma attacks and save 3,600 lives.

These important rules were developed with industry and public input. EPA states that it received 4.3 million public comments and held hundreds of meetings with stakeholders. The final rules reflect this vigorous process.

However, if the SCRUB Act were enacted, industry or special interests could use the judicial review provisions to stall important rules like the Clean Power Plan.

The judicial review provisions of this bill are yet another attempt by the House Republicans to erect a roadblock for important public health and safety protections.

This amendment removes this flawed provision from the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment strikes the bill's title providing for judicial review of agency compliance with requirements for repeal of existing rules and publication of plans for decennial review of newly promulgated rules.

These provisions must be retained, not stricken. They are critical to ensure that recalcitrant agencies abide by Congress' approvals of rules for repeal and actually do plan for effective, decennial cost-reduction reviews for newly promulgated regulations.

We know that, without provision for judicial review, retrospective review of agency regulations can lead to nothing but increases in the overall cost of regulation.

Just look at the results of the Obama administration's retrospective review under Executive Order 13563, which precluded judicial review.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I again concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO). This amendment strikes the applicability of judicial review of agency compliance with this legislation. That is why I am urging a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

The legislation will begin a much-needed review of our Nation's regulatory structure and hopefully identify many outdated regulations. This amendment gets in the way of that. I think it would slow this process down. It gets rid of something that, again, makes it an alteration that I think has been well debated and well discussed.

I urge the passage of the overall bill, but I stand in opposition to this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 22, insert before the period the following: '', except that the term does not include an independent establishment as defined in section 104 of such title''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment, cosponsored by Subcommittee on Government Operations' Ranking Member GERRY CONNOLLY, would exempt independent agencies from the requirements of this bill.

Independent agencies serve an important role in protecting the American people from a range of threats, including the collapse of our financial markets and health and safety risks.

Agencies such as the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission are designed to independently regulate the industries they cover.

These agencies are not required to obtain approval for their rules from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, as other executive branch agencies must do. The reason independent agencies are treated differently is to protect them from political interference in their rulemaking.

The SCRUB Act would jeopardize the independence of these agencies by subjecting their rules to oversight by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

Section 203 of the SCRUB Act would require OIRA to review and certify the cost estimate for every new rule promulgated by an independent agency. This bill would also require independent agencies to comply with the bill's regulatory CutGo requirements.

For example, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has a proposed rule that would establish safety standards for infant high chairs. How would the Commission choose which unsafe product to stop regulating in order to protect the approximately 10,000 children injured each year by unsafe high chairs?

The Commission recently wrote a rule creating the strongest crib safety standards in the developed world. Would they have to repeal that rule? Under our amendment, independent agencies would not have to make this choice.

Bank regulators are already subject to the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996, which requires them to review all existing banking regulations and ''eliminate unnecessary regulations.''

The bank regulators are already required by law to remove all outdated, unnecessary, and overly burdensome regulations. They cannot save up outdated regulations for the purpose of promulgating new rules under the SCRUB Act, like other agencies.

This bill would handcuff our bank regulators and make financial crises and the recessions that follow that much more likely.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to keep the independent agencies truly independent.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are not proposing to hurt or kill babies, and we are not proposing to put handcuffs on certain regulators in the financial institutions.

What we are asking for is to simply have a bipartisan group of people—bipartisan—look at regulations that may be outdated and scrub them. I think that is a reasonable expectation. That is not asking too much.

It doesn't mean that every regulation is going to go away. There are some good regulations, but there are a lot of bad ones and there are a lot that are outdated. Things come into this institution, whether they come in through laws or they come from the executive branch. They never go away. A lot of them are unnecessary.

The bill creates a bipartisan, impartial commission to conduct a comprehensive review of the Federal regulations system. The commission will identify out-of-date and expensive regulations.

Independent agencies function very similarly, if not the same, as executive agencies, and the regulations impose significant costs on the economy. Unfortunately, independent agencies often impose major regulations without reporting any quantitative information on benefits and costs, which makes it even more important that those regulations be reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need to distinguish independent and executive agencies in requiring the Federal agencies to clean up out-of-date and unnecessary regulations.

A regulation identified as unnecessary remains unnecessary regardless of whether it came from an independent agency or an executive branch agency. It doesn't matter. It should be reviewed or be eligible to be reviewed. We think that is reasonable, and that is why we would urge a ''no'' vote on this particular amendment.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 21, insert after ''Code'' the following: '', except for a special rule''.

Page 29, insert after line 24 the following:

(6) SPECIAL RULE.—The term ''special rule'' means a rule made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment to H.R. 1155 would exempt rules and regulations made by the Department of Veterans Affairs from the burdensome provisions of this legislation.

The rules that are promulgated by the Department of Veterans Affairs serve the nearly 21.9 million veterans who have served our country, more than 9 million of whom are enrolled in the VA health system.

These are the rules that will improve the VA, and these improvements are urgently needed to repair a system that is poorly equipped to handle the increasing numbers of veterans returning from overseas. These are the rules that will ensure that those who have served our country have access to critical and quality health care.

However, in its current form, the SCRUB Act would delay or even block the implementation of these rules. For example, it would delay rules designed to provide care to the 2.6 million veterans who were potentially exposed to Agent Orange during the Vietnam war.

To help these veterans, the VA issued a final interim rule in June of 2015 that would expand the class of veterans presumed to be eligible for treatment. The new regulation would include those who worked with C–123 aircraft known to have been sprayed with this herbicide during the war.

But under the terms of this legislation, the VA would be required to go through additional hurdles to meet the procedural requirements of this legislation with absolutely no additional benefits. If this rule comes with any cost to the economy, the VA must repeal a rule of equal or greater cost. All of this means delays for our veterans who deserve better.

In effect, the SCRUB Act asks the VA to choose between classes of ailing veterans. It would delay treatment and create a zero-sum game in which our veterans ultimately lose. This is completely wrong. It would delay essential reforms to improve the system, address existing flaws, and better serve our veterans.

□ 1945

The problems that have plagued the system have been well-documented both in congressional hearings and in the press.

Since the year 2000, at least 22 government reports have looked into patient wait times at VA facilities. One of these reports found that more than 57,000 of our veterans have waited longer than 90 days for health care. The audit found that staff were instructed to misrepresent data in 76 percent of VA facilities.

The VA is in need of immediate attention and reform, and we are doing a disservice to our veterans by delaying these reforms and the rules that are necessary to accomplish these reforms.

The SCRUB Act is based upon the faulty idea that it is more important to cut regulations than it is to move forward to improve care for our veterans.

While my amendment will not cure all that ails this legislation, it will address one of the most glaring flaws and preserve the ability of the VA to effectively serve our veterans by ensuring that these reforms move forward without delay.

So I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the purpose and the function of the bill. The SCRUB Act merely clears the underbrush of outdated and unnecessary regulations.

There is no reason to exclude any specific agency from retrospective review. A regulation identified as unnecessary remains unnecessary, regardless of its subject matter or agency that originally issued it.

I am sure that there are regulations that were issued in the 1920s, 1930s, or 1940s—pick your decade—that were well-intended, but the world has changed, and I think it is time that we actually go and review this.

In the case of this amendment, it could disadvantage veterans who are likely to bear the burden of unnecessary regulations. So with all the laws and all the regulations, guess what. The Veterans Administration isn't getting it done.

So let's clear the underbrush of regulations. Let's work in a bipartisan way to fix the Veterans Administration. But it is not unreasonable to ask for a bipartisan group of people to go in and look at this and study this and make these types of recommendations. I think that is reasonable, it is balanced, and it is not going to harm veterans. In fact, I think it is actually going to help veterans. I think it is going to help an administration and a bureaucracy that is so bloated, once things get in, they never come out. That is what we are trying to change, and that is why I think this amendment is unnecessary and counterproductive, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to respond briefly, we have heard a lot about clearing the underbrush and about scrubbing the regulations. But the reality is, if this legislation passes, there will be certain implications; and it will, in fact, require the VA, who is in the midst of major reform, to not move forward on its regulations that are intended to improve the lives of our veterans until they find another regulation to repeal that someone has determined is of equal cost.

So the reality is that it will delay implementation of these improvements. We can describe it as clearing the underbrush and scrubbing, but what it will mean for America's veterans in many instances is that they

will be denied the quality care that they deserve and that they have earned in the defense of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will carve out the Department of Veterans Affairs, the agency charged with honoring the service of our veterans, and ensure that the improvements that are underway and that we are all demanding will not be delayed because of the SCRUB Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the SCRUB Act that is going to slow it down. It is not an excuse for the administration to do what they have been trying to do for the last 7 years and have absolutely, totally failed to do.

How many times are we going to get constituents coming into our own offices complaining about the VA? I guarantee that if you go across this country and ask the people that work in your offices what are the number one, two, and three complaints and problems that they have, I guarantee you in the top three it is going to be veterans.

We are not taking care of the veterans that we need to take care of. We are not going to be introducing a bill that is going to harm our ability to fix that problem. But you are naive, at best, if anybody thinks that all the regulations in place right now are just perfect, because that is, in essence, what they are arguing: it is perfect. We don't need to get rid of anything. We just need more, more, more regulations.

Take a bipartisan group of people, let them look at it, study it, and spend the time necessary in a bipartisan way. That is reasonable. That is why we should vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 21, insert after ''Code'' the following: '', except for a special rule''.

Page 29, insert after line 24 the following:

(6) SPECIAL RULE.—The term ''special rule'' means a rule made by an agency in response to an emergency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Like the mountain of antiregulation bills we have considered in the past, the SCRUB Act is in no way a serious effort to make targeted improvements to the rulemaking process.

Touted by its supporters as a job creation measure, this irresponsible bill takes a sledgehammer approach to reform. Particularly egregious is this legislation's complete failure to provide an exemption for emergency situations. My amendment would correct this very serious mistake.

In March 2014, the Oso landslide, a horrific natural disaster that took the lives of 43 people in my district, required every available resource to be deployed without delays. And given the many crises the country faced last year alone, from wildfires to terrorist threats, I am alarmed that we are considering a bill today that would get in the way of an agency trying to do its job at critical moments like these. The idea that an agency responding to an emergency would be forced to weigh what existing regulations to get rid of before they can take new action, while lives are at risk, cannot be what this body intends.

Bills like this are not jobs packages. They are pandering to a few select corporate special interests that put the lives and well-being of every American at risk.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment and to ensure, the next time our country faces an emergency, the citizens of this country can rest assured knowing that the Federal agencies they expect to provide services in times of crises will not have their hands tied by this irresponsible legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for our Members here. But to suggest that what we are doing is throwing a sledgehammer and that it is pandering, come on. This is a serious effort to suggest, in a bipartisan way, to go back and review things.

Now, in the case that was brought up earlier in this debate, there may have been an emergency to deal with something in, say, the State of Washington. And I hope that was dealt with very successfully. But 70 years from now, it is probably not applicable. And I guarantee you, there are regulations and things that are happening by the tens of thousands, by the way, on a regular basis that are no longer needed.

All we are asking for is an opportunity to put together a bipartisan group to go review these. That is what JASON SMITH has been passionate about. That is what he is fighting for. That is what is reasonable. That is why we are here today. But to suggest that it is because of pandering or any other negative word, our heart is sincere in that we actually do think that these regulations cause problems.

You have got to have bureaucrats who understand all these regulations. It is not just the taxpayers—who we work for—but it is also the bureaucrats who are supposed to try to sort all of this out and have manual after manual after manual to bind people to the point where they have a difficult time doing their very jobs that they are supposed to be doing.

So should we review things that were put forward on an emergency basis? Yes. I am not saying that has to be done 3 months afterwards. But we are going to be able to have a long look back, and you shouldn't exempt out veterans and, in this case, you shouldn't exempt out somebody who is just trying to go back and look at something that may originally become a very legitimate emergency. Why would we not look at that?

It is just this attitude and this approach that says everything is perfect. Essentially, what the Democrats are arguing is that all of the regulations are perfect. No need for any changes. No reason to get rid of anything.

What we are saying is, in a bipartisan way, let's go back, let's review these, and let's come up with a way to cut out that underbrush. Let's try to find the ones that are no longer needed and streamline what we are trying to do in our government. It will be better for the employees. It will be better for the taxpayers. It will be better for America because we will actually understand what the rules and regulations are.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I think that my colleague, Mr. CHAFFETZ, would agree with my amendment because this bill requires that before agencies can issue a new rule, they get rid of an old one, and there is no exception for emergencies. It seems like a very reasonable approach to make sure that, again, in a time of crisis, agencies are able to respond right away.

This is an important amendment. It is a very reasonable amendment. It addresses a serious flaw in the bill. I ask again for my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind our colleagues that the cutting doesn't apply until the commission reports back. So until they have had a chance to go in and look and review, then there is an opportunity to cut out this underbrush. And I think I have made my point. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 21, insert after ''Code'' the following: '', except for a special rule''.

Page 29, insert after line 24 the following:

(6) SPECIAL RULE.—The term ''special rule'' means a rule made by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for their leadership and for making the Jackson Lee amendment in order.

Thank you for the opportunity to explain this amendment to H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, referred to as the SCRUB Act.

This amendment would exempt any rule issued by the Department of Homeland Security from the onerous mandates of this legislation. If enacted, the SCRUB Act would establish a retrospective regulatory review commission to identify existing Federal regulations that can be repealed to reduce unnecessary regulatory costs to the U.S. economy.

This bill purports to reduce bureaucracy by establishing a new regulatory review commission charged with identifying duplicative, redundant, or so-called obsolete regulations to repeal. I am offering this amendment because I am concerned about the procedural process by which the SCRUB Act attempts to accomplish this worthy goal and the real and potential dangers this legislation presents to our public health and safety.

If passed without this amendment, this legislation could really undermine and jeopardize public health and safety. In particular, this bill undermines the ability of agencies to act in times of imminent need to protect citizens.

The SCRUB Act would prohibit any regulatory agency from issuing any new rule or informal statement, including nonlegislative and procedural rules, even in the case of an emergency or imminent harm to public health, until the agency first offsets the costs of the new rule or guidance by eliminating an existing rule identified by the commission. This regulatory CutGo process would force agencies to prioritize between existing protections and responding to new threats to the health and well-being of our people and the safety of our homeland.

Such a sweeping requirement would endanger the lives of Americans by creating unnecessary delays in the Federal rulemaking process and creating additional burdens and implementation problems that will only divert critical agency resources and diminish agencies' ability to protect and inform the public in times of imminent danger and need.

□ 2000

For instance, if an agency needed to respond to an imminent hazard to the public or environment, it would have to either rescind an existing rule that is identified by the commission's arbitrary and cost-centric process or choose not to act.

This amendment is a simple solution to that problem, and it will protect the health and well-being of all Americans. It would ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is not unnecessarily burdened with regulatory mandates that would jeopardize its ability to carry out its mission to prevent terrorism, enhance security, manage our borders, administer immigration laws, secure cyberspace, and ensure disaster resilience.

The Department of Homeland Security is the first line of defense in protecting the Nation and leading recovery efforts from all hazards and threats, which includes everything from weapons of mass destruction to natural disasters.

You may recall the Nation's first documented case of Ebola last year in Dallas, Texas. It was an unforeseen and singular event that required DHS to develop new procedures and rules governing travel to the United States by individuals who had recently visited countries suffering through the Ebola outbreak.

The Department of Homeland Security was also recently tasked with adjusting its efforts to secure the southern border when a wave of unaccompanied minors entered the country without notice.

We do not need to be reminded of the heightened state of security that we are now in and the increasing demand upon our government agencies tasked with keeping our borders and citizens safe.

The overall mission of the Department of Homeland Security is too critical and its function so essential that it would be irresponsible to impede the agency in the performance of its duties, as this bill would do.

Now is not the time to undermine or slow the ability of the Department of Homeland Security to address growing threats and active acts of terrorism. The Department of Homeland Security must remain focused on the crucial mission of securing the homeland. This amendment will help them achieve that goal.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, the amendment indicates a fundamental, I think, misunderstanding of the purpose and the functionality of the bill.

The SCRUB Act is intended to cut out unnecessary regulations. So the first question you really have to ask yourself is, are there unnecessary regulations?

I would remind Members that on May 26, 2011, the Homeland Security Department, which really hadn't been in place for a very long, as it is a new agency, started an initiative to cut out unnecessary regulations.

The President, three times, has asked to cut out unnecessary regulations. So we are formalizing that process a little bit more so that it is true for every department and agency, and we are doing so in a bipartisan way.

So what are we afraid of? What are we afraid of?

We are trying to say things need to be reviewed, and they need to go look. And if they are perfect—I doubt it. I really doubt it. But they are going to have this opportunity, in a bipartisan way, to allow the commission to go do its work, make recommendations, look at these things that are just there by the tens of thousands.

The world has changed. It has dramatically changed. And we ought to be reviewing this on a regular basis, and that is what the SCRUB Act does.

That is why I think, again, creating another carve-out for somebody is unnecessary and counterproductive and ill-advised. That is why I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, that may well be the purpose of this bill, and I don't think anyone would disagree with reviewing regulations and making recommendations. That may be the purpose of the bill, but that is not what the bill does.

What the bill does—and we have to understand the implications, and I will repeat it—it prohibits any regulatory agency from issuing any new rule or informal statement, including nonlegislative and procedure rules, even in the case of an emergency or imminent harm to the public, until the agency first offsets the cost of the new rule or

guidance by eliminating an existing rule identified by the commission.

So it is not that anyone is suggesting everything is perfect and a review isn't necessary, but it is the procedure that the bill sets forth which will become law that requires agencies to delay doing anything until they find something to undo.

In the context of the requirements and the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security, this has potentially life-threatening implications. So it is not that anyone is suggesting everything is perfect and a review isn't necessary.

But the bill does much more than that. It says to agencies like the Department of Homeland Security, you may not act, even if it is necessary to protect the public, until you repeal or rescind a corresponding amount of regulation. That is a danger. It is what this bill will do.

This amendment relieves that and provides an exemption so that, at least on issues of defending the homeland, we do not delay implementation of the rules.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's passion for this issue. All we are asking for, in a bipartisan way—and I sound like a broken record up here—is to review these regulations, go back over an indefinite amount of time to look way back, back, and go look at what these rules and regulations that have been put out there.

Remember, we are supposed to be implementing it by law. There are times when regulations and rules—certainly in emergency situations, it has to be dealt with. But they can go back and look at these. It is not going to slow down our dealing with an emergency.

What we are going to do, and I think we are going to find, is that it is actually going to clean up the process in the system.

It is like—I am trying to think of a good example of this—but they keep throwing things into the garage, and there is so much clutter you can't even get in the garage.

And I just think they are living on a different planet if we think that all these regulations are perfect; nothing needs to be cleared out; we don't want to take any time; we want just the administration to do it; we don't want the other party to be involved.

Republicans are suggesting to do this in a bipartisan way. I think that is reasonable. I think that is what the American people want.

But Democrats don't want us to do that. They don't want a bipartisan group of people looking at rules and regulations in the executive branch. I don't think that is fair. I don't think that is balanced.

What we are offering, I think, is an opportunity to do that. They are allowed to go through, this commission goes through this process. The department and agency can identify a list of things that need to be cleaned out of that garage.

I think that is a reasonable way to go and why, again, nobody should be excluded. I think it is a healthy part of the process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 21, insert after ''Code'' the following: '', except for a special rule''.

Page 29, insert after line 24 the following:

(6) SPECIAL RULE.—The term ''special rule'' means a rule pertaining to consumer safety made by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, including any rule made under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this amendment to protect food safety standards for consumers.

In 2010, Congress updated our food safety protections for the 21st century by passing the Food Safety and Modernization Act, greatly expanding these consumer protections through the Food and Drug Administration.

Today it is critical that we maintain this progress and protect the implementation of this law from the obstructionist policies included in the SCRUB Act. It is especially important that we allow the FDA to carry out this effort unimpeded because our food safety standards are facing attacks from many other directions.

A recent decision from the World Trade Organization repealed our country-of-origin labeling standards on beef and pork, undermining consumers' right to know where their groceries are coming from.

Meanwhile, the United States is considering entering the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a massive multinational trade agreement that may allow food into our grocery stores and restaurants that may not even meet basic safety standards. The TPP weakens our ability to inspect these dangerous foods before they end up on our dinner plates.

We know that seafood imported from countries like Vietnam and Malaysia are often contaminated with dangerous antibiotics and foodborne pathogens. Between 2002 and 2010, 44 percent of catfish and related species from China, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, and Cambodia tested positive for antibiotics banned in the United States. Further, in 2013, 100 percent of the Vietnamese catfish farms used antibiotics not approved in the United States.

Meanwhile, large amounts of shrimp imported to the United States also contain dangerous bacteria. Last year, harmful bacteria were found in 83 percent of the shrimp from Bangladesh, 74 percent of the shrimp from India, and 58 percent of the shrimp from Vietnam.

For these reasons, the number of dirty seafood shipments from Vietnam and Malaysia rejected by the FDA increased 224 percent in the first 2 months of 2015 alone. We must amend this legislation to preserve the FDA's ability to protect our food.

It is not too much to ask that families are assured basic food safety standards and protections are met. Please support this amendment, which will allow the FDA to continue doing its job by protecting consumers and making sure our food is safe to eat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The SCRUB Act is not going to take away the entire FDA. Our food, and the people that work at the FDA, the food safety is an important part of the function that they hold.

But I would appreciate anybody to have us understand—we actually, through the staff, read this report from George Mason University. In February of 2014 they wrote a really good report, ''The Consequences of Regulatory Accumulation and a Proposed Solution.'' I just want to highlight one of the examples of something that is still on the books. The Food and Drug Administration has been creating rules since its inception in 1906.

There is still a regulation on the FDA's books that governs the width of strings in canned string beans. That is still on the books. You are breaking the law if you go past this regulation.

This is the kind of stuff that should be out of there because, you know what, there is some entrepreneur, there is some business that has the liability now hanging over their head. In 1906, somehow, somebody thought that was a good rule, but it is not anymore. It is unnecessary. It is burdensome. It is still on the books.

Let's have a bipartisan group of people look at this and go find the width of string beans and get rid of that regulation. What is wrong with that? That

is what the SCRUB Act does. That is what JASON SMITH is talking about.

There are other examples. It was just, I believe, according to The Wall Street Journal, the EPA had saccharine, was treated as a dangerous chemical. But the FDA said it was safe for people to consume. And it wasn't until just last month that the EPA said: All right, it is not a dangerous, hazardous chemical. And the FDA prevailed. But there are conflicts.

Again, a commission looking at this, with professionals, staff, people who are looking at these types of things are going to go find these regulations and try to go weed them out. It will streamline what we are doing. It is good for the economy. It is good for the country. It makes common sense, and we are trying to do so in a bipartisan way.

So the FDA, they do good work. But we are talking about a lot of other regulations and rules that were put forth that are no longer necessary and need to be eliminated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, first let me say I am not going to impugn anyone's motives why it was introduced. My problems are with the implementation of the law.

If you would like to, with my office, sign a letter to repeal the 1906 string bean width regulation, I am with you. We can do that, and that is a commonsense way to get things done.

You mentioned things from the twenties and thirties and forties that might be there. But let's put it another way. You are saying every time a new regulation is necessary, you have to find an old regulation, which is overly simplistic, ultimately impractical and, I think, ultimately dangerous, especially when it comes to issues like food safety and veterans and other areas. So it is the impracticality.

You are telling a consumer, if they have old things in their refrigerator that are outdated, when you buy your new milk, you take out your old milk, but you don't clean out your refrigerator. That is a ridiculous notion.

□ 2015

Only in Washington would we come up with a law as ridiculous as saying that you take one for one rather than just cleaning out old items. So I just have a problem with the bill itself. I am not impugning anyone's motives for introducing it. I just think it is a silly way of accomplishing what you want to accomplish.

I don't disagree with the gentleman, and I don't think many of us disagree that there are regulations that should be gotten rid of. But there is a way to do it that would make sense, that the public would understand, and that wouldn't be just the brainchild of the Beltway inside Washington which, unfortunately, is what the SCRUB Act is.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, here is the problem.

The Federal bureaucracy continues to grow and expand to the point where we have millions of people who wake up every day. A lot of them are regulators. They can't justify their existence unless they regulate something.

There is no incentive to get rid of those regulations. There is every incentive to add regulations because that is what they get paid to do. We want to just have a bipartisan group of people who can go and weed out all of this unnecessary underbrush, as I keep calling it, to streamline the system.

It should be done by every agency. It is going to take time to go through it. I hope we are saying that we recognize that there is this problem because we can keep coming up with examples and going through and saying, ''Hey, we will pass''—do you know how expensive it is to introduce and pass a piece of legislation and try to get it over to the Senate?

We are trying to create a commission in a bipartisan way to have people dive in and look at these regulations. That is what we are asking for. That is why I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying bill introduced by Mr. JASON SMITH.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 114–388.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''Commission'' means the Regulatory Improvement Commission established under section 3;

(2) the term ''commission bill'' means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the Commission recommended under section 4(h)(2)(C); and

(3) the term ''covered regulation'' means a regulation that has been finalized not later than 10 years before the date on which the Commission is established.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the legislative branch a commission to be known as the ''Regulatory Improvement Commission''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

(A) 1 member shall be appointed by the President, and shall serve as the Chairperson of the Commission;

(B) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(C) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(E) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) DATE.—The appointment of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(A) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Commission shall be an individual with expertise and experience in rulemaking, such as past Administrators of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, past chairmen of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and other individuals with similar expertise and experience in rulemaking affairs and the administration of regulatory reviews.

(B) MEMBERS.—Members appointed to the Commission shall be prominent citizens of the United States with national recognition and a significant depth of experience and responsibilities in matters relating to government service, regulatory policy, economics, Federal agency management, public administration, and law.

(4) LIMITATION.—Not more than 5 members appointed to the Commission may be from the same political party.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(f) OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.—Each meeting of the Commission shall be open to the public, unless a member objects.

(g) QUORUM.—Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(h) NONAPPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Commission is to evaluate and provide recommendations for modification, consolidation, or repeal of covered regulations with the aim of reducing compliance costs, all while protecting public health and safety, encouraging growth and innovation, and improving competitiveness.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) give priority in its analysis of covered regulations to those that—

(A) impose disproportionately high costs on a small entity (as defined in section 601 of title 5, United States Code);

(B) impose substantial paperwork burdens; or

(C) could be strengthened in their effectiveness while reducing regulatory costs;

(2) solicit and review comments from the public on the covered regulations described this section; and

(3) develop a set of covered regulations to modify, consolidate, or repeal to be submitted to Congress for an up-or-down vote.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the initial meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall initiate a process to solicit and collect written recommendations from the general public, interested parties, Federal agencies, and other relevant entities regarding which covered regulations should be examined.

(2) SUBMISSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The Commission shall ensure that the process initiated under paragraph (1) allows for recommendations to be submitted to the Commission through the website of the Commission or by mail.

(3) LENGTH OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—The period for the submission of recommendations under this subsection shall end 120 days after the date on which the process is initiated under paragraph (1).

(4) PUBLICATION.—At the end of the period for the submission of recommendations under this subsection, all submitted recommendations shall be published in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission.

(d) COMMISSION OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the public comment period described in subsection (c), the Commission shall conduct public outreach and convene focus groups to better inform the Commissioners of the public's interest and possible contributions to the work of the Commission.

(2) FOCUS GROUPS.—The focus groups required under paragraph (1) shall include individuals affiliated with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the Administrative Conference of the United States, the offices within Federal agencies responsible for small business affairs and regulatory compliance, and, at the discretion of the Commission, other relevant stakeholders from within or outside the regulatory entities.

(e) COMMISSION REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the period for the submission of recommendations ends under subsection (c), the Commission shall convene to review submitted recommendations and to identify covered regulations to modify, consolidate, or eliminate.

(f) EXAMINATION OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) PROCESS FOR EXAMINATION.—In examining covered regulations under this section, the Commission shall determine the effectiveness of individual covered regulations, by using multiple resources, including quantitative metrics, testimony from industry and agency experts, and research from the staff of the Commission.

(2) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission convenes under subsection (e), the Commission shall complete a substantial examination of covered regulations.

(g) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission convenes under subsection (e), the Commission shall publish, and make available to the public for comment, a report, which shall include—

(A) the findings and conclusions of the Commission for the improvement of covered regulations examined by the Commission; and

(B) a list of recommendations for changes to the covered regulations examined by the Commission, which may include recommendations for modification, consolidation, or repeal of such covered regulations.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be approved by not fewer than 5 members of the Commission.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The Commission shall make the report required under paragraph (1) available through the website of the Commission and in printed form.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—During the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is published, the Commission shall—

(A) solicit comments from the public on such report, using the same process established under subsection (c); and

(B) publish any comments received under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register and the website of the Commission.

(5) CONSULTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is published, the Commission shall complete a consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the committees of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and Senate regarding the contents of the report.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The consultation required under subparagraph (A) shall provide—

(i) the opportunity for the chair and ranking member of the committees of jurisdiction to provide substantive feedback or recommendations related to the regulatory changes contained in the report required under paragraph (1); and

(ii) the opportunity for the chair and ranking member of the committees of jurisdiction to provide recommendations for alternative means of achieving a reduction in regulatory costs while maintaining the same level of benefits to society.

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the 90-day period described in subsection (g)(4) ends, the Commission shall—

(A) review any comments received under subsection (g)(4);

(B) incorporate any relevant comments received under subsection (g)(4) into the report required under subsection (g)(1); and

(C) submit the revised report to Congress.

(2) CONTENTS.—The revised report required to be submitted to Congress under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the findings and conclusions of the Commission for the improvement of covered regulations examined by the Commission;

(B) a list of recommendations for changes to the covered regulations examined by the Commission, which may include recommendations for modification, consolidation, or repeal of such covered regulations; and

(C) recommended legislative language to implement the recommendations in subparagraph (B).

(i) NOTICE TO REGULATORY AGENCIES.—

(1) ENACTMENT OF COMMISSION BILL.—If the commission bill is enacted into law before the first date on which Congress adjourns sine die after such bill is introduced, the President shall—

(A) not later than 7 days after the date on which the commission bill is enacted into law—

(i) provide notice to the affected regulatory agencies; and

(ii) publish notice of enactment in the Federal Register and online;

(B) require affected regulatory agencies to implement the commission bill not later than 180 days after the date on which the commission bill is enacted into law.

(2) FAILURE TO ENACT COMMISSION BILL.—If the commission bill is not enacted into law before the first date on which Congress adjourns sine die after such bill is introduced, the President shall provide notice of such failure to enact the commission bill in the Federal Register.

SEC. 5. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out this Act.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act. Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman, the chairman of any subcommittee created by the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(2) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(e) SPACE FOR USE OF COMMISSION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall support on a reimbursable basis the operations of the Commission, including the identification of suitable space to house the Commission. If the Administrator is not able to make such suitable space available within the 60-day period, the Commission shall lease space to the extent that funds are available.

SEC. 6. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of the

executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(3) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Following consultation with and upon the request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any agency may detail an employee of the agency to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(4) GAO AND OIRA ASSISTANCE.—The Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(e) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—The Commission may acquire administrative supplies and equipment for Commission use to the extent funds are available.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 4.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to the Commission to carry out this Act.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment to provide a bipartisan approach to this regulatory reform discussion.

As a CPA and a small-business owner myself, I have seen firsthand the burden that unnecessary regulations can have on businesses, particularly small businesses.

My substitute amendment would establish a regulatory improvement commission consisting of experts appointed by the President and congressional leaders of both parties to evaluate and provide recommendations for the modification, consolidation, or repeal of regulations that are unnecessarily burdensome.

The commission would have an aim toward reducing compliance costs, encouraging growth and innovation, and improving competitiveness, all while protecting public health and safety. After opportunities for input and consultation from experts, industry stakeholders, and the general public, the commission would submit a report to Congress containing proposed legislation to implement its adjusted changes. If Congress chooses to act and the President chooses to sign the report, agencies would have 180 days to implement.

My amendment is based on the Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015, which I was proud to introduce with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) along with 14 cosponsors, 7 Democrats and 7 Republicans.

Our bipartisan proposal rejects the partisan approach before us today in favor of a true, bipartisan compromise that all Members should be able to get behind.

My constituents sent me to Congress with the expectation that I would be willing to work with anyone with a good idea. It shouldn't matter what party you have behind your name.

Traveling up and down my district, I hear the same thing from all of my constituents, whether they are Republican, Democrat, Tea Party alike. They get that there can be a cost to protecting the environment. But in my district on the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches, they also know that having clean water is probably worth it.

They also get that there can be a cost to protecting their workers and workplace safety. But many of them have had the same workers for many, many years, if not decades, and they know that the safety of their employees is also probably worth it.

So what frustrates, I think, those constituents the most and those business owners the most is the unnecessary red tape and the excessive costs for the hoops that they have to jump through that don't make the air any cleaner and don't make the projects any safer. They expect Washington to work to fix that problem. That is why I have offered this amendment today.

I know that some on the left are going to say that this goes too far and some on the right think it doesn't go far enough. But I also know that, in a divided government, the partisan bill before us will do nothing to help relieve the regulatory burden on the small businesses in my district and across this country.

Riddled with poison pills, the SCRUB Act is a messaging bill, trying to send a message about one side allegedly not caring enough about jobs and the other side doesn't care enough about clean water or public safety.

But that is not the message that the small businesses care about and the small businesses in my district want to hear. They want results. They want solutions to this. Their message shouldn't be that Congress doesn't care.

So while I hoped that we would be able to pick up where we left off on this bill in the last Congress and find some areas where we can come together to solve problems for the American people, I understand that there are concerns with the amendment, and I do intend to withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say how much I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's bipartisan work on this issue.

I look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue as well as other issues of joint concern, like criminal justice reform and the restoration of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working together and to working with our friends on the other side of the aisle, getting back to getting things done for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BABIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act came with a lot of promises. Remember the President's words in 2009, ''If you like the plan you have, you can keep it. If you like the doctor you have, you can keep your doctor, too. The only change you'll see are falling costs as our reforms take hold.''

This, Mr. Speaker, was false advertising. While some may have gained coverage under the ACA, far too many others were harmed by the law. Millions of Americans lost their plans or saw their premiums and out-of-pocket costs skyrocket, like the mom in my district who now has to pay $400 for her daughter's lifesaving peanut allergy medication when it used to cost her $10. That is not what was promised.

We need to empower all patients with more choice while also offering solutions for the uninsured and those with preexisting conditions. And there is a way. For decades, Republicans have proposed patient-centered, market-based answers to our health insurance challenges.

Today's historic vote, which is a victory over HARRY REID's 5 years of obstruction, gets us a step closer to real reform. I urge the President to sign today's bill.

FACES OF ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) is recognized for half the time remaining before 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise as the co-chair of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic to call upon my colleagues to refocus our efforts on bringing an end to the opioid epidemic that continues to threaten communities all across New Hampshire and across this country.

The opioid epidemic has grown to historic proportions. Our medical providers are struggling to keep up with the flow of overdoses entering our clinics and to secure treatment for those who need it.

Our law enforcement, as first responders, have taken on the burden of responding to more and more potentially dangerous situations when a call for help comes in, and these calls are becoming more and more frequent. Statistics now show that more Americans die from drug overdoses than do in car crashes in this country.

In my home State of New Hampshire, the opioid epidemic continues to grow. In 2015 alone, the total number of drug deaths in the Granite State exceeded 400, more than one per day, far surpassing the current record of fatalities set just last year at 324.

There is no doubt that these numbers are staggering. But behind each and every one of these numbers is a daughter or a son, a mother or a father, a community leader or a neighbor whose life was precious and whose death has inflicted terrible pain on loved ones.

For every life lost, there are also many more individuals and families whose lives have been forever changed by opioid misuse. We must never forget or overlook what each number represents.

As the epidemic has continued to infiltrate communities across New Hampshire and New England, experts and advocates have risen to challenge opioid abuse in a number of important ways and sometimes from unexpected places.

My dear friend Kriss and I have known each other for years now, and she has taken it upon herself to be a champion of this issue. Through her unique position as a premier cosmetologist in the State and the make-up artist of choice for many of the Presidential candidates that pass through New Hampshire during primary season, Kriss has forced a conversation about the need to end the opioid epidemic onto the national stage.

Kriss has emerged as a leader on the issue back home, and she and her husband, Mark, continue to display remarkable courage and strength as she shares the story of her stepdaughter, Amber, who is with me here today in this Chamber, who lost her life to a heroin overdose.

Kriss' hope is that her experience might help and enact real change. So with Kriss' and Mark's blessing tonight, it is my honor to share Amber's story with you.

As Kriss puts it, Amber was the girl who helped everyone else. But, tragically, she could not help herself once she took that first drug at the young age of 15.

As Amber's stepmother, Kriss came into her life when she turned 17. At that point, Amber had already passed through the gateway drugs of over-the-counter Benadryl, marijuana, alcohol, and prescription opiates that were available on the streets.

□ 2030

She suffered from untreated bipolar disorder, but she did not have access to the appropriate medication and, like so many others, was left uncomfortable in her own skin, self-prescribing medication to find relief.

In Kriss' words, Amber was a girl hard to catch. She chose ''life on the run.''

When she found herself living on the streets, she would help others by giving them the coat off her back, panhandling to buy food, or helping others as they detoxed from heroin while homeless.

By age 20, she took her first hit of heroin and became spellbound by it. It made choices for her. She had the opportunity to have a loving home, an education, and parents that could support her recovery, but her addiction led her to a life of homelessness on the streets of Manchester, New Hampshire.

After four incarcerations in the last 2 years of her life for heroin possession and prostitution, she was a victim of trafficking on the streets of Manchester to maintain her high.

When incarcerated and craving treatment, a bed finally became available for Amber at a wonderful treatment center in New Hampshire, but, meanwhile, the prison would not let her out. The prison itself offered no recovery. When she was released, the bed was no longer available. Amber even had to lie to the emergency room to get help by saying, ''I want to kill myself.''

She detoxed in that hospital, but no recovery aftercare was available. Kriss and her husband, Mark, brought Amber home, and on the third night, she fled home leaving them a note that said, ''I have to go back to my people.''

The last time that Kriss and Mark saw her was Easter Sunday. She was high, vacant, and the drug had consumed her soul. Three days later she was found in an alley dead of a heroin overdose. She was 22 years old.

Her death would be easy to blame on institutional failure to ensure that those in need can access resources or on a general lack of empathy for individuals crippled by addiction. Kriss and Mark have made a conscious effort to use Amber's life, her death, and her ongoing vibrant spirit to wake up the hearts and minds of those who have the power to change fate.

Tonight, I share Amber's heart-wrenching story in the hopes that we can all recognize opioid abuse is not a disease singular to a certain socioeconomic group or race or region. It can take hold of anyone.

Amber's parents have been incredibly brave to share her story and to come to Washington to push for reform. We need to erase the stigma from substance abuse disorder, and we need to be far more honest and productive considering the effect on daughters or sons, mothers or fathers.

That is why tonight we called our colleagues together for this Special Order so that we can speak from both sides of the aisle and share the lives of friends and loved ones. It is my intention that by honoring those we have lost and by acknowledging the complexities of opioid abuse and the human lives that are behind these fatalities, we can come together to convey the urgency behind bringing an end to the opioid epidemic.

I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join bipartisan Members, Republicans and Democrats from around the country, to talk about heroin use, an increasingly deadly public health crisis. I welcome Kriss and Mark from New Hampshire, who are here today to honor the life of Mark's daughter.

A special thank-you to Congresswoman ANN KUSTER, my fellow Granite Stater and partner on our Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic. We formed this task force last year to bring attention to opiate addiction and overdose spreading nationwide. Now over 40 House Members have joined our task force and this cause.

We aim to inform not just members of the public, but the Nation about the tragedies and the challenges that face our families, our communities, our States, our loved ones, and our friends. We are here not just to combat this epidemic, but bring solutions not just to this body, but to every area of the Nation.

Congresswoman KUSTER and I have held a roundtable with addiction and law enforcement experts in Concord, New Hampshire, our home State. We

held a subsequent policy briefing in Washington, D.C., featuring officials from the Drug Enforcement Agency, Centers for Disease Control, and other Federal agencies.

They are providing a fuller picture of the scope of the problem, which in New Hampshire has claimed 400 lives in 2015. To put that figure in perspective, 1 out of every 3,000 people have died of a heroin overdose just last year. The CDC reports that, nationally, overdose deaths have tripled over the last 10 years. These numbers, unfortunately, are likely to rise.

But numbers don't tell the whole story. To truly illustrate the dangers of heroin use, we need to hear from fathers like Doug Griffin of Newton in New Hampshire's First Congressional District. At a forum yesterday in Manchester, New Hampshire, where I proudly served as mayor, he told the audience about his daughter Courtney, who fell victim to heroin at just 20 years young.

Doug remembers his daughter as an exuberant young girl who had a great sense of humor and a passion for life until a mix of prescription pills, fentanyl, and street heroin ensnared Courtney—like millions of other Americans—in a fatal web of addiction. Before the drugs overcame her, she played music and she loved s'mores.

She wanted to be a marine and trained for it. But just 3 years later, Courtney was lost on the streets, in and out of rehab facilities. She no longer had the will to live. Because Courtney's situation was so dire, because it seemed like they had so few options, Doug said he and his family hid the truth from the outside world. Bravely, Doug is now telling everyone he knows about the warning signs of heroin addiction and deficiencies in our public response.

Tonight is about telling the truth in order to build momentum towards better solutions. It is about putting political disagreements aside, because the heroin epidemic crosses party lines. It crosses every congressional district in the United States.

The truth is addiction strikes every demographic and every geographic region. There are too many stories like Courtney's. However, we also have a wealth of ideas to combat this problem. Congresswoman KUSTER and I formed the Bipartisan Task Force to gather those stories and ideas and assemble them into effective legislation.

We introduced the STOP ABUSE Act as the first order of business to coordinate law enforcement and public health agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels. The bill targets high-intensity drug trafficking areas for special attention. Newton, New Hampshire, where Doug Griffin's daughter died of an overdose, lies on such a route just north of the Massachusetts border.

The STOP ABUSE Act creates a stronger prescription pill monitoring program. In fact, it was overprescribed legal opiates that hooked Courtney in the first place. Personally, I have introduced legislation to increase access to lifesaving overdose medication.

The STOP ABUSE Act includes treatment and prevention grants to localities overwhelmed by the scale of addiction, as my colleagues gathered here tonight will continue to tell you. They have their own stories and their own ideas to share. I am grateful for their partnership and leadership as we work together to combat heroin abuse in the United States.

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

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

Mr. NEAL. First, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the efforts that have been made by Congresswoman KUSTER and Congressman GUINTA. When Congresswoman KUSTER approached me on this issue, I was all too happy to join in. I think that the perseverance that she has offered in the early days on this is, I think, a challenge for all of us across New England, because what has happened across New England now is gripping in terms of the attention that this issue has drawn.

But I want to call attention specifically to a very important case in which there is an individual whom I had a chance to witness his testimony. At the same time, I intend to quote liberally from the Springfield Republican, which is the paper of record for western Massachusetts.

I want to call attention tonight to a former Ludlow, Massachusetts, police lieutenant, Thomas Foye. Lieutenant Foye had a strong upbringing with supportive parents, a college education, a good marriage, three children, and a long career as a lieutenant in the Ludlow Police Department.

The 50-year-old was a longtime head of the detective bureau and even served on an FBI task force. He arrested many drug addicts and responded frequently to overdoses. He was at the scene of many drug-related suicides. He warned schoolchildren about the dangers of drugs. He was even an official who had been elected to the Ludlow School Committee.

That was, however, until he got addicted to OxyContin pills following shoulder surgery. Two surgeries and more pain medication prescriptions later, Lieutenant Foye found himself admitting that he was addicted.

After trying to quit on his own multiple times and suffering sickening withdrawals, he turned to his doctor for help. The same doctor who had originally prescribed him OxyContin now prescribed him more pills to both wean him off the painkillers and to put an end to his sickness.

When none of that worked, Foye admits that he broke the law and began to acquire pills illegally, taking them straight from his police department's own evidence room. When he was arrested in his office at the Ludlow Police Department in 2013, he was charged with tampering with substances, two counts of possession of a class B substance—cocaine and OxyContin—and two counts of larceny of a drug. Subsequently, he was sentenced to 2 years in jail.

He said that it was not fear, dread, or panic that he felt when the investigation finally came to a head; rather, he felt relief. He now would be able to get help.

He talks about the police officer who stayed with him in the detox facility following his arrest. ''Some day I want to be that guy,'' he said. ''There needs to be some dignity in drug addiction treatment.''

Lieutenant Foye was lucky in the sense that he survived his addiction and is telling his story to help others. Those who have not survived, including eight people this weekend in my congressional district in a very small geographic area, died from a lethal string of heroin that was identified as the Hollywood brand.

The Opioid Overdose Reduction Act of 2015 would exempt from civil liability emergency administration of opioid overdose-reversing drugs, like naloxone, by people who prescribe or are prescribed them. Senator MARKEY has offered the same legislation down the hallway in the United States Senate.

When an opioid overdose occurs, administration of an opioid-reversal drug is necessary to prevent death, but it must occur within a certain window of time before the chance of survival is lost. This is a time of quick action, not deliberations or a potential lawsuit.

Every day, 120 people die as a result of drug overdoses fueled by prescription painkillers, and another 6,748 are treated in emergency rooms for the misuse or abuse of illegal drugs. According to The Washington Post, ''overdosing is now the leading cause of accidental death in the United States, accounting for more deaths than traffic fatalities or gun homicides and suicides. Fatal overdoses from opiate medications such as oxycodone, hydrocodone, and methadone have quadrupled since 1999, accounting for an estimated 16,651 deaths in 2010.''

It is time to bring a face to those affected by addiction and stop the epidemic in communities across this country.

I want to close as I started with a note of congratulations to Ms. KUSTER and to Mr. GUINTA for calling attention to what is really happening across New England now. We need to be mindful of the lives that are being destroyed and the families that are succumbing to this torture over long, long periods of time trying to treat those who are addicted and to make sure they get adequate help.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) and the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for organizing this Special Order this evening, and also for the participation with the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic; and to also recognize the individuals from New Hampshire, Kriss and Mark, who came down, and for the bravery in sharing the story of Amber and how it is important for all of us to be reflecting on this very serious crisis that we have.

Many of our communities have been hit hard by the opioid abuse epidemic. Like other regions of the country, this brutal epidemic is affecting western Pennsylvania, destroying lives, breaking up families, and claiming far too many of our loved ones.

Vonda Probst from Friedens, Pennsylvania, knows firsthand the devastating reality of losing a loved one to drugs. Nearly 2 years have passed since Ms. Probst lost her son, Jared Carter, to a heroin overdose. Jared enjoyed motorcycle riding, four-wheeling, fixing old cars, and just being outdoors. He would have turned 30 this last summer.

□ 2045

There are far too many stories like Jared's in Pennsylvania and throughout our Nation, lives full of potential and value that are cut short by drug abuse.

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, last year alone there were well over 10,000 heroin overdose deaths. This number reflects a six-fold increase in the number of heroin deaths since 2001.

In my State of Pennsylvania alone, drug overdose deaths have increased by 470 percent over the past two decades, and heroin and opioids are increasingly to blame. These drugs have been responsible for the loss of nearly 3,000 lives in our State in just the last 5 years.

Parts of the 12th District have been especially hard hit as heroin use is the leading cause of accidental deaths. In fact, in 2012, there were a record 261 drug overdose deaths in Allegheny County, which is more than Allegheny County's traffic fatalities and homicides put together and is 30 percent higher than the State average. In Cambria County, the drug overdose death rate is nearly double the State average.

These statistics are horrifying, but behind the numbers are people and tragedy. Every heroin-related death cuts short a valuable human life that should have ended with a much brighter and a much later chapter. Every American who dies from a drug overdose is a person who had dignity and potential. Without adequate assistance, however, each one did not have hope.

It is time to turn a new page in order to proactively defeat this deadly epidemic with renewed dedication. As a member of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic, I am strongly committed to ending this scourge.

We need to find new ways to combat this crisis and to continue learning from our community-based organizations on how they are providing help on the front lines. I have worked with local leaders in my district, such as Reverend Sylvia King, the pastor and founder of Johnstown's Christ Centered Community Church, which provides drug recovery services and counseling. I have also worked with local law enforcement and other treatment groups to make sure the necessary resources are available to help those in need.

Here in Congress we also need to be looking at legislative responses to help address this issue. In the past, I have supported increased funding for the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, which provides resources and support for heroin victims through prevention and education programs as well as drug treatment and enforcement.

I am also a cosponsor of legislation that has been introduced by Representatives SUSAN BROOKS and JOE KENNEDY—the Heroin and Prescription Opioid Abuse Prevention, Education, and Enforcement Act—to reauthorize the Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs that are so critical to local law enforcement efforts, to increase access to the life-saving opioid reversal drug Naloxone, and to raise public provider and patient awareness of opioid drugs and their link to heroin.

We must remember heroin's victims, such as Jared Carter and so many other like him, who have lost their lives. Let's galvanize the support necessary to stop these tragedies. We must be mindful in that people, as they watch this discussion this evening, may know somebody who is hurting right now, somebody in need. It may be somebody, himself, who is watching.

Get help. Reach out. Don't do this alone.

I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire, and I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for organizing this Special Order. I look forward to continuing to work back home and here in D.C. to address this crisis.

Mr. GUINTA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for sharing that heartfelt story as well as the challenges that your community is facing.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for yielding time on this critically important issue.

I also thank the gentlewoman and Congressman GUINTA for pulling this Special Order together and for their hard work on the Bipartisan Task Force to address this heroin epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, as the heroin epidemic sweeps the Nation, too many families and communities are mourning the deaths of loved ones who have been lost over the years due to heroin addiction and addiction to painkillers. One of the lives we lost not too long ago was in a town called Rockford, Illinois, which is in the heart of my congressional district.

The gentleman's name was Chris Boseman. He was 32 years old when he died in the summer of 2014. He was a kind, tender-hearted son and brother. He had a back injury that led to his addiction to pain medication.

When he could no longer get relief from that pain medication, he began to buy different kinds of pain relief on the street. As the costs would add up, his dealer told him about something called heroin and that he could get this for $10.

After his first overdose, Chris tried hard to fight his addiction. He had a couple of relapses, but it appeared that he had been successful in overcoming this addiction.

He enrolled at Rock Valley College, a community college, where he studied construction management. He was 1 year away from graduating. No one knew that he was still fighting this battle because he was ashamed of it. One night he was home alone—he was just over 1 year clean—when he relapsed again and died.

The sad thing is that Chris' story is all too common. In fact, I lost a member of my own family to the heroin epidemic when my brother-in-law's son died after overdosing on heroin in the summer of 2013.

He was not the kind of kid one would think would be taking something like heroin. His dad had no idea. His family had no idea. He was a college football player. He was a musician. He was an avid weight lifter and was just a redheaded kid who was fun to be around.

Yet, when he injured his back and his knee and felt that he needed more than just aspirin and a little physical therapy to overcome this pain, he got on painkillers. As we are telling these stories this evening, this eventually led to his trying heroin as a way to relieve his pain. It was probably, they thought, the third time that he took heroin. He ingested what would be considered pure heroin, and he died.

I am here to say that we can no longer sit on the sidelines while folks in our communities and our family members are suffering and are dying, when parents are burying their children, and when the men and women who are struggling with this addiction are crying out for help.

We also know that heroin use is increasing among young people, especially in my home State of Illinois, with a nearly 50 percent increase in the use of heroin just in the last several years.

In Winnebago County, which is where Rockford is, which I was talking about earlier, there were 51 heroin-related deaths in 2013 alone. In Peoria, which is also in the heart of my congressional

district, emergency responders see at least one heroin overdose every single day.

Perhaps the most troubling is not just this rapid increase in the usage or in the rising number of overdoses, but in our inability to treat those who need it the most. While heroin use is increasing rapidly in every region of my home State, there has been a dramatic decrease in the availability of treatment. In fact, Illinois ranked worst—last in the Nation—in the overall decline in treatment capacity.

While we are at the height of this heroin epidemic, last year our Governor proposed a budget that would cut our already inadequate State-funded treatment programs by 60 percent.

To make matters worse, the ongoing budget crisis in Illinois has gutted the funding for treatment programs like one in my district of Rockford. It is called Remedies Renewing Lives. That is why next week, when the President gives his State of the Union, my guest will be a guy named Gary Halbach, who is the president of Remedies.

It is so he can witness the State of the Union and so he can talk about the important work that he and his colleagues at Remedies are doing every single day. Under the pressure of tremendous budgetary shortfalls, Gary and his team have been on the front lines in providing treatment to heroin addicts and support for victims of domestic violence.

We will not end the heroin epidemic if the programs that have been proven to help continue to be undermined and significantly underfunded. We cannot turn a blind eye to the families and to the communities that have been affected by the heroin epidemic. They deserve better. They deserve solutions.

Ms. KUSTER. For the record, this concept of bringing the faces of addiction to the floor of the House was the idea of the gentlewoman from Illinois. I thank her for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. As I stepped to the podium, I noticed two of the values that America has etched into or has carved into the Speaker's rostrum, ''liberty'' and then, to my left, ''peace.''

They are two values that we hold dear; yet, they are two values that are lost to people when they come under the cruel, cruel domination of heroin and other opiates. So it is good for us to talk about this tonight but, more importantly, for us to do something about it.

I thank Congressman GUINTA, Congresswoman KUSTER, and my colleagues who are participating in this Special Order, which highlights the ongoing epidemic of heroin and prescription drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic in order to discuss a growing public health crisis in the United States and, more personally, to discuss a crisis occurring in my home district, the Michigan Seventh.

You see, we can talk statistics over and over again, but, really, this is all about lives: friends, family, neighbors, people who are highly respected, and people whom we wouldn't know. Yet, they are impacted. The tragic stories of prescription drug abuse and fatal overdoses hit close to home in far too many Michigan communities.

Through September of this year, Washtenaw County, the home of the University of Michigan, suffered 41 opioid overdose deaths.

Local law enforcement officials in Monroe County—the gateway to Michigan from Ohio—believe the number of heroin overdose deaths in 2015 will top those in 2014.

In Jackson County, which is in the center of the State, the total number of drug overdoses has nearly tripled in the last 5 years. In 2015, 131 overdoses were reported.

These are troubling statistics, but, again, they are about lives, people. Behind these numbers are real individuals and families who have been affected by this tragic epidemic.

On May 17, 2010, Andrew Hirst died of a heroin overdose at the age of 24. For his father, Mike Hirst, a respected businessperson in Jackson, Michigan, this tragic loss has led him to dedicate himself to stopping heroin overdoses in the Jackson area by sharing the experience of his son's death and the life of his family.

For the past 5 years, Mike has counseled addicts, supported families, and mentored at-risk youths away from heroin and opiate drugs through his foundation, Andy's Angels. In addition, he has led educational efforts to inform people of the link between prescription opioid use and heroin addiction.

He has also teamed up with local police agencies to investigate heroin dealers in order to eliminate access points for this deadly drug. In recognizing his tireless efforts, the Jackson Citizen Patriot newspaper recently named Mike Hirst their Citizen of the Year.

Fortunately, Mike is not alone in this fight. Across Michigan's Seventh District, communities are ramping up education and prevention efforts as well as enforcement strategies. For example, Monroe County recently held its third annual Prescription Drug Abuse and Heroin Summit.

Jackson County held its second drug summit in December, and the County Prosecutor's Office plans to host a series of additional meetings in 2016. I applaud them for that.

Local efforts to raise awareness and to fight this growing epidemic are also underway in Branch, Eaton, Hillsdale, Lenawee, and Washtenaw Counties. Fighting against heroin and opioid abuse will take the work of citizens, treatment providers, law enforcement, and elected officials at every level, including each of us.

In Congress, we must continue to pursue legislative solutions to improve the coordination between Federal agencies and the States and to equip our first responders on the front lines.

Just as importantly, Mr. Speaker, we can promote awareness in our communities and support those who have been affected by this crisis.

Tonight's speeches aim to raise the profile of this issue, to increase education, and to honor people like Mike Hirst who are fighting to save others from the dangers of drug overdoses and to bring liberty and peace back to people's lives.

Mr. GUINTA. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for outlining, through the lens of liberty and peace, the challenge that Andrew Hirst and his father, Mike, have endured. My heart is with them and with your constituents.

I also want to thank you for your hard work on the Bipartisan Task Force. I look forward to your continuing leadership in Michigan and here in Washington, D.C.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire has 13 minutes remaining.

□ 2100

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman from New Hampshire, our colleagues who have made available this Special Order this evening through the auspices of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic.

As co-chair of a similar panel, the bipartisan caucus that addresses the disease of addiction, it is important, I believe, to share information and encourage response out there from the general public to drive the policy process here in Washington.

According to SAMHSA's National Survey on Drug Use and Health, the use of heroin has almost tripled in the past 8 years, going from 161,000 in 2007 to some 435,000 in 2014. Much of what is fueling this epidemic has been the proliferation of stronger and stronger prescription drug painkillers. Many individuals first get addicted to these prescription drugs and then turn to heroin as a cheaper alternative.

One in 15 people who take prescription pain relievers for a nonmedical use will try heroin within 10 years. These statistics are sobering and require a degree of response, an ultimate response, with great emergency.

I have seen these issues firsthand in my district, and all of my colleagues are acknowledging here that it is beyond the Northeast. It is penetrating our Nation.

While there has been increased congressional interest in these crises, not enough is being done to effectively end the epidemic. First, we need to increase funding for the Substance Abuse

Prevention and Treatment Block Grant. This funding stream represents the cornerstone of our States' response, their substance abuse prevention, their treatment and recovery systems.

Unfortunately, funding has not kept up with inflation over the past decade and adjusted for inflation, so we are actually funding the block grant program at a level that is some 25 percent less than we were in 2006. Contrasted to the stats that I shared on the growth of this epidemic, it is simple. It is immoral that we are not doing more.

In addition, we need to make certain that we are increasing access to effective, evidence-based treatments. One way we could do this is to raise the DATA 2000 caps that limit the number of patients that a doctor can treat with buprenorphine, which is a medication-assisted treatment for opioid abuse.

There are many doctors who have months-long, if not years-long, waiting lists of patients seeking help with their addictions, yet they cannot get in the door for treatment due to this arbitrary cap.

I was proud to join with my colleague from upstate New York, Representative HIGGINS, in introducing the TREAT Act to address the issue of prescriber caps, and I hope to continue to work with interested Members on both sides of the aisle to address the issue of access to treatment.

Again, I thank my colleagues for bringing attention to this critical epidemic here this evening. Let's get the people's business done.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her work on this.

Tonight, I want to share the story of a young man from my district, James Brendan Bye. His mother, Barbara, a good friend of mine, shared her story with me and asked that I share it tonight with this Congress and with the country.

Brendan was born on August 3, 1989, followed by his sister, Megan Elizabeth. Their father left early on, leaving Barbara as a single working parent. Another sibling, Preston, blessed them in 1999.

Brendan was a wonderful kid, a respectful young man, an honor student. His love of playing sports was never realized because of asthma.

In his senior year of high school, things changed. He became paralyzed with fear, couldn't go to school, dropped out, and spent a year looking for help. He met friends that turned out to be bad influences, made experimental choices. His mother was aware of this sudden change and saw the signs of anxiety and depression.

Brendan, though, got his GED, started a job at 18, grateful for work in a city with high unemployment.

He struggled through his early twenties. His mother did everything in her power to help him. As a single mom, she worked and raised a family of three on one paycheck, often finding herself needing to look for help, including Medicaid.

For Brendan, because his symptoms of mental illness were not so easily recognizable, help was harder to get. He was not properly diagnosed or treated. His treatment plan did not work. It was not successful. As he sunk further into depression, prescription drugs led to illegal drug use. He self-medicated.

His mother, Barbara, did not share her home life with others. For her, it was an element of confusion and shame which became the norm. Unfortunately, in their community of Grand Blanc, heroin was readily available. Like many other communities, lots of kids from all backgrounds were using and dying from heroin.

Brendan first overdosed when he was 24. He was saved by his grandfather, Al, who helped him get into rehab. He was able to get ongoing treatment at Sacred Heart in Flint, where he had a great counselor who helped him. Things were looking up.

Last year, Barbara was happy. All three of her kids were employed for the first time. Their future looked bright. Heroin, it seemed, was out of Brendan's life.

He started taking medication prescribed by a doctor to reverse the effects of heroin, volunteered at a food bank, loved nature, loved his pets, loved his brother and sister. His relationships flourished, especially with his Aunt Amy, Aunt Carla, and his cousins. As Barbara told me, ''he was a beautiful person inside and out.''

At the end of August this last year, things changed again. He was taken off prescription medication, and a short time later his mother and sister found him collapsed in his bedroom. Brendan, at the age of 26, on September 8 of last year, died.

For Brendan, he is now in heaven. His struggles with mental illness and addiction are gone. For his family and friends, they continue to grieve.

Barbara has become an advocate. She wants to make sure we honor Brendan and his life by making sure that those who need health care can get health care, those who need mental health services can get mental health services. Her message, and really Brendan's message, is that we have to do more as a society and as a nation to deal with this incredible problem. It is the way we honor those that we have lost. It is the way we honor Brendan.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent if I could have an extra 5 minutes. I have three more speakers on our side of the aisle and one more Member would like to include Mr. DAVIS as a speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). The Chair cannot entertain that request for additional time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from New Hampshire yield for that purpose?

Ms. KUSTER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Chair can entertain requests for unanimous consent at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain a unanimous consent request to extend a Special Order speech.

Ms. KUSTER. So as not to lose any of our precious time, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. This is a very important issue that is affecting central Illinois that I am blessed enough to represent right here in this great institution.

As a Member of Congress, I have witnessed firsthand what heroin and opioids can do to communities like my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois. In my hometown of 12,000 people, I never would have thought, growing up in the 1980s, that a drug like heroin would cause such a scourge.

As a matter of fact, it is interesting to hear many of my colleagues talk about what is happening in their communities. Not too long ago, in that hometown of 12,000 people, our local newspaper had a coroner's jury report that I believe I remember mentioned four deaths in one coroner's jury report related to heroin and opioid overdoses. This is something in my community I never thought I would witness, and it is also something in my community that demands action.

I am so proud to sponsor the STOP ABUSE Act with my colleagues here tonight. What they are talking about and what everybody who has stood in front of this sign tonight has talked about is the importance of addressing opioid abuse. This bill is something that, because of small towns like my hometown, we are here to address. It has become a Federal issue.

I want to end by talking about a friend of mine, a gentleman that I grew up with, his family. He actually used to run our county health department at the time he was arrested for heroin use. Who would have thought that in a town of 12,000 people the director of the county health department would be addicted to heroin?

It doesn't matter what your socioeconomic status is, it doesn't matter what your job is, and it doesn't matter where you were born or who you were born to; you, too, can become addicted to heroin. That is why we have demanded action tonight. That is why I am thankful to be here. That is why I am thankful to be able to help each and every one of my colleagues in a bipartisan way to address this problem. Mr. Speaker, we are going to do something about this issue.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KUSTER for her leadership in bringing us together this evening. Congressman GUINTA has really done the Nation a huge service.

I rise tonight to speak for the mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, children and friends who have buried a loved one because of heroin. Nationwide, there has been a fourfold increase in death from opiates over the last decade, and every year nearly 17,000 people die from prescription opiate overdoses. Over 8,000 die from heroin overdoses, and more than 400,000 seek treatment in emergency rooms. In Ohio alone, heroin kills an average of 23 people every week, more than 1,100 persons per year.

Heroin and opiate abuse is not a criminal justice issue alone. This Nation must recognize this addiction as the overwhelming, powerful, chemical dependance condition it is. Concurrently, too, it is often a mental health and medical crisis as well.

They tell us the annual financial cost for our society now is over $33 billion a year, and that is based on 1996 figures. The gravest cost is in lives lost and grief felt by those loved ones whom the overdose victims leave behind.

I think of the family of my own district staffer, Theresa Morris, who lost her beloved cousin, Angelique ''Angel'' Kidd, this past July to heroin. Angel grew up in a working class family, got married young, had two children, and went to work in food service. One night on her way home, she was in a terrible car accident and was given opioid pain medicine to help her with her discomfort.

As she regained strength, she found it difficult to live with chronic pain and turned to other prescription medication and eventually to illegal substances in order to cope. She and her husband eventually divorced, and she became somewhat depressed.

As her addiction grew, the price of her prescriptions rose. She turned to the cheaper substitute: heroin. She eventually lost her job due to poor performance and began withdrawing and even stealing from her family and got into trouble. It was a horrible descent.

She died on Friday, July 24, 2015, this past year of combined drug toxicity. She was 41 years old. She was a mother, a daughter, a sister, a niece, a cousin, and a grandmother. There was no obituary in the paper, no public visitation, just a quiet service attended by those who loved her. The sorrow in her family simply can't be repeated.

I know that the time has expired, but we must simply treat the chemical dependence that these terrible opioids cause in the American people, and we must call to task pharmaceutical companies like Purdue Pharma, Cephalon, Janssen, Endo International, and Actavis, because with over $11 billion of profits from these opioid pills alone, they can surely afford to help the American people.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues Congresswoman ANN KUSTER and Congressman FRANK GUINTA for leading this important Special Order Hour on opioid and heroin abuse and dependence.

Today's theme, ''Faces of Addiction,'' gives us a unique opportunity to the powerful addicting qualities of heroin and opioids, which have serious implications for every family impacted by its abuse.

Some of you may have seen the 60 Minutes segment, ''Heroin in the Heartland,'' which filmed in parts of my district.

Let me share the story of Robbie, whose struggle stands out to me.

Robbie was prescribed opioids—Oxycodone and Oxycontin, among others—for a chronic pain condition.

Although he said he never intended to abuse these medications, Robbie became an addict, taking painkillers for 25 years as his doctors kept prescribing higher and higher doses to manage his pain.

Robbie eventually stopped caring about anything except opioids and finding his next dose of medication.

His marriage fell apart.

He became estranged from friends.

He gained 90 pounds and developed diabetes, heart disease, and arthritis.

He lost his will to live and contemplated suicide.

Ultimately, it was a pharmacist who put a stop to Robbie's opioid use by refusing to fill his prescription.

This abrupt end to the drugs led Robbie to connect to a new doctor, an addiction specialist.

Robbie is not alone in his struggle with opioid dependence and abuse.

According to the American Society of Addiction Medicine, over 100 Americans died from drug overdose deaths each day in 2013.

46 Americans die each day from prescription opioid overdoses, which is two deaths per hour or 17,000 deaths annually.

In Ohio, according to the Ohio Department of Health, from 2000 to 2012, Ohio's death rate due to unintentional drug poisonings increased 366 percent, and this increase in deaths has been driven largely by prescription drug overdoses.

On average, approximately five people die each day in Ohio due to drug overdose.

As these statistics illustrate, much work remains to be done toward resolving the problems of opioid abuse nationally as well as in my home state.

We need an honest effort to integrate prevention, treatment, and enforcement.

Ohio is adding a weapon to its arsenal in fighting drug abuse by providing doctors and pharmacists with a one-click link to the state opiate tracking system.

Ohio will become the first state to integrate its database, the Ohio Automated Rx Reporting System (OARRS), with electronic medical records already maintained by doctors and pharmacists.

This database linkup is one of the latest tools utilized by state officials to combat the epidemic of overdose deaths.

The opioid epidemic has been particularly devastating to our fight to end infant mortality in central Ohio.

When a pregnant mother abuses drugs, her unborn baby isn't just an innocent bystander. The drugs can affect that child to the degree that the baby will likely suffer withdraw after birth.

As of 2013, about 12 in every 1,000 babies born in Franklin County faced that uphill battle.

Those numbers grow year after year and experts say heroin is fueling the increase.

That is why at the federal level, I co-sponsored and voted in favor of the Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015, which was signed into law November 25, 2015.

This new law will help prevent and treat babies exposed to opioids in utero.

It will also support efforts to collect and disseminate strategies and best practices to prevent and treat maternal opioid use and abuse.

Finding solutions to this epidemic will require all of us to work together at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Drug abuse certainly isn't a partisan issue and many Members of Congress are actively engaged on the matter.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this epidemic.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic, I would like to thank our co-chairs for arranging this special order to discuss the faces of heroin and opiate addiction.

The faces of heroin and opiate addiction are getting younger. In my home State of Ohio and across the country, we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of infants born with opiates in their system and needing for Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome, or NAS. Tragically, these children are born addicted to drugs and have no voice or awareness as to why they are suffering.

The symptoms of withdrawal begin almost immediately. They may suffer from low birth weight, difficulty feeding or breathing, seizures, dehydration, tremors, and excessive or continuous high-pitched crying. Hospital personnel may spend ten hours in a single day to holding and rocking these newborns in an effort to console them, but over 80 percent of children with NAS still require medication to treat their withdrawal.

The toll that the heroin epidemic takes on these children can go beyond the terrible physical symptoms and complications, and the effects can be lasting ones. The faces of heroin addiction are young and they are fighting an incredibly difficult and painful battle without ever choosing to suffer. Through no action of their own, these children are victims of the heroin epidemic.

Parents who do not successfully treat their addiction have overdosed and died, leaving these children without their mothers and fathers. We must work to ensure that children are not born addicted and not left without a parent.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to do as I have, and go out into your communities and meet with your local hospitals, doctors, and healthcare professionals to see how they are dealing with the growing number of heroin and opiate addicted newborns. I have held multiple forums to better understand how we can begin to prevent addiction beginning at birth.

The faces of the heroin epidemic are not limited in age or gender. We know now that it can be anyone: a child born unknowingly addicted or a parent who does not know where to turn for help. We must remain committed to combating the heroin epidemic and the devastating effects it has on these children and families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire has expired.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, do I have any time remaining, as I have two more speakers just for 1 minute each?

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

Ms. KUSTER. It is regrettable. This is such an important topic for the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair could entertain requests for 1-minute speeches at this time.

□ 2115

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CICILLINE was allowed to speak out of order.)

FACES OF ADDICTION

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, addiction has many faces, and one of those is my friend from Rhode Island, Tom Coderre, who was elected to the State senate at the age of 25 and also oversaw 40 employees as the director of a local nonprofit.

Already a heavy drinker, Tom soon started using cocaine as a way to cope with the stress of his responsibilities, and when he realized that drugs were taking hold of his life, he tried to quit on his own but was never able to maintain sobriety for more than a month or two.

Eventually, he checked himself into an inpatient treatment at Butler Hospital. There he was able to get help and support and to maintain his sobriety and get his life back on track.

Today, more than 10 years sober, Tom works as the chief of staff for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. His victory over addiction is an inspiration for all who are struggling today.

It is a reminder for those of us in Congress that we need to do more to provide resources and support for those who need it most. We need a comprehensive approach from the Federal Government that focuses on ensuring that those struggling with addiction get the support and treatment they need. That is particularly important in the area of opiate and heroin abuse.

In 2012, of the 23.1 million Americans who needed treatment for drugs or alcohol, only 2.5 million received it through a specialty facility.

There are millions of Americans who are in need of treatment. We have a responsibility to do all that we can. Heroin use has grown tremendously over the last decade, particularly in New England. It is an epidemic that cuts across all demographic boundaries—Black and White, rich and poor, young and old—and we need to do something about it.

REQUEST FOR ONE-MINUTE SPEECH

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time will we have for our Special Order on the Republican side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition will stop at 10 p.m.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the 1-minute speech then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Ms. KUSTER. We have taken our 45 minutes, this is the 45th. We just have one 1-minute. This is a very important topic for the country.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I understand, but we are already at 9:17, and I have quite a few Members here to talk about the issue we have come to the floor to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

GUN CONTROL AND AMERICANS' SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with quite a few Members to address the issue of gun control and Americans' Second Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the Third District of Indiana. In the Hoosier State, we cherish our constitutional right to bear arms. For many years I also had the honor of serving in the Indiana General Assembly, where I was proud to coauthor and get signed into law the lifetime concealed carry permit so that Hoosiers could protect themselves, their families, and their homes.

Starting in 2013, in response to the push for radical gun control legislation from Senate Democrats, we founded the Republican Study Committee's Second Amendment Initiative here in Congress, which serves as a platform for House Republicans to share the most important facts about gun control and the Second Amendment.

Tonight I will be joined on the House floor by many members of the Second Amendment Initiative and other proud Members who steadfastly defend Americans' gun rights.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the House floor tonight to set the record straight. Yesterday President Obama announced his intentions to unilaterally pursue executive actions on gun control.

Like times past, I wholeheartedly oppose the manner in which the President has chosen to pursue changes to current law. In fact, when reports surfaced this past fall that the President was considering executive actions on guns, I led over 30 of my House colleagues in sending a letter to the White House requesting information on what exactly he planned to do and why.

My colleagues and I had a number of very simple questions. First, if the President is planning on closing the supposed gun show loophole, did the Vice President and his gun control commission recommend this policy for inclusion among the 23 executive actions announced by the White House in January of 2013? If so, why was it excluded from the announcement?

Second, is the White House relying on any new data that was not available when those 2013 actions were announced?

Third, does the White House have any evidence private sellers' transaction volumes and propensity for illegal sales are positively correlated?

Fourth, does the White House believe this new policy would have prevented any of the recent year's major shootings?

Finally, does the White House expect criminals to voluntarily comply with these new rules?

The White House still has not responded to our letter. Tomorrow, the President plans to hold a Q&A townhall televised on CNN regarding guns in America.

Mr. Speaker, I fear after this event, Americans will continue to be left with more questions than answers, like, first and foremost, why does President Obama insist on infringing on Congress' lawmaking authority?

The reason we don't have any answers to the questions about this new gun control policy is because it was crafted in back rooms, out of view of the public, instead of in Congress, where we would have held hearings, committees would have reviewed the policy, and our constituents would have had the opportunity to comment on it.

Mr. Speaker, in the event Congress would have held a hearing on this issue, we probably would have uncovered the glaring reality that there is no gun show loophole. If you were one of the 55,277 federally licensed gun dealers in America in fiscal year 2014, you would have been required, by law, to run background checks on individuals, no matter if you sold a gun at your place of business or at a gun show.

Congress would probably also have come across the Department of Justice's study of inmates from 2001 that

found that less than 1 percent of inmates, when interviewed, actually bought their crime gun at a gun show. In contrast to this, almost 40 percent reported acquiring their guns illegally, such as by theft.

Members of Congress would have also found interesting a December 10 Fact Checker's column in The Washington Post which reported as true the fact that none of the past year's and month's tragic mass shootings would have been prevented by newly proposed gun laws.

Due to the President's insistence on going it alone and pursuing actions that challenge the Constitution, today we introduced H.R. 4321, the Separation of Powers Restoration and Second Amendment Protection Act. Joined by over 60 colleagues in the House, this bill would render any executive action that violates the Second Amendment or infringes on Congress' article I responsibilities as having no force or effect, and to prohibit funds for such actions and established standing for Congress, State, and local governments, and for aggrieved persons to challenge such actions in District Court. This legislation is the House companion bill to Senator RAND PAUL's bill S. 2434.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the White House cut out the distractions. Stop blaming gun owners and start taking threats to Americans' safety seriously. Instead of continuing to blame Congress for not enacting new laws, perhaps the President should look to laws already on the books.

Reports suggest that some Federal prosecutors are choosing not to prosecute straw purchasers as a matter of policy. These are the individuals that purchase guns and illegally give or sell them to individuals they know could not pass a background check. For example, in 2012, the U.S. attorney for Chicago announced a transition to focusing on interstate trafficking and other violations instead of these illegal straw purchases.

On top of this solution, the President could also look to Congress for ideas. For example, States have been expanding concealed carry reciprocity to the point that Federal laws ought to catch up. I have a bill, H.R. 923, the Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming months, I look forward to working with House Republican leadership on bold strategies to actually make America safer.

At this time, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank my friend from Indiana for doing so. It has been a pleasure working with him on this and many other issues.

I have to tell you, my heart breaks for those families who have been impacted by violent crimes. These tragedies, however, do not give President Obama the authority to circumvent the Constitution.

Just yesterday, the President announced unilateral actions to undermine the Second Amendment without input from Congress, making good on his vow from an October 2015 speech of his willingness to politicize tragedies to advance his gun control agenda.

The President needs to enforce the laws currently on the books. Criminals who abuse firearms or obtain them illegally should be prosecuted to the fullest extent, and that isn't always the case currently.

I wish President Obama understood what a majority of Americans already know, and especially those of us who have purchased weapons and purchased guns. Those who abuse firearms or obtain them illegally should be prosecuted. However, purchasing a legal gun is not quick or easy.

They also know limiting the rights of law-abiding citizens will not solve this problem. Instead of pursuing his political agenda, the President should join the bipartisan effort to fix our Nation's broken mental health system.

I am a proud cosponsor of Representative TIM MURPHY's Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. This legislation would overhaul our Nation's inadequate and outdated mental health system so people who need treatment can receive it. Simply throwing more money at this issue without these reforms is like giving the VA more money without demanding better care for our veterans.

According to ABC News, 63 percent of Americans see mass shootings as a reflection of problems identifying and treating people with mental illness and mental health problems rather than adding more restrictive gun laws.

Also, according to The New York Times, not exactly a conservative newspaper, 77 percent of those asked said that they thought that better access to mental health treatment and screening would reduce gun violence.

The American people are correct. These people who have been polled on this are absolutely correct. Responsible gun ownership is not the problem. The House must remain vigilant to protect the American people from an ever-encroaching Obama administration that is more interested in creating a political issue than a solution.

As a responsible gun owner myself, I am committed to being an advocate for Second Amendment rights, the constitutional legislation that will actually help prevent gun violence across America, and those who have been impacted by its violence.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I want to voice my strongest opposition to the Obama administration's continued assaults on our Second Amendment rights.

After seeing his gun control agenda fail in the Democrat-controlled Senate, President Obama is once again trying to go around the will of the American people and unilaterally take action through executive fiat.

This latest effort to unconstitutionally restrict one of our most fundamental rights has nothing to do with safety and security and has everything to do with government control. This is neither what the American people want nor deserve.

In fact, the executive action the President announced yesterday would not have prevented the recent tragedies our Nation has experienced, including the San Bernardino attack. Instead, it would trample the rights of law-abiding citizens. It could actually have a chilling effect on people seeking help for mental illness.

Nobody wants to see guns in the hands of someone who is dangerous because of mental incapacity, but we really need to look at the consequences of this type of action. It is just common sense. If folks believe that they could potentially lose their rights for simply seeking mental health, it is going to be a deterrent to folks actually seeking that help.

Let me give you an example. In our country, we have an absolute tragedy of veteran suicide. If one veteran who returns home from the conflict doesn't seek help for issues that may have arisen from that service, then shame on the President for this action. If they are afraid that if they go seek help, that one day they could lose their gun rights the rest of their life, what a deterrent effect that might have on a population that desperately needs help.

□ 2130

We will never regulate people's actions by regulating their freedoms. If that were the case, then the streets of Chicago would be some of the safest streets in America, because they have some of our strictest gun control laws.

Rather than infringing on our Second Amendment and governing by executive fiat, this administration should work with Congress on commonsense reforms that would actually reduce gun violence, like confronting our mental health crisis and preventing criminals and terrorists from actually entering our country in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my constituents back home in North Carolina, I am a responsible, law-abiding gun owner who cherishes our Second Amendment freedom. This right to keep and bear arms is a freedom by which we protect all of our other freedoms as a fundamental first freedom. For that reason, I encourage my colleagues in the House to stand with me against the President's proposed executive actions.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for organizing this tonight and bringing us together for this very important discussion.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, the President's plan to once again bypass Congress and unilaterally implement gun control measures represents yet another, sadly, all too familiar assault

on our Constitution. This time, the President is doubling down with a two-for-one special by proposing executive orders which violate our Second Amendment rights, while at the same time abusing the separation of powers written in our Constitution. In the process, the President claims that the overwhelming majority of Americans, including gun owners, support his executive actions.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure him that when it comes to the Texans that I represent, the President is dead wrong. This isn't the first time I have had to fight the President's radical agenda on gun control—and just like before, I won't back down.

So today, I stand in support and as a cosponsor of the Separation of Powers and Second Amendment Protection Act, a critical bill that we now, unfortunately, need to put a stop to any action by this President to weaken our Second Amendment rights.

I refuse to let this President use these unconstitutional executive orders as a way to distract the American people from his epic foreign policy failures, to turn our focus away from his failure to keep Americans safe not from the Second Amendment, but from ISIS-inspired terrorists in our own homeland. San Bernardino was not, as the President called it, ''an act of violence.'' It was terrorism.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. STUTZMAN, for putting this important Special Order together.

Yesterday, President Obama moved unilaterally, via executive order, in a misguided attempt to curb gun violence in America. He stated he had to take unilateral action because the Congress refused to support his initiatives. That is true, somewhat, but not because this Nation wishes to curb gun violence that has fallen upon innocent victims of America—victims like Kathryn Stienle.

This young lady was murdered in San Francisco by a person here illegally—a person that had been deported over four times and should have been deported once again, but instead was allowed to stay in this country illegally because of this President's policies and the policies promoted by sanctuary cities like San Francisco.

Obviously, I cannot speak for her family, but I would venture to say her family would have had a very different holiday this year than the one they experienced had the justice system not failed them and the man who murdered her had been deported. She would be here today if the President and his administration had chosen to simply enforce the laws on the books.

President Obama's executive order will not curb this kind of violence. Only the enforcement of the laws will. And, Mr. President, you know this.

Please abide by article II, section 3 of our Constitution: The executive shall faithfully execute the laws of the land.

Now, I agree with the President that we should appropriate more money to mental health, as has been talked about here tonight. The lack of resources for those seeking mental health in this country is abysmal. Thirty years ago, this Nation had over 500,000 hospital bed facilities for mental health care. Today, there are less than 50,000. This is inexcusable.

I also agree with the President that we should increase the number of ATF inspectors to process background checks more quickly and more efficiently. We can work this out through the legislative process—the way it should be done—and not through, again, executive fiat.

With all due respect, Mr. President, your phone and pen are not a substitute for the other two branches of government.

Aside from sidestepping Congress again, your other initiatives encroach on Americans' personal liberties and freedoms. Take, for example, your plan to revoke gun ownership from folks whose oversight of their finances are turned over to someone else—specifically, those receiving disability through the Social Security Administration or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

For reasons beyond their control, sometimes additional help is needed in managing one's finances. Sometimes they do it voluntarily. This does not mean they are incapable of making sound, moral decisions, and certainly does not mean their Second Amendment rights can and should be infringed upon.

As an aside, I want to highlight how this President's administration allowed for Syrian rebels to receive military grade weapons and they supplied Mexican drug cartels with weapons through the failed Fast and Furious program administered under Attorney General Eric Holder at the time. All of this has been done irresponsibly and without conducting background checks.

This administration's gun policies have killed innocent people. Customs and Border Security Agent Brian Terry was a victim of this. Yet this President's solution to gun violence is to restrict law-abiding American citizens from one of our most basic rights of American freedom and liberty. It simply does not make sense.

The Second Amendment of our Constitution is very clear and concise. Allow me to read it: ''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.''

This amendment was not added in the early years of our Nation's founding for hunting or sporting purposes, but for personal protection to fend off an overbearing, tyrannical government. It is very clear and has consistently been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I understand and sympathize with your frustrations, but please uphold the Constitution and come to Congress. Let's work together on those areas where we agree upon to curb gun violence. And let's preserve the Second Amendment. Let's all respect and revere the Constitution for all Americans.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I thank my colleague and good friend from Indiana for organizing this Special Order, and I am very pleased to be here this evening to help defend our Second Amendment, which is the amendment giving teeth to all our other amendments and rights.

The Second Amendment is one of the most fundamental principles of our Republic. And yet the Obama administration and the Democratic Party as a whole have now been engaged for years in an attempt to undermine the rights of law-abiding American citizens to keep and bear arms.

President Obama, as has already been discussed this evening, has come before the American people just yesterday announcing his attempt to yet again infringe upon the rights of law-abiding American citizens by unilaterally instituting new restrictions on firearm sales.

The President's blatant disregard for the constitutional role of Congress to write the laws of the land is absolutely astounding to me. This latest move is just yet a larger part of executive abuse that has been going on for quite some time and an overreach.

In 2013, Congress rejected legislation that would have expanded background checks. I fully believe that that would have the same result today. And yet because it was not in accord with the wishes of the President, he now claims that Congress has relinquished its responsibility. Therefore, he somehow has the right to create laws as he sees fit. Well, he is wrong.

As well as being unconstitutional, this moral imperative that the President claims to have regarding gun controls is not even statistically or logically on sound ground. In fact, the President has pointed directly to a string of domestic terror attacks as the reason for his executive action. And yet we all know that his unconstitutional executive order would not have prevented any of these terror attacks.

So the real issue here is that this gun grab by the President is a smokescreen to hide from his own failed policies and his refusal to deal with terrorism and to eliminate it. And it is time for the truth to be told and for us to stand in opposition against this continued assault on the Second Amendment.

Personally, my defense of the Second Amendment is firm and unwavering. I will never support any measure that infringes upon the rights of law-abiding American citizens to purchase, use, and keep firearms and ammunition. I believe that any law that restricts these

rights is unconstitutional and should be steadfastly opposed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to share this tonight. And I am just reminded of Thomas Jefferson's statement: ''No freeman shall ever be debarred the use of arms.''

This is an issue upon which our liberties rest.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for the reminder from one of our Founding Fathers, and I appreciate your service to the citizens in Georgia.

I yield to another Member from the great State of Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my colleague from Indiana for reserving this time and for giving me a few minutes to speak on this very important and critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, as I am standing here, I see the word ''liberty'' engraved at the base of the rostrum. One of the great principles of this Nation is one of the principles of which our Founding Fathers sought to take on in the field of battle the most powerful military force in the history of the world for an idea, a principle of liberty.

One of the great influencers on our Founding Fathers was Charles Montesquieu, an 18th century philosopher and judge. He said that when the legislative and the executive power is vested in one person or one body, there can be no liberty.

Many of my colleagues that stood here before I came this evening have testified to the role that the President has taken upon himself to become both the legislator and the executive in this matter. In fact, in his statement on the White House Web site, he said that he was going to have to take action, even though some of the gaps in our gun laws could only be fixed by legislative action by Congress. But because Congress failed to act, he is going to have to take action.

Clearly, he is admitting to stepping into the constitutional role of this body and the body on the other side of this building. When that happens, there can be no liberty.

Now, the President has said he must take this action because Congress has failed to act. No, Congress did act. But Congress did not act in the way that he wanted us to. And because we didn't act in the way that he specifically wanted, now he has to take action. And the action he says that he must take is to make America safe.

Many have talked about the constitutional issues. Clearly, he is taking an unconstitutional approach in this decision that he has made and in this action. But I want to highlight the ultimate hypocrisy of his statement that his actions are to make America safe.

This body has taken actions which he has ignored that would truly make America safe. Back in February, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I traveled to our open and porous southern border, and I traveled side-by-side with Border Patrol agents, the Coast Guard, and local law enforcement who have committed their time and their lives. It is their mission to secure that border. We saw that the border is controlled by illegal cartels that smuggle human traffic. They smuggle narcotics and they smuggle drugs across the border into this country.

Now, if guns just arbitrarily kill people, then maybe the action the President is taking would have some effect. But I have been around guns all my life and I have yet to have a gun jump up and just arbitrarily start shooting anyone. Guns don't kill people. People kill people.

□ 2145

Bad people that use guns come into this country, and often those guns are smuggled in through the southern border.

Now, as a result of being on the border, we realized that the only way to secure that border is we have to have a combination of physical barriers, of technology, but, most importantly, boots on the ground.

We have talked about building fences and building walls. Well, I had one Border Patrol agent say that those are really ineffective unless you have boots on the ground. You build a 12-foot wall. The cartels buy 13-foot ladders.

The cartels use high technology. They use engineers to build tunnels. They use aircraft to drop contraband on our side of the border and smuggle people, many people who are intent to do ill to people in this Nation, as we saw in San Francisco earlier this year.

But the President has basically ignored Congress' call to secure the border. Instead of putting more Border Patrol agents on the border to secure the border, he wants to bring 200 more ATF agents to investigate American citizens.

Just a few weeks ago, we dealt with the threat of ISIS and al Qaeda that says they are going to exploit our refugee resettlement program to get operatives into this Nation to conduct terrorist attacks against this Nation.

This Congress, out of this body, passed a bill to pause that program until we could fully vet every person. The President decided he would ignore the call of Congress, and he pursued on with the refugee program.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I was able to question the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the FBI, saying: If we do bring these refugees in, how are you going to monitor them?

The FBI said: We don't have the resources to monitor 10,000 new refugees coming into this Nation.

But, yet, in his executive order, the President wants to hire 230 administrators, administrative personnel, to conduct background checks instead of providing us with more FBI agents to investigate terrorist activities. You tell me who is wanting to make America safe.

He also has proposed $500 million toward mental health care and eventually tie mental health assessments to background checks. I applaud that.

But, at the same time, we have thousands of soldiers coming back from war areas suffering from PTSD that this administration and the Veterans Administration has ultimately abandoned.

Finally, he wants to use taxpayer dollars and resources to research and test smart gun technology. Well, maybe that is a technology in the future that could be applicable.

But, yet, the TSA has postponed time and time again putting in new scanning technology that is desperately needed at our airports to stop contraband and banned items from getting through to our Nation's airlines and into our transportation system. Once again, that has been postponed.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the President and his call that he wants to make America safer is making America more dangerous because he continues to ignore what the will of the people is.

What this Congress is calling for is that we need to close our borders, we need to put more FBI agents investigating terrorist activities, we need to take care of our war veterans, we need to stop the influx of refugees that we know are going to be exploited by our enemies, and we also need to invest in technologies to make our transportation safe and secure.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate his comments tremendously. I think he made some very good points.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I appreciate this opportunity to certainly stand in support of our Second Amendment.

This is an issue that has obviously been around for some time. With the recent very violent events that have stricken various communities around our country, I think that the way the President has chosen to respond is ineffective. I think it is inappropriate, certainly an overreach by the President himself.

I believe that, as the President has chosen to operate without going to Congress or even attempting to work with Congress on many issues, but especially this one, it is disappointing.

We already have laws on the books that need enforcing. Those laws that we have I think can be effective.

Certainly, I don't think anyone will say that someone can just automatically go buy a gun without any effort whatsoever.

But, disappointingly, none of the President's recent unilateral actions targeting law-abiding citizens and restricting gun ownership would have prevented the tragedies that the President himself has referenced.

I would like to highlight one area of the executive order which falls under the jurisdiction of the committee on which I serve, the Ways and Means

Committee, which is the President's proposal to have Social Security beneficiaries with representative payees included in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Now, let me say that the mismanagement of one's finances alone should not mean that an individual would lose their Second Amendment rights. I am concerned not only that this targets law-abiding citizens, but that it would also discourage some beneficiaries from seeking needed assistance for fear of losing their constitutional rights. Many similar views have been shared here earlier this evening.

Also, when the Los Angeles Times first reported consideration of the representative payee issue last summer, I joined the majority of the Ways and Means Committee members in writing to the President opposing this proposal.

Despite the administration's unwillingness so far to change its stance on representative payees, I remain hopeful we can scale back these orders.

Early last year, when the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives proposed banning M855 ammunition, I was one of the 238 House Members who wrote the former ATF Director opposing the proposal, as did more than 80,000 Americans. Now, in response to massive public and congressional opposition, the ATF actually withdrew the proposal.

President Obama has repeatedly disregarded our legislative branch and the American people. The President's job is to respect all constitutional rights, not just the ones he chooses. His executive order sets an incredibly dangerous precedent.

I will continue to stand against this overreach and protect Nebraskans' and, quite frankly, all Americans' constitutional right to bear arms.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me the time.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for leading this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the Second Amendment is crystal clear. It ensures that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The founders rebelled against the largest empire in the world. They knew it was crucial to guarantee individuals the right to protect their life, liberty and property. That is the entire point of the Second Amendment.

Unfortunately, we have a President more obsessed with the politics of gun control than living by the oath he twice took to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The President should work with Congress to solve the problems facing this country, not try to take on the legislative duties of Congress.

Americans have a history of confronting those who wish to take away their rights, and they have said: ''No. You can't do that.

The best way to fight against the gross overreach by the Federal Government is for citizens to exercise their Second Amendment rights.

The good news is the people of this country, the responsible people who will exercise their constitutional rights and follow the law, are already doing this. They are flocking to purchase guns and ammunition despite President Obama's best efforts.

Since President Obama was sworn into office, 106 million background checks for gun purchases have been conducted by Federal or State authorities. Only 96 million were conducted in the previous 11 years. Gun makers have doubled their manufacturing output since 2009 as well.

Meanwhile, according to the ATF, the number of privately owned firearms in the U.S. has increased from about 250 million twenty years ago to roughly 350 million today.

President Obama's obsession with killing the Second Amendment has unintentionally become the catalyst for gun ownership in America. The firearms industry's $43 billion nationwide economic impact has more than doubled since 2009 and is also one of the few bright spots in the Obama economic record.

But there is more good news in all of this. Despite the White House's misleading rhetoric, violent crime rates are consistently down over the last 20 years. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report, the number of violent crimes has decreased 35.5 percent over the last 20 years.

There are more guns than people in the United States; yet, the violent crime rate continues to tumble because a criminal knows a well-armed gun owner is a direct threat to a criminal's safety.

And despite President Obama's obsession with undermining the Second Amendment, Federal weapons convictions have dropped 35 percent compared to 2005.

The Obama Department of Justice should focus on enforcing current Federal weapons laws instead of issuing ideological edicts from the executive branch.

Once again, I would like to thank my colleague from Indiana, Mr. STUTZMAN, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's executive orders relating to gun control are a major distraction from the real national security issues.

Frankly, I think dealing with ISIS and confronting Iran over their violations of this administration's agreement with them and securing our borders are of greater importance than pushing gun control measures that will do little to protect us.

Apparently, this administration is more concerned about 4 million senior citizens on Social Security owning a gun than they are about a nuclear-armed Iran or terrorists crossing our unsecured borders.

The fact that millions of Americans have purchased firearms over the weeks following the shootings in San Bernardino is indicative that they have lost confidence in this administration's ability to protect them. They are literally taking personal responsibility for their own safety. It could be argued that these Americans are creating their own homeland security.

Pushing executive orders for more gun control that exceed the President's constitutional authority will not only do little to improve our national security, it will do little to increase the public's confidence in this administration's policies for protecting our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this latest abuse and overreach of executive authority and reassert the lawmaking authority of Congress.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to focus our attention on defeating ISIS, on restraining Iran, and on securing our borders in order to protect American citizens right here in our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for leading this Special Order for this critical discussion.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire as to the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate each Member coming down tonight to talk about this. This is a very important issue. I am hearing from my constituents back in northeast Indiana every day on the concern that they have about the President's actions.

I would like to share just a statistic, that we know that national crime rates, violent crime and gun crime, have both dropped over the last 2½ decades. I think that is a positive sign that we should all be encouraged about and that we continue to work together to make sure that violent crime and gun crime is eliminated in this country.

In 2013, the national crime rate was about half of what it was at its height in 1991. Violent crime had fallen by 51 percent since 1991 and property crime by 43 percent.

In 2013, the violent crime rate was the lowest since 1970. Compared with 1993, the peak of U.S. gun homicides, the firearm homicide rate was 49 percent lower in 2010 and there were fewer deaths, even though the Nation's population grew.

The victimization rate for other violent crimes with a firearm, assault, robberies, and sex crimes, was 75 percent lower in 2011 than in 1993.

Violent, nonfatal crime victimization overall, with or without a firearm, also is down markedly, 72 percent over the past two decades.

As one of the former Members mentioned, if you look at the city of Chicago, which has some of the strictest gun laws in the country, it has a huge problem with gun violence in that city.

I would like to just read, in closing, again, what I think is really important for all of us, the Second Amendment: ''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.''

I ask that all of us, as Members of this great body, continue to remember that the Second Amendment is there to protect liberty and freedom.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

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

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending to family member's medical procedure.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11. These revisions are designated for Public Law 114–74, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

The revisions designated for Public Law 114–74, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, are made pursuant to section 1002 of Public Law 114–113, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. Section 1002 of Public Law 114–113 allows for the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the applicable levels of the budget resolution to achieve consistency with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

The revisions designated for the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015, are made pursuant to section 4502 of S. Con. Res. 11 and are consistent with section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11. Section 4502 of S. Con. Res. 11 permits the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the applicable levels of the budget resolution for a measure that promotes real health care reform. Section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11 permits adjustments for a reconciliation measure that is deficit neutral. These revisions will facilitate the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted, and will be used for budget enforcement purposes. Pursuant to section 3403 of S. Con. Res. 11, these revisions to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762 is under consideration or upon its enactment. Corresponding tables are attached.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman,
Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,113,623	(1)
Outlays	3,162,793	(1)
Revenues	2,698,104	32,298,936
Adjustment to achieve consistency with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015:		
Budget Authority	38,012	(1)
Outlays	2,286	(1)
Revenues	269	26,588
Adjustment for SA to HR 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Act of 2016:		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	−52,700	−793,300
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,151,635	(1)
Outlays	3,165,079	(1)
Revenues	2,645,673	31,532,224

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2016
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,066,582
OT	1,170,357
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	73,693
OT	32,079
Program Integrity:	
BA	1,523
OT	1,311
Disaster Relief Spending:	
BA	7,143
OT	388
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,148,941
OT	1,204,135
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	960,295
OT	952,912

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3861. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31040; Amdt. No.: 3663] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3862. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31037; Amdt. No.: 3661] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3863. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31038; Amdt. No.: 3662] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3864. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31041; Amdt. No.: 3664] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3865. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Missouri towns: Chillicothe, MO; Cuba, MO; Farmington, MO; Lamar, MO; Mountain View, MO; Nevada, MO; and Poplar Bluff, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0842; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ACE-2] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3866. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Louisiana towns: Jonesboro, LA and Winnfield, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0843; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-5] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3867. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Vancouver, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3322; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-16] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3868. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3940; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-18300; AD 2015-19-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3869. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Sikorsky-Manufactured Transport and Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0442; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-24-AD; Amendment 39-18291; AD 2015-20-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3870. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1985; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-214-AD; Amendment 39-18294; AD 2015-21-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3871. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Vincennes, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2049; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-12] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3872. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Columbus, Ohio State University Airport, OH, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Columbus OH [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1649; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-6] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3873. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0498; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-18305; AD 2015-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3874. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5819; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-18336; AD 2015-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3875. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3642; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-18335; AD 2015-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3876. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5806; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-083-AD; Amendment 39-18331; AD 2015-22-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3877. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tomah, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1387; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-4] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3878. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hart/Shelby, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1835; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AGL-7] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 581. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation (Rept. 114–389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 451. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–390). 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. STUTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4321. A bill to provide that any executive action that infringes on the powers and duties of Congress under section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States or on the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 4322. A bill to clarify the prohibition on affiliation under the Mentor-Protege Program of the Department of Defense, to amend the Small Business Act to improve cooperation between the mentor-protege programs of the Small Business Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4323. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations for the safe and environmentally responsible reopening of abandoned mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 4324. A bill to prevent certain monitoring and interception by Federal authorities of Federal prisoner communications that are subject to attorney-client privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4325. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the anticipated value of certain contracts reserved exclusively for small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand the duties of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4327. A bill to require the Governor of each State that receives a grant under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to certify to the Attorney General that under the laws of that State there is no statute of limitations for any offense under the laws of that State related to sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 4328. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives or Senate of the text of any legislation which has not been published online at least 72 hours prior to its consideration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify determinations of the total value of contract awards; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to add reporting requirements for certain small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HARDY (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 4331. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure small business concerns receive assistance with post-award compliance with the requirements of a contract or subcontract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the duties of procurement center representatives with respect to reviewing solicitations for a contract or task order contract; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize expedited consideration of sanctions in the event that the Government of Iran commits acts of terror or uses ballistic missile technology in violation of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4334. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations are being made for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 4335. A bill to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4336. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the burial of the cremated remains of persons who served as Women's Air Forces Service Pilots in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 4337. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide information on regulatory changes and regulatory compliance training materials to certain entities; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4338. A bill to provide that the authority to grant clemency for offenses against the District of Columbia shall be exercised in accordance with law enacted by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4339. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the responsibilities of Business Opportunity Specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

166. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution No. 58, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 4321.

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

Article I, Section 1:

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

Article I, Section 8:

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

Amendment II to the U.S. 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.''

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 4322.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4323.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 4324.

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

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'').

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4325.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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 Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4326.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4327.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 4328.

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

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Article 1, Section 5, clause 2—Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings . . .

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 4329.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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 Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4330.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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. HARDY:

H.R. 4331.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 4332.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 4333.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4334.

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

Article I, Sec. 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 4335.

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

(a) Section 8, Clause 1 of Article I of the Constitution; and

(b) Section 8, Clause 3 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 4336.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12—''The Congress shall have Power To . . . raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years . . . ''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14—''The Congress shall have Power To . . . make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces. . . . ''

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4337.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4338.

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

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4339.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 228: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 429: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 452: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 563: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 663: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 676: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 814: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 842: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 887: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 940: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1057: Mr. COSTA and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1076: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1089: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1178: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1180: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1288: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1292: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1306: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1309: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1333: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1342: Mr. HONDA, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1399: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1407: Mr. PETERS and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1475: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1484: Mr. HECK of Nevada

H.R. 1559: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1610: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1632: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1684: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1688: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1706: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1748: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1761: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1784: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1797: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1818: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1901: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2096: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2123: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2216: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2302: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2366: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2380: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2400: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2460: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2612: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2646: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2689: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2715: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2726: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2730: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2759: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2805: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2817: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2956: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2994: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3034: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3084: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3136: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3248: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3299: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3323: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 3355: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3356: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3381: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3455: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3516: Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3565: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3662: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COOK, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3691: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 3710: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3719: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3722: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3723: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3742: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 3779: Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3799: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 3808: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3860: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 3879: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3892: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. TROTT,

H.R. 3926: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3970: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3986: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3990: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4007: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4016: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 4019: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4062: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 4076: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4087: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 4113: Ms. MENG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4132: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4156: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 4162: Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4185: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 4186: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 4197: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4213: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4219: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 4223: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4247: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4257: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4258: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 4264: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4273: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4276: Mr. BEYER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4298: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 4315: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 4316: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 4319: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H. Con. Res. 66: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. YODER, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. BOST.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. BARTON.

H. Res. 14: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 32: Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 265: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 374: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 467: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 470: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 548: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H. Res. 549: Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 551: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. KLINE.

H. Res. 569: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H. Res. 571: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 575: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. LEE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative COHEN, or a designee, to H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

40. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Attorneys General of West Virginia and Texas, relative to the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our legislative counsel for all their help over the past few weeks, starting with Sandra Strokoff and Ed Grossman.

I also want to thank all the senior and assistant counsels for their hard work: Tom Cassidy, Ryan Greenlaw, and Justin Gross on appropriations; Henry Christrup, Wade Ballou, and Scott Probst on taxes; Paul Callen, Marshall Barksdale, and Veena Srinivasa on housing and financial services; Hallet Brazelton, Megan Chasnoff, and Susan Fleishman on the 9/11 VCF and immigration; Jessica Shapiro, Warren Burke, Ed Grossman, Jesse Cross, and Michelle Vanek on the WTC health program; Tom Cassidy and Bob Weinhagen on budget; Justin Gross and Lucy Goss on Social Security; Hank Savage and Lisa Daly on Oceans, coastal security, and land and water conservation; and Tony Sciascia, Hadley Ross, and Mat Eckstein on intelligence and cybersecurity.

Then there are the drafters who worked nights and weekends to produce all the other major legislation: Curt Haensel, Rosemary Gallagher, Tom Dillon, Karen Anderson, Tim Brown, Kakuti Lin, Sally Walker, Brady Young, and Chris Osborne on the highway bill; Sherry Chriss, Greg Kostka, Hadley Ross, Tony Sciascia, and Mark Synnes on the defense bill; Susan Fleishman, Anna Shpak, and Brendan Gallagher on the education bill; and Sandy Strokoff, Mark Synnes, and Mat Eckstein on trade and customs bills. Thanks also to Doug Bellis, Jean Harmann, Jim Grossman, Noah Wofsy, and Alison Hartwich for their work drafting other legislation.

Finally, I want to thank all the office's support staff: Nancy McNeillie, Debby Birch, Kelly Meryweather, Elonda Rich, Tomas Contreras, Miekl Joyner, Ashley Anderson, Joe Birch, Angelina Patton, Craig Sterkx, Tom Meryweather, Matthew Loggie, Willie Blount, Peter Szwec, and David Topper, and GPO detailees Mel Gilbert, Theresa Harris, Toni King, and Preble Marmion.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 2016 CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG/BUNDESRAT EXCHANGE

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag and Bundesrat have conducted an annual exchange program for staff members from both countries. The program gives professional staff the opportunity to observe and learn about each other's political institutions and interact on issues of mutual interest.

A staff delegation from the U.S. Congress will be selected to visit Germany for ten days from Friday, May 27–Sunday, June 5, 2016. During this ten day exchange, the delegation will attend meetings with Bundestag/Bundesrat Members, Bundestag and Bundesrat party staff members, and representatives of numerous political, business, academic, and media agencies.

A comparable delegation of German staff members will visit the United States for ten days from Saturday, April 16–Sunday, April 24, 2016. They will attend similar meetings here in Washington.

The Congress-Bundestag/Bundesrat Exchange is highly regarded in Germany and the United States, and is one of several exchange programs sponsored by public and private institutions in the United States and Germany to foster better understanding of the politics and policies of both countries. This exchange is funded by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The U.S. delegation should consist of experienced and accomplished Hill staff who can contribute to the success of the exchange on both sides of the Atlantic. The Bundestag reciprocates by sending senior staff professionals to the United States.

Applicants should have a demonstrable interest in events in Europe. Applicants need not be working in the field of foreign affairs, although such a background can be helpful. The composite U.S. delegation should exhibit a range of expertise in issues of mutual concern to the United States and Germany such as, but not limited to, trade, security, the environment, economic development, health care, and other social policy issues. This year's delegation should be familiar with transatlantic relations within the context of recent world events.

Please note that the U.S. participants are expected to plan and implement the meetings and program for the Bundestag/Bundesrat staff members when they visit the United States.

Participants are selected by a committee composed of personnel from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State and past participants of the exchange.

Members of the House and Senate who would like a member of their staff to apply for participation in this year's program should direct them to submit a résumé and cover letter in which they state their qualifications, the contributions they can make to a successful program and some assurances of their ability to participate during the time stated.

Applications should be sent to the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, HC–4, the Capitol, by 5 p.m. on Friday, February 26, 2016.

RECOGNIZING NORTHWEST INDIANA'S NEWLY NATURALIZED CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oath of citizenship on Friday, January 8, 2016. This memorable occasion, which will be presided over by Magistrate Judge Paul R. Cherry, will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On January 8, 2016, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Husamuldeen Abdulhadi Abdulameer, Alaa Husamuldeen Abdulhadi, Cynthia Chinonso Chijioke, Andrea Conces, Carlos Delgado Rubalcava, Alberto Lopez, Nada Mandic, Albino Akon Ibrahim Akon, Shireen Ahmed Amouri, Claudia Boyd, Maria Kisselle Aguilar Corey, Alfredo Salomon Esper Cure, Juan Camilo Esper Rios, Natalia Esper Rios, Nidia Esperanza Esper, Angelica Garcia, Ken Guo, Lucas Yang Hong, Asha Thomas Mathew, Miguel Meza, Juan Mora, Emmanuel Nicholas Kwame Opuni, Ernesto Honorio Ortega, Jaime Roman, Mido Chunru Song, Antonio Tapia, Rezan Tecle, Jessie Tom, Guadalupe Carmen Trevino, and Rose Ntaki White.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country ". . . of the people, by the people, and for the people." They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on January 8, 2016. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit

of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DANTE J. ZAMBRINI

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Dante J. Zambrini, former superintendent of Canfield Schools and interim vice president of Eastern Gateway Community College.

Dante was born April 12, 1954, in Youngstown, Ohio. He was the son of Joseph A. and Ann (Peters) Zambrini. The son of an immigrant father, Dante was very proud of his Italian heritage and spoke fluent Italian.

A graduate of Ursuline High School, he later earned his Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Education and Administration from Youngstown State University, and devoted his life to education in our Valley. He served as superintendent of Canfield Schools, retiring in 2012, and then assumed the position of interim vice president of Eastern Gateway Community College.

Dante is remembered as a wonderful man who always put his students' needs before his own. In every position he served during his career, he was respected by all and served as a fine example of educational excellence.

Professionally, he was a member of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Mahoning County Association of Elementary School Administrators, Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, and served as the director of the Associated Schools Employees Credit Union and Phi Delta Kappa.

Always active in the community, Mr. Zambrini was a member of the Rotary Club of Canfield where he served as president from 2010 to 2011, vice president from 2009 to 2010, and was a three-time recipient of the Rotary International Paul Harris Fellow Recognition.

He was a member of the Canfield Historical Society, where he served two terms as a director, Friends of Riverside Gardens, Canfield Community Club, lifetime member of the Youngstown State University Alumni Association, served as a trustee of the James and Coralie Centofanti Foundation and served on the Canfield steering committee for the new Canfield Library.

Dante is survived by his cousins, Dominic (Georgette) Peters, Thomas (Lucy) Peters, Eugene (Diane) Marra, Frank (Karen) Marra, James Peters, Donna (Walt) Chmielewski, Norma (Gerald) Vrabel, Patty (Thomas) Halas, Jean (Gerald) Vrabel, Debbie Rose, Annie Marra, Michael (Stacey) Durkin, Tim (Jill) Durkin and others including Polly Marsh; and his neighbor and dear friend, Joyce (Loran) Brooks, whom he considered a second mother.

There is no doubt that the fabric of the Mahoning Valley community was strengthened by Dante's lifelong work in education, and his steady commitment to community service. His influence will be missed, but I join with the rest of Northeast Ohio in grateful thanks for his many years of contributions to our community.

RECOGNIZING SIMMONS COLLEGE ON BECOMING OUR NATION'S 107TH HBCU

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and congratulate Simmons College of Kentucky on officially becoming recognized as our nation's 107th Historically Black College and University. One hundred and fifty years ago, members of twelve Black Baptist Churches met in Louisville to discuss the need for a school that would allow Black students to pursue a college degree. After years of planning and consideration, they decided that this school should be located at the corner of 8th and Kentucky in Louisville, where they purchased four acres of land and continued working to make their dream a reality. Originally founded as the Kentucky Normal Theological Institute, it was under the leadership of Dr. W.J. Simmons that the school became a full university, growing in both size and opportunity, and would eventually be renamed in his honor.

Today, Simmons College continues to make a positive impact in our city and throughout Kentucky. The faith that inspired this institution to persevere throughout the years is now stronger than ever, and the hundreds of students who are currently enrolled are continuing the school's proud tradition as the birthplace of Black higher education in Louisville. As the school's motto so accurately states, Simmons College has been ''dedicated to educational excellence since 1879,'' and I extend my most sincere congratulations to their President, Dr. Kevin W. Cosby, his students, and the entire Simmons community. Go Simmons Nation.

IN HONOR OF DOLORES EATON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, legacy, and work of Dolores Eaton; who was a well known resident of Harlem. Dolores was not only a beloved Mother and Grandmother but she was also an artist, activist, and a longtime community figure.

It is well known to those in good spirit that sunrises are filled with color and beauty; they light up and bring warmth to the land. There cannot be a more accurate description of Dolores Eaton that captures the life she lived.

Dolores was born in Harlem, New York to Mrs. Rovena Hodge and Edward Rubin. Dolores, who was an only child, was raised with her two first cousins Mattie and Madeline and was lovingly nurtured by her Aunt Naomi and Cousin Lottie. True to the old custom of Black Families who supported their transitioning family members from the south to the north; they all lived together in Harlem. The family roots hailed from Sumter, South Carolina, which is not only the birthplace of this magnificent family but is also unfortunately known as the home of the Ku Klux Klan, and where the Civil War began.

Dolores was baptized at Mount Zion Lutheran Church under the leadership of the founders, Pastor and Mrs. Clemonce Sabourin. She also attended the church's famous School on the Hill, which sits across from the historic Convent Avenue Baptist Church. After graduating from elementary school, Dolores was accepted into the then prestigious George Washington High School. There Dolores studied dance, drama and the cello. In 1955, Dolores joined the Penthouse Dance and Drama Theater, located at 21 West 145th Street, which at the time was under the leadership of Sheldon B. Hoskins, to follow her dream to pursue a career in theater.

Dolores was smitten by a tall handsome man, Donald H. Eaton, Jr., mechanical engineer. They were married in 1957 at Mount Zion Lutheran Church. Their beautiful wedding was catered by the famous Katz's delicatessen. They began to raise their family at the Colonial Park Houses, now known as the Ralph J. Rangel Houses. The Eaton's became very well known in Harlem and beyond. The couple gave birth to Donald H. Eaton, III in 1957 and then to Geoffrey Eric Eaton in 1958.

After Geoffrey was born, Dolores began her own career at Mutual of New York Life Insurance (MONY) in mid-town Manhattan. Dolores was not only very smart but a truly beautiful woman as well, and so she also began a career in modeling. Dolores's beloved mother, Rovena was a seamstress at a coat factory on Delancey Street. Rovena was a gifted artist with a pair of scissors, a threaded needle and sewing machine. She hand-made all of Dolores's attractive business suits and attire. Dolores was easily always the apple in every man's eyes.

As you can imagine, raising two active boys was no easy task, especially during the early days of the Black Revolution up North and the Civil Rights Movement down South. But, nonetheless, Dolores's perseverance, dedication, and strong maternal instincts gave well deserved success: her eldest son Donald is an outstanding musician, a tenured percussion teacher at the renowned Harlem School of the Arts, a member of The Last Poets, arranger and composer for Arthur Mitchell's Dance Theatre of Harlem and Yoruba philosopher. Her youngest son Geoffrey is my top aide, President of the NAACP Mid-Manhattan Branch, and chair of the Uptown Dance Academy, while serving on the executive board of Harlem Arts Alliance.

After retiring from MONY, Dolores served as district director for the late Harlem Assemblywoman, the Honorable Geraldine Daniels; where she worked hard to help to make history by electing the first African American Mayor of New York City, the Honorable David Dinkins. In 1990 she helped to make history again, by working hard to bring South Africa's first black president, Hon. Nelson Mandela to African Square on W. 125th Street during HARLEM WEEK. In 1994 she joined the staff of the first elected public advocate, the Honorable Mark Green. Dolores continued to serve public advocate Green, and public advocate Betsy Gotbaum as Director of Ombudsman Services until Dee's retirement in 2009. Dolores served as vice president of the Harlem Canaan House Tenant's Association, where, along with her son, Geoffrey and Cristal Johnson she advocated for and worked with management and it's residents to keep the building affordable and functioning at the

highest level for all residents. She was a fierce fighter, brilliant advocate and hero to all of the tenants.

Dolores also volunteered her services to support the political goals, missions and aspirations of Honorable Lloyd E. Dickens, NYS Assemblyman and business icon, Honorable Basil A. Paterson, NYS Senator and NY State Secretary of State and she was to the end also a strong supporter of NYS Assemblyman Keith L. T. Wright.

What many may not know about Dolores, was that she was a founding member of an elite group of activists—Blackfrica Promotions, a group, which was formed under the leadership of the late and great Percy E. Sutton alongside Lloyd Williams, Joseph Roberts, Marvin Kelly, Larry Frasier, Tony Rogers, Stephanie Francis, Voza Rivers, Jacques DeGraff, Gilbert Paschall, III, Andy Reddick, DiAnne Henderson and her very best friend and sister, Grace Williams. This group was the foundation for HARLEM WEEK and went a long way to reverse the negative trend and images that Harlem had in the early 70s, 80s, and 90s. One of Dolores favorite Blackfrica quotes was ''Learning is the beginning of wealth. Learning is the beginning of health. Learning is the beginning of spirituality. Searching and learning is where the miracle process begins.''

Dolores was also a founding charter member of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Democratic Club, where she worked diligently for the elections of H. Carl McCall for State Senate, David N. Dinkins for Manhattan Borough President and Percy E. Sutton for Mayor.

Dolores truly loved to travel and had great fun on her numerous trips, with her family and the members of Blackfrica Promotions, visited Europe, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Canada, Brazil, Latin & South America and many states and cities throughout the USA.

Dolores leaves to mourn her beloved sons, Donald and Geoffrey; her daughter Allyson; her beloved grandsons Geoffrey, Jr. and Geoffrey, III; her nephew Russell Eaton Jr.; daughters-in-law, Melanie, Cheryl and Reiko; her matriarch cousins Eleanor Holmes and Lulu Scott; first cousins Madeline Williams, Michael, Ginger, Laura Ceasar, William and Craig Spooner, Edward, Mark, Jessica Hodge, Iris Mack, Cathy and Thomasina Holmes and Otis Cruse; a host of cousins that hail from the north, the south and the west coast too numerous to name; many more family members; a host of dear friends, neighbors, Donald Eaton, Sr., the father of her sons, and many beautiful memories.

Dee now joins with John ''Smitty'' Smith, her longtime companion who preceded her in death.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Dolores Eaton, Sunsets always bring the night and new lights arise with the stars—with this comes new beginnings and we know that this mother, grandmother, aunt, cousin and friend, Dolores Eaton, is up there as one of the new and brightest stars in the sky.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. MAMIE WILLIAMS

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Mamie Williams. I join her family members and friends who gather on January 9, 2016, in Los Angeles, CA to commemorate this special day.

Mamie Williams was born January 6, 1916, in Indianapolis, Indiana to Eugene and Helen Dedmon. She graduated from Crispus Attucks High School in 1933 and married Lefred Williams that same year. Mamie Williams was a woman of many talents and giftings. She was an accomplished pianist and her musical talent became well known throughout the community. She was also a gifted seamstress with an eye for fashion, as she made many of her family's clothes. She began her journey of becoming the Mother of 13 children in Indianapolis with the birth of her first son in 1934. In 1951, the Williams clan moved to Beaumont, California and finally to the greater Los Angeles area where the family resides today.

Throughout her life, Mamie has been a devoted wife and mother who has always been there for her family. Perseverance, hard work, love and respect were just a few of the many lessons taught to those who have known her. In addition to being a Homemaker, Mamie was a member of several service organizations such as the Delta Mothers and the American Business Women Association. She also served 30 years as a volunteer for the Democratic Party where she worked at local polling places on voting day.

Mamie was a member of the Women's Club at Washington Memorial Church where her husband served as a Bishop. Along with the rest of her family, she later became a member of the United Church of Religious Science in Los Angeles and was a graduate of the inaugural Science of Mind class taught by Dr. Hornaday.

Mamie worked side by side for many years with her husband Lefred in the family owned business Youth Town Furniture & Appliances, started in 1969 on Crenshaw Blvd. in Los Angeles. The store became a staple in the local community until Lefred's retirement in 1985, and ultimate passing in 1987.

Today Mamie's legacy includes 11 surviving children, 7 sons and daughters-in-law, 24 grandchildren, and 17 great-grandchildren. Mamie has led an outstanding life, highlighted by her love of family and service to her community. I wish her many more years of health and happiness.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE CLEMENCY ACT OF 2016

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Home Rule Clemency Act of 2016, a bill that would give the District of Columbia exclusive authority, like states, to grant clemency to offenders prosecuted under its local laws.

While D.C. law appears to give the mayor authority to grant clemency (D.C. Code 1–301.76), it is currently the opinion of the Department of Justice that the President, and not the Mayor, has the authority to issue clemency for most local offenses prosecuted under D.C. law, particularly felonies prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney in the D.C. Superior Court. Under current practice, clemency petitions for D.C. convictions, like federal convictions, are submitted to the DOJ for the President's consideration.

Whether or not the DOJ's view is correct, my bill would remove all doubt that the District, and not the President, has the authority to issue executive clemency. The District, like states, should have full control of its local criminal justice system, the most basic responsibility of local government. Since the D.C. Council has the authority to enact local laws, District officials are in the best position to grant clemency for local law convictions. My bill would provide all clemency authority not currently reserved to the Mayor under D.C. Code 1–301.76 to the District government and would give D.C. the discretion to establish its own clemency system.

This bill is an important step in establishing further autonomy for the District in its own local affairs. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,900,932,690,017.04. We've added $8,274,055,641,103.96 to our debt in 7 years. This is over $8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CONFERENCE REPORT FOR THE TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement regarding House passage of the Conference Report for the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. Historically, legislation addressing customs procedures and import security has enjoyed bipartisan support. Even when this legislation, also known as the Customs Bill, emerged from the Senate, the new bill included language that was supported by a wide range of stakeholders.

This legislation authorizes the U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the first time since

it was created in 2002. Our rapidly evolving economy requires robust and adaptable trade enforcement, and I'm glad this legislation strengthens our Customs and Border Protection's ability to fulfill this duty. Without these tools in place we would not be able to meet the demands of our growing global economy. This legislation contains important provisions that will enhance and improve our customs procedures and duty laws. Our outdated customs and border policies would be improved by streamlining rules to stop importers from dodging U.S. antidumping and countervailing duties while adding new protections for intellectual property.

That being said, while leaders from across the globe were negotiating the largest climate agreement in history, Congress was debating a bill that intentionally bypassed our nation's ability to address climate change. This legislation provided an opportunity for us to strengthen our commitment to combatting climate change and to hold other nations accountable for their actions—but we let that opportunity slide. Congress cannot continue to pass the buck on this issue, and we should use agreements such as this to hold our trade partners to higher standards. That is why I voted against this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to address these issues. If we do not act now, we set a dangerous precedent for future agreements.

HONORING CHUCK SEEMAN FOR HIS LEADERSHIP AT UCFS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to thank Mr. Chuck Seeman, President and CEO of United Children and Family Services (UCFS) in Norwich, Connecticut for his 20 years of transformative leadership in eastern Connecticut. While Chuck has held command of UCFS, he has strengthened the organization's financial stability and has expanded services to make UCFS an exemplary community health organization serving the Norwich region and beyond.

This year, to celebrate National Health Center Week, UCFS displayed a flag on the Norwich town green for every client they have served in the past year. The green was covered with 17,000 flags—a visual reminder of the impact that this organization has on our community, and a testament to Chuck's leadership. That same day, I was pleased to announce that after years of hard work on the part of Chuck and his staff, UCFS had received ''federally qualified status'' that will allow them to expand and enhance the excellent medical, dental, behavioral, and eldercare services to their patients. This announcement was the culmination of nearly five years of advocacy, and will mean that UCFS will thrive and grow for decades to come.

As Chuck retires from his position as CEO this month, I can confidently say that his innovative leadership style, dedication, and drive have made a world of difference for families in eastern Connecticut. I am honored to have worked with Chuck to advocate for improved access to healthcare for our neighbors and I thank him for his steadfast commitment and vision.

Beyond his laudable contributions to his community's health and wellness, Chuck has been an approachable and friendly leader, beloved by the many hundreds of UCFS employees. Although I anticipate that Chuck will continue to contribute to his Connecticut community after leaving his current position, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him a restful retirement, and offering a big thank you for his decades of work advocating for community health in eastern Connecticut.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was unable to record my presence.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERNIE GLAVE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues MIKE HONDA and ANNA ESHOO to honor an important member of our community, Mr. Ernie Glave, who passed away on December 22, 2015. Ernie will be remembered for his dedication to San Jose as both a businessman and to the public, especially veterans.

Ernie proudly ran his downtown jewelry shop for over 30 years and was widely known for his exceptional work ethic. Even during the economic recession, while many stores fled to the suburbs or shut down completely, Ernie worked 6 days a week with remarkable enthusiasm and professionalism. He also took pride in downtown San Jose and was known as a leader in the Small Businessman's Association.

An Army World War II veteran, Ernie was also a passionate advocate for veterans. He worked hard to keep the San Jose Veterans Day Parade as one of the largest military pageants in the Western United States. Dedicated to the United Veterans Council, Ernie often spoke at local veterans events and commended their unbreakable bond and commitment to country. When we commemorate Memorial Day at Oak Hill Memorial Park every year, Ernie was always there, always working, always caring.

Today, we honor the life of Ernie Glave. Ernie's commitment to his country and community can only be matched with the strength of his hallmark vise grip. We thank him for his contributions to San Jose and join his loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

IN HONOR OF THE LEGACY OF LATE HARRIS COUNTY COMMISSIONER EL FRANCO LEE

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor the memory of a noble public servant and trailblazer: Harris County Commissioner El Franco Lee. Elected in 1985, after serving in the Texas House of Representatives for five years, Commissioner Lee became the first African American to sit on the Harris County Commissioners Court. He selflessly served Harris County's Precinct 1 for more than a quarter-century with exceptional distinction.

Commissioner Lee was not just a holder of public trust but a pioneer and community leader. He used his compassion and experience to boldly advocate for his constituents and the betterment of his community. Commissioner Lee will be specifically remembered for his impassioned advocacy for better healthcare access and educational opportunities throughout the inner city, as well as his support for the Harris County Precinct One Street Olympics Program.

Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate enough to say that I knew and worked alongside Commissioner Lee. I believe that when history records the legacy of Commissioner Lee, he will be forever remembered for his caring and candid demeanor as he worked to serve his constituents, his county, as well as his country.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON DEFEATS FLORIDA STATE AND WINS THE PEACH BOWL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I spoke on the House floor about the brilliant season the Houston Cougars and their coach, Tom Herman, experienced this year. In that speech I mentioned how the Cougars had a huge fight coming up on New Year's Eve against the traditional blue-blood, powerhouse Florida State Seminoles. Well, December 31st and 2015 have come and gone, and the Houston Cougars finished the year 13–1 with a 38–24 victory over the Seminoles in the Peach Bowl.

Coach Tom Herman may be known as an offensive innovator, but this team fought hard on both sides of the ball. The Cougars' fast-moving and hard-hitting defense rattled Florida State's offense, while their quick-paced and prolific offense sped past the Seminoles' defense. Folks, this game was one for the ages and solidified this season as one of the greatest in Cougar history. There can't be enough said about the resiliency and fight this team showed all year. I'm proud to call myself an alumnus and a Houston Cougar for life.

The Houston Cougars woke up for the first time in 2016 as Peach Bowl champions and proved to the doubters that they could play with anybody in the country. 2015 started in uncertainty for the program: they were breaking in a new coach, a new system, and in their

second year of a new football stadium. But as 2016 gets rolling, the only uncertainty for the Cougars now is where to place all the trophies they collected this year.

And that's just the way it is.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 7, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine defense health care reform.

SD–G50

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Robert McKinnon Califf, of South Carolina, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD–430

JANUARY 20

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Task Force for Business and Stability Operations projects in Afghanistan.

SR–232A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 2 p.m., on Monday, January 11, 2016.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4321–4339 were introduced. **Pages H100–01**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H102–03**

Reports Filed: A report was filed on January 5, 2016 as follows:

H.R. 2347, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–386, Part 1).

Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 581, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation (H. Rept. 114–389); and

H.R. 451, to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–390). **Page H100**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Costello (PA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H17**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:56 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H24**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H24, H67**

Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015: The House agreed to the Tom Price (GA) motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 6. **Pages H52–67**

H. Res. 579, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3762) by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 3, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 175 nays, Roll No. 2. **Pages H37–51**

SCRUB Act of 2015: The House began consideration of H.R. 1155, to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, January 7th. **Pages H67–87**

Agreed to:

Foxx amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that adds consideration of unfunded mandates to the Commission's review of rules; **Pages H76–77**

Schweikert amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that adds a new subsection (I) under 101(h)(2) requiring the commission to consider rules that are limiting or prohibiting government agencies from adopting technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness; and **Pages H77–78**

Walberg amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that directs the Commission to highlight the role regulations have on wage stagnation and income inequality by examining the negative impact of regulations on wages, including wages for minimum wage and part-time workers. **Page H78**

Rejected:

Cummings amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to strike Title IV of the bill. **Pages H79–80**

Withdrawn:

Murphy (FL) amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have established an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes. **Pages H85–87**

Proceedings Postponed:

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to strike title II of the bill, eliminating the legislation's regulatory ''cut-go'' process, which requires that agencies eliminate rules identified by the Regulatory Retrospective Review Commission prior to issuing a new rule; **Pages H78–79**

Cummings amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to exempt independent establishments from the requirements of the bill; **Pages H80–81**

Cicilline amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to exempt rules made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the additional provisions of the legislation; **Pages H81–82**

DelBene amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to create an exemption from regulatory ''cut-go'' requirements in the case of an emergency; **Pages H82–83**

Cicilline amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to provide that the term ''rule'' has the meaning given in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except for a special rule as made by the Secretary of Homeland Security; and **Pages H83–84**

Pocan amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that seeks to exempt from the bill rules put forth by the FDA for the purposes of consumer safety. **Pages H84–85**

H. Res. 580, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 712) and (H.R. 1155) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 176 noes, Roll No. 5, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 4. **Pages H51–52**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H50, H50–51, H51–52, H52, H66–67. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ARMY FEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM: PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''Army Fee Assistance Program: Part II''. Testimony was heard from Carol Fortine Ochoa, Inspector General, General Services Administration; Gerard Badorrek, Chief Financial Officer, General Services Administration; Stephanie L. Hoehne, Director of Family and Morale, Welfare and Recreation, G9, Installation Management Command, U.S. Army; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Rules: Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process held a hearing on H.R. 1610, the ''Biennial Budgeting and Enhanced Oversight Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cole, Price of North Carolina, McClintock, Schrader, and Ribble.

FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015''. The committee, by record vote of 8–4, granted a structured rule for H.R. 1927. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–38 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In the section 2, the rule provides that a vote on any motion relating to the disposition of the veto message for H.R. 3762 may be postponed through January 25, 2016, as though under clause 8 of rule XX. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte, and

Representatives Cohen, Johnson of Georgia, and Fitzpatrick.

ATTENTION NEEDED: MISMANAGEMENT AT THE SBA—THE GAO FINDINGS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Attention Needed: Mismanagement at the SBA—The GAO Findings''. Testimony was heard from William B. Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Acquisition Reform: Experimentation and Agility'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1797, the ''End Neglected Tropical Diseases Act''; H.R. 3662, the ''Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act''; and the ''Counterterrorism Screening and Assistance Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act: Examining Remaining Challenges'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Document Production Status Update'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Attention Needed: Mismanagement at the SBA—The Administrator Responds'', 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting to consider Member access request, 9 a.m., HVC–304.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, January 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, January 7

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 712—Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule). Complete consideration of H.R. 1155—SCRUB Act of 2015.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Carney, John C., Jr., E11
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E11
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E12
Green, Al, Tex., E12
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E12
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E11
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E12
Poe, Ted, Tex., E12
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E10
Ryan, Paul D., Wisc., E9, E9
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E10
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E9
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E11
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E10

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.