



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

No. 25

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BARRY LOUDERMILK 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.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DOUG RICHARDSON

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a gentleman who has dedicated his life to serving our Nation, a true American hero from the State of Florida, Mr. Doug Richardson. Mr. Richardson is retiring from the United States Special Operations Command after 50 years of government service.

Mr. Richardson currently serves as a defense intelligence senior leader and as the program executive officer for

Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Exploitation at USSOCOM. A West Point graduate, Mr. Richardson distinguished himself throughout his military career, retiring as a colonel from Active Duty in the United States Army in 1993 and then continuing his service to USSOCOM as a civilian.

Perhaps the best example of Doug's integrity and courage is recorded in his Silver Star Medal citation, which was awarded to Doug for his heroism in combat during the Vietnam war. On June 18, 1969, while serving as an adviser with the 4th Cavalry Regiment of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam, then-Captain Richardson accompanied a small armored infantry team moving to break through a very determined enemy force to rescue the crewmen of a downed United States Army helicopter. As the unit approached the village, it came under intense rocket-propelled grenade and automatic weapons fire from very well-concealed positions. The area was also known to be heavily mined and set with traps.

As the attempts of the Vietnamese to reach the helicopter were continually repulsed by enemy counterattacks, Captain Richardson dismounted his track, rallied a small force of Vietnamese soldiers, and then led them to the helicopter through enemy fire, exhorting his comrades to vigorously engage the enemy. Disregarding his personal safety and armed with only a pistol, Captain Richardson led his men through the mined area and into an assault on the enemy positions.

Following his example, the soldiers, though at a tactical disadvantage, pressed the attack vigorously and ultimately broke the resistance and secured the helicopter. Despite a hail of small-arms fire and hand grenades directed at his position, Doug continued his search for the survivors until he had found the remains of all U.S. crewmembers and then remained to extract the bodies of his fallen comrades from

the wreckage. As a result of Captain Richardson's valiant display of battlefield courage, the Vietnamese force was able to hold the area from a tenacious enemy and return the fallen soldiers to allied control.

Mr. Speaker, USSOCOM will miss Doug Richardson's leadership. As a Nation, let us recognize his valiant service. I ask that this body join me in honoring and congratulating Mr. Doug Richardson on a most honorable and truly heroic career.

FREE PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I come with a humble message from the Puerto Rican people to the House of Representatives: Free Puerto Rico.

Free Puerto Rico so that she can solve the problem of her crushing debt without being handcuffed by Congress. Free Puerto Rico so that her hospitals can stay open for sick moms and dads and her schools stay open for children. Nobody should fear that their house will burn down because the firemen have not been paid.

So far the response to Puerto Rico's debt crisis from Washington—the only place that Puerto Rico is forced to rely on—has been very little, and greedy bondholders and hedge fund managers only care about Puerto Rico as a wager, a way to make money whether Puerto Rico sinks or swims.

Right now, Puerto Rico needs serious, sustained attention from Washington to find a path forward such that Puerto Rico is neither absolved of her obligations nor mortally wounded by them. Mr. Speaker, here is what it comes down to: when the U.S. Supreme Court said that Puerto Rico belongs to but is not a part of the United States, the responsibility to care for her and her people came along with that judgment.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H713

Congress must act responsibly for the fact that we expect Puerto Rico to pay its obligation, but we force her to play by a particular set of rules. Puerto Rico cannot declare bankruptcy because Congress passed a law saying that she could not. Puerto Rico is under the choke hold of the Jones Act, a law passed right here in this room, without any consultation with the Puerto Rican people, that says, by law, Puerto Rico cannot shop around for the best deal on shipping. No. They must buy the most expensive, which means double the import costs and an estimated \$500 million extra on Puerto Rico's food bill alone.

When it comes to producing for themselves, a large chunk of the best agricultural land—the land that sustains and feeds a nation—is taken away from them for U.S. military bases. Thirteen percent of the land is gone.

Puerto Rico is a tropical island, but a lot of its fruit and vegetables and almost all of its food is imported. We must allow Puerto Rico to create an agricultural economy, allowing Puerto Ricans to feed themselves. The economy produces goods the people do not consume, and the people consume goods that they do not produce.

Even when the U.S. is caught re-handed stealing water from Puerto Rico's freshwater supply—not paying a dime for it—what happens? The U.S. Government is not held responsible or made to pay. When the military bombs and pollutes Vieques and Culebra, does the U.S. Government feel any obligation to restore it? Not really.

So, Mr. Speaker, when Congress talks about Puerto Rico's debt, I say we look at the totality of the debt—the part owed to Puerto Rico, not just the part Puerto Rico owes to Wall Street. Every soldier she has sent to war, every time the U.S. has stepped in to override her courts and her government, these debts add up but are not accounted for.

Now, what is the solution that everyone in Washington is lining up behind? A Federal control board. Imagine that. An island that cannot determine its own destiny. It has to play an economic game with a stacked deck and all the rules rigged against her. What is the solution in Washington? Take away what little autonomy they have left.

If Congress were smart, we would find a way to get out of the way. Free Puerto Rico's people to unleash their inherent, hardworking character, spirit, and dedication. Free Puerto Ricans to work and toil and build and create. Free Puerto Rico so that she can build a sustainable economy that keeps her people at home in the land of their birth and their heritage.

We cannot get sidetracked by seeing Puerto Rico's economic health exclusively through the lens of food stamps, Medicaid, government programs, and further dependency on Washington. We must make the conversation about jobs for Puerto Ricans, jobs that build the economy, the tax base, and the self-sufficiency of the island.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico's problems were a long time in the making, but I have utter confidence in Puerto Ricans' ability to solve them if we in the Congress begin to listen to them, work with them, and recognize them as equal partners.

We must free Puerto Rico so that the Puerto Rican people can free themselves.

KURDISH PESHMERGA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important efforts made by the Kurds and the Peshmerga in the fight against ISIS.

Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said last December: “The Kurdish Peshmerga have been exactly what we have been looking for in this whole fight in Iraq and Syria, namely a capable and motivated force that we can enable.”

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we need to do more to combat ISIS on the ground and also to help our allies who are willing to join us in this effort. ISIS is a brutal evil, and it is one of the greatest threats to both our national security and to the security of our allies in the region.

We continue to read reports of ISIS raping women, beheading captives, and brutally torturing their prisoners; and ISIS' alleged use of chemical weapons against the Kurds in Iraq and Syria reaffirms the danger posed by this terrorist group. During the conflict against ISIS, the Kurds tell me that at least 1,600 Peshmerga forces have died and thousands more have been wounded, and we see some of these pictures here on this graphic.

We are thankful to all of the members of the Peshmerga who are fighting to eradicate the evil of ISIS, including several all-women units who are proud to fight for their people's freedom. These are the hardships that they all endure.

Unfortunately, the Peshmerga still don't have the proper weapons, the proper equipment—most of which is over 30 years old—and they are still running low on ammunition. In fact, the Peshmerga are using captured ISIS tanks to roll through minefields, while ISIS is using American equipment that they have picked up after overturning Mosul.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation introduced by the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which would authorize the direct provision of weapons to the Peshmerga, a bill which our committee passed unanimously in December.

The Peshmerga have already proven to be one of the most capable forces on the battlefield, and making sure that they are strong, making sure that they are well-equipped is crucial to defeat-

ing the ISIS threat that confronts us all. The Peshmerga are continuing to fight despite not being paid for months, with uncertain logistical backup, and with inadequate weapons and equipment—three strikes against them.

The Peshmerga need our help, and we must get them what they need in order to have them continue to be successful. The Peshmerga provides safe havens for Muslims, Christians, Yazidis, and people of any religious minority who have been oppressed. According to the Kurds, about 300,000 Syrian refugees and 1.5 million internally displaced persons are in the Kurdistan region, where there is a growing humanitarian crisis.

I will turn to the other poster that I have, Mr. Speaker, their fighting forces.

The burden of war and the responsibility of caring for 1.8 million additional people have pushed the Kurdistan region's economy to the brink of collapse. My friend, Igor Pasternak, recently briefed me on his visit to the Black Tiger Peshmerga base south of Mosul on the ISIS front line, and he introduced me to the Kurdistan Regional Government's representative to the U.S., Bayan Sami Abdul Rahman.

Ms. Rahman's parents were sentenced to death by Saddam Hussein because they refused to bow down to his tyranny, and instead they fought for Kurdish liberation and for human rights. Her parents lived to see Saddam's downfall, and her father continued his leadership role in the Kurdish region's struggle before being tragically assassinated by Islamic extremists in 2004.

In the Iraq city of Erbil, Sami Abdul Rahman Park honors Ms. Rahman's father and, more importantly, recognizes the immense oppression suffered by the Kurdish people.

I am pleased that KRG Representative Rahman is in the gallery today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to announce that I will soon be introducing a resolution to honor the brave men and women of the Peshmerga and their families who are fighting bravely against the brutal evil of ISIS and to stand with the Kurdish people as they continue to endure great hardships during this war.

God bless each and every one of them.

□ 1015

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, since 1970, more Americans have been killed from domestic gun violence than all the Americans killed in every war going back to the American Revolution.

If all the victims of gun violence since 1970 were put on a wall like the Vietnam Memorial, it would contain

1.5 million names and stretch 2½ miles, 25 times the length of the Vietnam Memorial.

I have had enough of Congress' failure to lead. So each month that we are in session, I am going to speak the name of every person killed in a mass shooting in this country. I will also create my own memorial wall in the hallway outside my office.

Here are the stories of some of the victims of the 18 mass shootings in January of this year. There have been so many people last month affected by mass shootings that I don't have the time to list those who were injured, just those who were murdered.

David Washington, age 24, Eneida Branch, age 31, and Angelica Guadalupe Castro, age 23, who were shot and killed in a house on January 6 in Lakeland, Florida.

Antoine Bell, age 17, was shot and killed while helping a woman with car trouble on January 7 in Memphis, Tennessee.

Raymon Blount, age 29, was shot and killed while standing on the street on January 8 in Chicago, Illinois.

Ira Brown, age 20, was shot and killed on January 11 during a home robbery in Wilmington, Delaware.

Joshua Steven Morrison, age 18, was killed near a house party January 17 in Gloucester County, Virginia.

Randy Peterson, age 64, was a bank president shot and killed during a robbery on January 21 in Eufaula, Oklahoma.

Kevin McGrath, Sr., age 47, and Shanna McGrath, age 42, were killed at their family home on January 23 in Crestview, Florida. Elbert L. Merrick, age 22, was killed outside the home on the road.

Jason and Jacob McLemore, a father and son, age 44 and 17, were killed at the gun store they owned in a dispute over a \$25 service fee. This was on January 23 in Pearl River County, Mississippi.

Cyjia Nicole Bell, age 16, Shujaa Jasiri Silver, age 19, were killed outside a liquor store on January 23 in Los Angeles, California.

An unidentified man was killed at a Mexican restaurant on January 25 in Perris, California.

James Quoc Tran, age 33, and Jeanine L. Zapata, age 45, were killed at a homeless encampment on January 26 in Seattle, Washington.

The Dooley family, including mother Lori, father Todd, son Landon, daughter Brooke, and grandmother Doris, were killed at their family home on January 27 in Chesapeake, Virginia. The shooter, their son, Cameron Dooley, committed suicide after murdering the family.

Andre Gray, age 42, and Tina Gray, age 42, were killed at their family home on January 29 in Caroline County, Virginia.

Sean Marquez, age 19, Jose Aguirre-Martinez, age 19, and Yovani Flores, age 16, were killed at a house party on January 30 in Glendale, Arizona. Sean Marquez died in his sister's arms.

Victor Mendoza, age 46, was shot and killed at a motorcycle show in Denver, Colorado, on January 30.

May the dead rest in peace and the wounded recover completely. It is time. It is time for Congress to end this bloodshed.

APRIL BROOKS' STORY

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the war on coal touches nearly every family in southern West Virginia. President Obama and his EPA regulations don't just close mines. They put families out of work.

Coal miners call it job scare. Every time miners go underground, they don't know, when they come up, if they will receive a WARN notice telling them that they are going to be laid off. Families worry about making ends meet or moving to find work someplace else.

Businesses that depend on coal are suffering, too. CSX recently announced it is closing its Huntington division and moving its jobs to another State, in part because of the decline in coal shipments. Norfolk Southern in Bluefield is also moving jobs out of Bluefield, West Virginia.

Shops and restaurants are closing their doors, as families leave town and have less disposable income. Walmart in McDowell County has recently shut its doors, and the residents in the area have to drive to another State just to get groceries. The uncertainty can be paralyzing.

This is reality for so many of my constituents like April Brooks of Princeton in Mercer County. April writes me:

"My husband has worked in the mining industry for the last eleven years, and my dad was a coal miner for over thirty years.

"Like every family that depends on coal for a living, we live day to day worrying about what will happen tomorrow. You can't plan for the future because of the uncertainty.

"I went back to work several years ago so that we would have supplemental income in case of layoffs. We love our State, but how does one stay here and survive if the jobs aren't there?"

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's job-killing overregulations are having real consequences for real West Virginians. We need to pass policies that create jobs and ensure a future for all West Virginians, all West Virginia families, so they can stay and work and live in our great State.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of EPA's Clean Power Plan.

I am concerned that the Supreme Court ruling on the Clean Power Plan will significantly and unnecessarily delay the full implementation of this important action.

The longer we wait, the more expensive it will be to reduce greenhouse gas pollution and the less chance that we have to keep this world's warming below a safe threshold.

This week's Supreme Court decision only highlights Congress' inaction on the issue of climate change as well as the immediate and pressing need for action.

A damaged climate has a negative impact upon our Nation and on my southern California community. Changing weather patterns, more frequent droughts, worsening air quality, and sea level rise all cost us money and threaten the well-being of our families and our neighbors.

We all want the world to be safe, to be a healthy place to raise our families and to grow our economy. Now America has the opportunity to lead the world in making our environment safe and healthy, both now and into the future.

We can do this by increasing our use of local, renewable energy sources, investing in research and development to bring about the next generation of clean and efficient energy systems, and assisting communities both here and abroad in adapting to the inevitable changes that have already been done to the climate.

Reducing emissions from our power sector is a foundational action in this endeavor. This is an achievable endeavor.

America's innovation has given us spaceflight, the Internet, cures to disease once thought to be incurable. Our innovation and our leadership is paving the way for a cleaner, safer world, and many States have already determined how they can meet their goals and reduce carbon pollution.

Cities and electric utilities in my district have taken the extraordinary steps in increasing efficiency and sustainable practices to reduce their carbon footprint.

My State of California is on track to exceed its carbon pollution reduction goals under the Clean Power Plan. California implemented the first statewide carbon trading system and has set ambitious targets for increasing renewable energy, increased efficiency, and decreased petroleum usage.

America's leadership like this will save us money and create jobs, but if we delay, the costs will be higher to us and especially to our children and grandchildren.

We are not doing this alone. Because greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide spread around the world, no country is immune to the damaged climate. No country can fix this problem alone.

Representatives of over 200 nations recently gathered in Paris and agreed on an international agreement to lower greenhouse gas emissions and develop strategies to adapt to changing climate.

This contribution from the world's biggest polluters, including China and India, represents 90 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions.

These international contributions demonstrate how seriously the world is taking its moral responsibility to care for our common home, our families, and our neighbors.

This roadmap for the world reduces climate-damaging greenhouse gas emissions, increases investments in clean energy development and deployment, and assists the most vulnerable communities in adapting to climate change.

But the United States has to do its part. This pause on the Clean Power Plan slows down the progress we have been making and puts U.S. leadership on climate in question.

I am deeply troubled by the Supreme Court's decision, but I am optimistic that the Clean Power Plan will ultimately be upheld.

By acting to reduce carbon pollution, we will create more opportunity today and a better future tomorrow for all of us.

IN RECOGNITION OF ADMIRAL ROBERT SHUMAKER ON THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF HIS IMPRISONMENT DURING THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today, February 11, a day that for at least me, and I know many other families around our country, is a very dark day.

February 11, 1965, flying off of the USS *Coral Sea*, a young lieutenant commander, Robert Harper Shumaker, was prepared to do a bombing run over North Vietnam.

Taking anti-aircraft fire, he was shot down over North Vietnam. He ejected from his F-8 Crusader 35 feet above the ground, broke his back upon impact, and was immediately captured.

Over the next 8 years, 8 years and a day, he spent time in the Hoa Lo Prison, a prison that we now know as the Hanoi Hilton, one that he was able to name the Hanoi Hilton.

He was considered to be the great communicator because, while he was in captivity, he and a few others devised a tap code system, a tap code system with five rows and five columns that enabled American POWs to communicate with one another to be able to let them know that they were thinking of each other, to be able to make sure that they were exercising the most important muscle in captivity, that is, their brains.

Over the course of those 8 years, Lieutenant Commander Shumaker was

considered to be one of the top greatest threats to camp security.

He and 10 other POWs, commonly known as the Alcatraz 11, were taken out of the Hoa Lo Prison, brought over to a prison now known as Alcatraz, and put in solitary confinement.

These 11 heroes included James Stockdale; George Coker; Jeremiah Denton, who was a Senator from the great State of Alabama; Harry Jenkins; George McKnight; James Mulligan; Howard Rutledge; Ron Storz; Nels Tanner; and, Mr. Speaker, our colleague SAM JOHNSON of Texas, who was elected to this body in 1991 and has served with distinction ever since.

□ 1030

Many of the stories that we look back on came from these heroes about the efforts they made to resist their captors. They were tortured day in and day out for information. Yet, day in and day out, they battled back.

For me, it is very important that we never forget. Fifty-one years after February 11, 1965, I am honored to be able to rise in this body to remember Robert Harper Shumaker for his valiant efforts and heroism. He is near and dear to my heart, Mr. Speaker. He is my uncle. When my wife and I had our first child, we decided we would name her after him, in the hopes that she would have a little bit of the courage, a little bit of the intelligence, and the stick-to-itiveness that Admiral Shumaker has.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, is that February 12, 1973, 591 POWs started their return home. Bob Shumaker, the Alcatraz 11, and many others were on that C-141 that flew out of Hanoi. I am proud to say that they returned home with honor, which was absolutely critical not only for them, but for all of the POWs. It is imperative that we in the United States Congress never forget their sacrifice and heroism.

For me, from now, until as long as I am able to serve in this body, on February 11, I will rise and recognize the heroism of our POWs and say: You will never be forgotten. We will always remember the sacrifice and the heroism that you all have given to our Nation.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, from the moment I arrived in Congress, I have been working to rebuild and renew America. Our great country, sadly, is falling apart as it falls behind the rest of the world. The American Society of Civil Engineers rates our infrastructure as failing.

I have worked to develop a plan, a vision for infrastructure for this century because people have forgotten our history and are woefully uninformed about the nature of the challenge we face and the opportunities to do it right.

This doesn't need to be a partisan fight in Congress. Indeed, infrastructure used to be much more central to our mission in Congress, dating back to the postal roads mandated by the Constitution to President Eisenhower's interstate freeway system.

I welcome the administration's proposal for an oil fee to invest in green infrastructure. I truly believe that President Obama is committed to investing in infrastructure. He understands its value, and he has worked to include some infrastructure investment in the Recovery Act. I think we all know that it actually should have been much larger than it was; but, nonetheless, was very helpful.

The President has proposed things Congress after Congress that would fund a grander vision. Unfortunately, in the context of this Congress, they were not realistic. They had no chance of passing, probably regardless of who has control, given the nature of those proposals.

Nonetheless, I welcome the administration's proposal for a \$10 per barrel fee on oil to finance green infrastructure because of the timing at this point of incredibly low gas prices, flirting with \$1 a gallon, high oil production, a swollen inventory. Thirty dollars per barrel has become the benchmark.

Unfortunately, the new proposal was launched, as near as I can tell, without consultation with people in either party or the organizations that deal with infrastructure. It was not met with organized support on behalf of the vast array of individuals and organizations who are deeply committed to rebuilding and renewing America. It simply begs the question: Why not just raise the gas tax?

The proposal I have introduced to raise the gas tax was widely supported by business, labor, professions, local government, environmentalists; indeed, it was supported by the widest collection of interest groups supporting any major initiative before Congress. When you get the truckers and AAA both saying, "Raise taxes on motorists and truck drivers," that is a signal.

The proposal does not have the gaps associated with an oil fee that would impose challenges on consumers of oil, like school buses or home heating, and it does provoke the petroleum industry, which has accepted reasonable gas taxes, but would oppose an oil fee.

This is, however, an opportunity for us to revisit the need for investment in infrastructure, now that the administration has signaled its comfort with raising taxes on people who make under \$250,000 a year. The oil fee would be the equivalent of 20 to 25 cents a gallon—far more than the model proposal I had to phase in a 15-cent per gallon increase over 3 years.

Maybe we can reengage the conversation about raising the gas tax. After 24 years, we might follow the lead of President Reagan, who led an effort to raise the gas tax in 1983. After we raise the gas tax, we should index it and

then abolish it and replace it with a more sustainable mechanism for funding transportation in the future.

I appreciate the administration starting this conversation related to infrastructure finance. Maybe we can have a broader effort to work cooperatively on an issue that is gaining traction at the State level around the country. Over a dozen States have raised their gas tax, including a number of red Republican States.

This will be something that meets the needs of America now—and in the future—and I hope it is time for us to refocus on it.

PROPOSED CRUDE OIL FEE

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year, we are starting to work on budgets in Washington, D.C.

The President recently proposed his eighth budget. If we want to give credit to the President, he is consistent. He believes that we are just one tax increase, one regulation, one more government program away from prosperity in America. But the reality is, Americans in my district are struggling. They are struggling to be able to maintain the jobs they have. Far too many Americans are struggling to be able to find a job.

One area where we have had an opportunity to be able to provide good-paying jobs has been in responsible energy development in this country. Today, I would like to be able to speak to some of the deeply flawed logic by the Obama administration in trying to eliminate the use of fossil fuels in America.

Mr. Speaker, over the last year and a half, despite the administration's best attempts to stifle production, one of the few areas of the economy that has provided some financial relief to the poor and middle class has been the low price of energy. The cause of this has been the result of American productivity and American ingenuity driving down the costs, making it more affordable for people.

It is a surprise to no one then that, with his latest budget proposal, the President is trying in earnest to take the little savings Americans have welcomed into their wallets and now feed it back to Big Government.

Effectively, what the President is stating is that government—Washington—needs those resources more than the American people do.

Two days ago, the President presented a budget that included a \$10 per barrel tax on crude oil. His budget stated that if tax would result in \$319 billion in revenues that would be used to fund transportation infrastructure, “reduce America’s reliance on oil,” and ensure “electric cars and other alternatives to oil-based vehicles have the technology and charging infrastructure they need.”

I believe we need to be clear. I firmly back the notion that we need to have an all-of-the-above strategy. That is highlighted in the bill I have introduced in this Congress, Planning for American Energy Act, which literally calls for all of the above. It explicitly states as such.

Those resources and technologies are only part of what should be a multi-pronged strategy. If true energy independence is our goal, we cannot simply price ourselves out of using traditional energy resources and transportation fuels. Yet, that is unmistakably exactly what the President is proposing.

So, while cheap energy is one of the few things keeping the economy out of a nose dive into a further deep recession, the President proposes a tax cut on crude oil—whether produced domestically or abroad—that will cut directly into already low revenues, and will undoubtedly be passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices at the pump.

An additional \$10 per barrel will be a significant sum, even with a healthy commodity price, but on the day that the President submitted his proposal, the spot price for a barrel of oil was just under \$30. Given that our oil and gas energy sector is already struggling mightily with this downswing in price, what exactly does the President hope to accomplish by wresting away a third of that sum? The economic impacts of this policy on an industry that is already struggling would be extremely harmful.

Now, I assume that when we envision who the industry is, the picture comes to mind of large, multinational corporations. Make no mistake: they, too, will feel the impacts. But the brunt of an ill-conceived policy, such as what the President has put forward, will fall squarely on the shoulders of small- and medium-sized companies that make up the backbone of our domestic oil and gas industry.

It will also fall squarely on the many contractors who work in those companies. They are geologists, engineers, construction companies, well servicing companies, and the hospitality industry. They are the many hardworking Americans working to provide for their families and working to provide the rest of us with an invaluable resource that we too often take for granted.

The President wishes to move us away from oil as a transportation fuel, so he pursues a purely ideological strategy to force it, never mind who is trampled in the process.

The President wishes, instead, to pursue electric vehicle sales, which, in 2015, accounted for less than 1 percent of the total car sales in the country. Yet, he takes measures to halt coal leasing and bludgeon coal-fired power plants into nonexistence. Coal, of course, is the single largest source of electricity in the United States.

These two incoherent policy pursuits are a perfect demonstration of the complete lack of vision this adminis-

tration has when it comes to achieving actual energy independence.

Let’s stand up for the American consumer and American jobs and reject the President’s budget proposals.

RECOGNIZING ABIT MASSEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Abit Massey.

Last week, Mr. Massey was awarded one of the highest honors that anyone can receive from the University of Georgia. On January 27, Mr. Massey was awarded the University of Georgia President’s Medal for extraordinary contributions to students in academic programs, the advancement of research, and for inspiring community leaders to enhance Georgians’ quality of life.

Mr. Massey graduated from the University of Georgia in 1949, and received his Juris Doctorate from Emory University. For almost 50 years, he was executive director of the Georgia Poultry Federation, known to many as the dean of the poultry industry. Before joining the Georgia Poultry Federation, he was head of the Georgia Department of Commerce, where he created the first Welcome Center in Georgia. He has received numerous awards for his service to the State of Georgia.

But Mr. Massey would argue that his greatest accomplishment would be his family. Mr. Massey, along with his wife, Kayanne, who was a former Miss Georgia, have more than 18 family members who attended the University of Georgia, and the Massey family was named the University of Georgia Alumni Association Family of the Year in 2014.

I commend Mr. Massey for his commitment to Georgia, and I congratulate him for receiving this distinguished award.

RECOGNIZING MS. FRANKIE QUIMBY AND THE ASSOCIATION FOR CULTURAL EQUITY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Frankie Quimby and the Association for Cultural Equity.

Ms. Quimby, the oldest of 13 children, was born and raised on the Georgia Sea Islands and descended from slaves of the Hopeton and Altama Plantations in Glynn County. She, along with her family, make up the Georgia Sea Island Singers, who have continued to preserve the rich traditions of African American culture, customs, and the songs of the Gullah language. In fact, the Quimby family is one of only a few families who can trace their ancestry back to a specific spot in Africa on the Niger River.

□ 1045

In fact, the Quimby family is one of only a few families who can trace their ancestry back to a specific spot in Africa on the Niger River.

Along with the Association for Cultural Equity, whose mission is to facilitate cultural equity through preservation, publication, and repatriation of music, dance, and spoken word, the Quimby family has been able to continue to preserve the rich heritage of their African American culture throughout the Georgia Sea Islands because people living in the area have been able to retain pure versions of games and songs brought over from Africa centuries ago.

I commend Ms. Frankie Quimby, the Quimby family, and the Association for Cultural Equity for preserving this rich history of Georgia's heritage.

STEPHEN ELMO WEEKS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Stephen Elmo Weeks, who passed away on January 17, 2016.

Born on December 6, 1919, Elmo, as his friends called him, graduated from Savannah High School in 1940. Upon graduation, Elmo attended the Georgia Institute of Technology before heading off to war in 1942, where he was stationed at a German POW camp in Opelika, Alabama.

Upon his return to Savannah, he joined the family business, Fox & Weeks funeral home, and soon became actively involved as a founding board member for the Savannah Christian Preparatory School.

Mr. Weeks was actively engaged with numerous organizations in the Savannah area, including the Savannah Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Kiwanis Club, and his church and my church, Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church.

He was also a man who recognized and enjoyed the great outdoors. As an avid boater, he spent a significant amount of time on the water, teaching his children, his grandchildren, and his great-grandchildren about life's lessons.

Whether it was having lunch at the Oglethorpe Club with his close friends or his continued involvement with the funeral home into his late eighties, Elmo was a committed and devoted man who always put his friends and family first.

Elmo, your love and service to your family and community will be missed.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JIM MONAGHAN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Jim Monaghan and his dedication to Tybee Island, Georgia.

Born in New York City in 1927, Mr. Monaghan arrived in Savannah by sailboat in 1982 with his wife, Anne Merchant Monaghan. Soon after their arrival in Savannah, they moved to Tybee Island.

Over the years, Mr. Monaghan served Tybee Island with enthusiasm. He served on the Tybee Island City Council, volunteered at the Tybee light-house, and delivered stuffed animals to nursing home residents.

He was a board member and former president of the Tybee Island Repub-

lican Club. A true gentleman with an uplifting spirit and a warm smile, Mr. Monaghan rarely missed the club's dinner meetings, always enjoying the social atmosphere and meeting new guests.

Mr. Monaghan passed away last week at the age of 88. He is survived by his two children, Mr. James C. "Tripp" Monaghan III, and Mrs. Shane Sturm.

I am honored to celebrate the life, the generosity, and the character of Jim Monaghan. He will truly be missed.

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 48 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: God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You that we are a nation fashioned out of diverse peoples and cultures, brought forth on this continent in a way not unlike the ancient people of Israel. As out of a desert, You led our American ancestors to this promised land, where they declared their independence and constituted a new nation founded upon inalienable rights given to us by You, our Creator. Bless our Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, and bless the Members of this people's House. Renew in us Your Spirit that we may affirm our freedoms by actions proven beyond words.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the centennial of the Farm Credit System.

One hundred years ago, the Farm Credit System began its mission to provide American agriculture with a steady hand and dependability, which they needed to provide for our Nation.

Throughout its history, the Farm Credit System has helped our farmers through the Great Depression, the agriculture crisis of the 1980s, and even the market collapse of 2008.

This deep-rooted understanding of our Nation's complex agribusiness industry and the people who work tirelessly to send products to market is what makes the Farm Credit System so critical to our producers and their future success.

This dedication to my district in upstate New York and to American agriculture across this great Nation is why I am proud to stand on the House floor today and honor the Farm Credit System on its centennial.

WE MUST NOT WEAKEN AVIATION SAFETY STANDARDS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, in 2010 Congress passed landmark aviation safety legislation. The provisions of this law reflected the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board, which tragically were given urgency after the crash of Continental flight 3407 near Buffalo, New York.

The families of those who were lost in the crash turned their grief into purpose and led a relentless and heroic campaign to pass this law.

Years later—at this very moment, in fact—the families are across the street at a committee markup of the FAA authorization bill, amid rumors that regional airlines might encourage amendments to water down these safety reforms.

I want the families to know that they are not alone. The western New York congressional delegation will fight alongside them and against any attempt to weaken aviation safety standards.

Tomorrow marks the seventh anniversary of the crash. I call on this House not to forget it.

**THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
IGNORES FISCAL REALITIES**

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, President Obama released his budget for fiscal year 2017. Some might call this proposal a vision for the future of the country. Well, I am here to tell you the President's vision for America ignores our fiscal realities and the magnitude of the problems we face.

The national debt is nearly \$19 trillion. Our country is in the middle of a fiscal crisis driven by reckless borrowing and runaway government spending, and President Obama once again offers us a budget filled with untenable tax hikes that never balances.

Something has to change or the legacy we leave to our children and grandchildren will be a crushing debt burden and a weaker nation.

Washington has a moral obligation to the American people to present a responsible budget that reins in wasteful Federal overspending and guarantees accountability for the use of taxpayer dollars. House Republicans will continue to do all we can to make this vision a reality.

**IN RECOGNITION OF EVA HAMLIN
MILLER**

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today during Black History Month to recognize my mentor and friend, fellow artist and teacher, the late Eva Hamlin Miller.

Eva Miller dedicated her life to her art and her students, encouraging us to pursue our artistic goals. From the 1930s Harlem street scenes to stained glass windows in North Carolina, Mrs. Miller's artistic talents, range, and precision were phenomenal.

She was a pioneering voice for African American art, curating one of the first regional shows of African American art in the North Carolina Museum of Art in Raleigh and founding the African American Atelier with me 25 years ago, an art gallery focusing on African American art and artists located in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Eva Miller possessed an unwavering dedication to students, as a teacher at Tuskegee Institute, Bennett College, Winston-Salem State University, and North Carolina A&T.

Her legacy continues to live on, not only through her work but through the many students she taught and inspired.

**CAREER AND TECHNICAL
EDUCATION MONTH**

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today as co-

chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus to recognize February as National Career and Technical Education Month.

Career and technical education programs play a key role in closing our Nation's skill gap by preparing students of all ages for the 21st century workforce and jobs. That is why I was encouraged by the inclusion of career and technical education center provisions in the recently passed Every Student Succeeds Act.

Not only does the ESSA provide much-needed flexibility to States and local education agencies, it also encourages businesses to get involved with their local schools. More schools will be able to use Federal funds to provide academic credit for apprenticeships and strengthen their career counseling programs.

This was a result of bipartisan legislation I introduced with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my colleague and friend, aimed at informing school counselors of local labor market conditions so that they can best guide the decisionmaking process of their students.

It is my hope that this and other Federal education policies will provide support to schools, businesses, and community organizations in Pennsylvania's Fifth District and across the country as they work to prepare our students for the future.

I look forward to working toward improving and reauthorizing the Perkins Act for career and technical education training.

IN RECOGNITION OF CTE MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, as co-chairs of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), my good friend, in recognition of CTE Month.

Across the country, students are using CTE programs to seek out career pathways, hone 21st century skills, and find good jobs. Unfortunately, while demand has increased for CTE, Federal funding has been reduced from its high level in 2010 of \$1.3 billion.

It is time, Madam Speaker, that we reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act to deliver student-centered education that provides the right skills for successful careers. We have the opportunity to remake Perkins in a way that works for the new economy in the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to seize this chance.

As Rhode Island's Governor, Gina Raimondo, has put it aptly, it is time to invest in skills that matter and work that pays.

**RETURNING TO A FISCALLY
RESPONSIBLE NATION**

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the need to control our Nation's debt.

Due to a rapid and unsustainable expansion of the Federal Government, the Obama administration has racked up \$8 trillion in new debt, pushing the national debt to more than \$19 trillion. If we continue down this reckless path, the Congressional Budget Office projects a return to \$1 trillion annual deficits by 2022.

Today, the House of Representatives is working toward returning to a more fiscally responsible nation by voting on the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. This legislation will begin to restore fiscal discipline by requiring the U.S. Treasury Secretary to appear before Congress at least 21 days before hitting the debt ceiling to present the administration's plans to reduce the national debt.

While more work needs to be done, this legislation is one step closer to financial sanity and security.

I want to thank Representative MARCHANT for his hard work on this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

**THE NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY
STRATEGY**

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the national cybersecurity strategy included in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2017.

This is a solid framework that includes a 35 percent increase for cyber and a new high-level official focused solely on implementing a cyber strategy across the entire Federal Government.

Cyber hackers are costing American companies billions of dollars in intellectual property every year. Terrorists, like ISIS, organized criminals, and even state actors, such as Iran and North Korea, are honing their cyber skills, which could put our country at critical risk, including infrastructure shutdowns.

For years, I have advocated for a Cabinet-level cyber position with budget authority because the cyber threat is so severe. This new official should have real authority to drive change across the Federal Government.

We must also continue working on issues still unaddressed, such as the insider threat posed by people within the government. An example of that is Edward Snowden, who gave stolen American information to Russia and China.

This is especially critical in the wake of a data breach affecting more than 22 million current, former, and prospective Federal employees last June.

I urge my colleagues to support this priority.

CHILDREN'S BEREAVEMENT CENTER

(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 would like to commend the Children's Bereavement Center, an organization located in my congressional district that has been providing support and lifting spirits for so many south Florida families after facing a tragic loss.

Founded in 1999, the Children's Bereavement Center offers free peer support groups and serves as an outstanding resource for children, parents, and caregivers, providing them with the aid they so desperately need while experiencing the hardship of losing a loved one, a tragedy that some families may one day experience.

When dealing with loss, it is often the grieving children who are affected the most. This wonderful organization has made it its mission to assist students at Miami-Dade County public schools, having helped over 1,300 children just this past year alone.

I am so thankful for the noble endeavor that the Children's Bereavement Center has undertaken so that adults and children can find a way to find peace and move forward with their lives.

CALIFORNIA'S DEVASTATING DROUGHT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the current status of California's devastating drought.

I urge the California State and Federal agencies to maximize the pumping of water in the delta to the allowable legal limits.

As a result of State and Federal agencies' inability to operate at the most flexible range available under the Biological Opinions of the Endangered Species Act, over 44,000 acre-feet of water has been lost just this last week during these El Nino conditions, and over 131,000 acre-feet of water has been lost this year, water that could be used to grow crops and to feed people. This is morally wrong.

Congress must pass legislation to provide relief for the people of the San Joaquin Valley and California. Senator FEINSTEIN's introduction of water legislation is a critical step. I urge the Senate to pass her legislation so we can enter into negotiations with the House-passed bill, which I strongly support.

Time is of the essence. Every day of delay only results in further losses of the vital water that is necessary for the people of the valley and the people

of California. Californians need to use this water during these times of El Nino conditions.

I urge that we do the right thing.

□ 1215

LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with the President's budget request.

I am especially concerned about the President's proposal to cut the Littoral Combat Ship program. These ships are built, in part, by Austal USA in my home district.

I have seen these ships being built, I have talked to the Navy leadership, and I have visited with the sailors who are actually working on these vessels. They all support the LCS and the vital role it plays in the Navy's fleet. In fact, just last year, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus said: "We have a need, a demonstrated need, for 52 of these small surface combatants."

Cutting the LCS program, along with failing to include an additional Expeditionary Fast Transport ship, would be a tremendous mistake as it relates to maintaining the workforce base that we have worked so hard to build up along the Gulf Coast.

So I have a message for the 4,000 people who work at the Austal shipyard in Mobile: This proposal from a lameduck Secretary of Defense and a lameduck President will not stand.

I will fight every day to make sure that our Navy has the resources they want and need to protect our Nation and keep sea lanes open. The LCS is a critical part of that mission.

CONGRATULATING YOLANDA ADAMS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great enthusiasm to honor and salute Yolanda Adams, an enormous and wonderful talent of gospel music, and to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Yolanda Adams Morning Show.

Many know that I introduced legislation to make September Gospel Music Heritage Month in order to honor the many talented Americans who enjoy singing, writing, and providing inspiration through gospel music. Elvis Presley won his first Grammy with gospel music.

I remember young Yolanda Adams singing in a church in Houston, and the inspiration she gave even then. She was a young teacher who worked until she finally knew that her talent was worthy of presenting it to the American people.

Yolanda Adams rose to fame as one of gospel music's greats, making her

debut in 1988. I remember her song, "Just as I Am." Since then, Yolanda has been wowing gospel audiences. She has been before the President of the United States and all over the world, but yet she is a humble person.

Following her illustrious music career, she began the Yolanda Adams Morning Show. These shows often don't last, but her spirit has guided it forward. She connects with listeners, bringing them warm and inspirational messages. Her music and growth has been wonderful.

Mr. Speaker, Yolanda's co-hosts, Anthony Valary and Marcus D. Wiley, give love and camaraderie every morning. They make it not just a morning show, but a celebration of friends and family.

I am delighted to stand here today to call Yolanda Adams an American treasure. She is a native daughter of Houston, and someone who understands God's blessings, but is not selfish. She provides those blessings to others through her musical genius.

Congratulations to Yolanda Adams for 10 years of the Yolanda Adams Morning Show.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN JORDAN

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of Susan Jordan, the beloved principal of Amy Beverland Elementary School, who served the Lawrence, Indiana, community for 22 years as an educator.

In January, when a bus accidentally lost control, Principal Jordan put herself between her students and the bus, saving their lives and losing her own. I am extraordinarily moved by her heroic sacrifice and the incredible outpouring of love and support from her students, fellow teachers, and the greater Lawrence community.

Principal Jordan was known for her warmth and her passion for her students to achieve their very best. At the start of every school day, she stopped by each classroom to welcome and encourage her students. Under her leadership, Amy Beverland Elementary was named a Four Star School by the Indiana Department of Education, its designation for excellence.

On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I offer my deepest sympathy to Principal Jordan's family and friends, the students who were injured, the Lawrence Township community, and all Hoosiers who mourn her loss and cherish her memory.

REMEMBERING FLIGHT 3407

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today about Flight 3407 that

crashed in Buffalo, New York, 7 years ago tomorrow.

This plane crashed inside of the runway on an icy February night. We learned that the pilot and the copilot had never been trained at all on flying into an icy situation. The young woman who was the copilot had flown in the night before from Seattle. She was paid so little—around \$13,000 a year—that she could not afford a motel room to sleep, so she slept on the floor somewhere. On the black box, you could hear them yawning before the crash.

In that plane crash were two of the best musicians in the United States, a woman who knew more about Rwanda and its problems than anybody else, and one of the most extraordinary anthropologists in the world. They died because these pilots had no idea of how to fly in those conditions.

Colgan Air, their owner, was trying to take some responsibility.

We have worked with the families of the people who died on that plane. They have selflessly come down here for 7 years, and we have finally gotten some regulation through the FAA of how much training they had to have, that at least the pilot or the copilot had to have some hours of flying time behind them that would be of some use.

Now, we are facing an FAA bill here today, where they are trying to undo those safety regulations. It absolutely applies to every last one of us in the United States.

For goodness sake, I implore my colleagues not to let it happen, that those regulations would be weakened and, once more, we would be flying people who are living on subsistence wages, unable to really cope with the weather or the elements.

We deserve better than that in this century.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, the President submitted his final annual budget proposal to Congress this week. It was my hope that the President would have used this opportunity to progress an agenda that reflects our Nation's needs. Unfortunately, it seems to be exactly the opposite.

The President's proposed budget is supposed to serve as a blueprint for our Nation's prosperity. Sadly, his plan offers an unrealistic way forward. Currently, our national debt stands at over \$19 trillion. If the President got his way, that number would rise to \$27 trillion over the next decade.

The President has chosen to ignore the facts. If Americans have to balance their checkbooks and live within their means, so should the Federal Government. To pay for his spending, the President hopes to raise taxes and institute a \$10 per barrel levy on an already anemic oil industry.

I believe my constituents deserve better than that from the President, and we should work together to ensure certainty, not uncertainty, in today's challenging environment.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(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, we are a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws. When those two come into conflict, the responsibility for addressing it belongs in this body, the United States Congress.

We are a compassionate people. We need to unite families. We need to provide a pathway to citizenship. We need to make sure that companies in America have access to the talented employee pool that they need.

We are also a Nation of laws. We need to get serious about our border security. We need employment verification and real penalties for those who violate our laws.

It is past time for Congress to act on immigration reform. I renew my call for Congress to restore the rule of law and recognize that our Nation of immigrants must also be a moral Nation, leading the way for the next great generation of Americans to take their place alongside us as leaders of American industry, civil society, and even in this very body itself.

CRISIS AT OUR OWN BORDER

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, along with other members of the Border Caucus, I traveled to the lower Rio Grande Valley sector of the United States border.

Mr. Speaker, the flood of illegal immigrants across the southern border has proven to be a mounting American crisis, greatly impacting Texas families.

You simply cannot understand the magnitude of the problem in the lower Rio Grande Valley unless you see it for yourself. It is impossible to understand the characteristics of this ever-changing region and why it is so difficult to manage. That is why I make regular visits to the border.

President Obama missed an opportunity when he refused Governor Perry's request to come to the border while he was in Texas in July 2014. I would renew that call for our executive to come to the border.

The United States, as a Nation, has a sovereign right and responsibility to define and defend its borders. In order for this problem to be improved, the executive must travel to the border and have the will to make this a priority and get it done.

TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize February as Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

One in three teens will experience some form of abuse in a dating relationship. As a father of three young children, I recognize that this is not a partisan problem, but rather a violation of basic human rights that demands immediate action. I believe it is our collective responsibility as mentors, leaders, and even parents, to find a way to protect our youth and to prevent them from dating abuse.

While current Federal law prohibits someone from purchasing a handgun if they are convicted of abusing someone they live with, unfortunately, victims who have been abused by a current or former dating partner are not protected.

Abuse of a dating partner is unacceptable as domestic abuse, plain and simple, which is why I introduced the Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers Act with my good friend, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan effort.

In the meantime, we can make a difference by encouraging our schools, community-based organizations, parents, and teens to come together to combat teen dating violence.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

Mr. RYAN, Wisconsin
Mr. MCCARTHY, California
Ms. PELOSI, California

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time through the legislative day of February 12, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 757) to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2017, COMMON SENSE NUTRITION DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2016, THROUGH FEBRUARY 22, 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 611 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 611

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. 2017) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A. 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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. On any legislative day during the period from February 15, 2016, through February 22, 2016—

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

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, arti-

cle I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. The Committee on the Judiciary may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2016, file a report to accompany H.R. 3624.

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

□ 1230

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 611 provides for a rule to consider a commonsense, bipartisan piece of legislation that will fix a problem that was wholly created by the intransigence of the bureaucrats at the Food and Drug Administration. This important bill amends the difficultly drafted Affordable Care Act, which rigidly mandated that food establishments provide physical notices of the nutritional value of every food item that they offer.

Perhaps this is a noble endeavor in theory, until one considers that the inflexible rule put out by the Food and Drug Administration makes no allowances for establishments that allow for multiple variations of their offerings. This could mean that a pizza chain, for example, would have to provide calorie counts for every possible different type of pizza combination that one could order, a mandate that would result in a pizza place needing to literally wallpaper their establishment, and perhaps the establishment next door, with all of the different scenarios for personalized pizzas.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate. It is equally divided between the majority and the minority of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Committee on Rules made in order every amendment that was submitted to the committee to be considered, two Democratic amendments and one bipartisan offering. Finally, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommit, a final opportunity to amend the bill should the minority choose to exercise this option.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today in the underlying bill is not about whether restaurants should provide their customers with nutritional

information; the issue is fundamentally one of the proper role of government. Since President Obama moved into the White House and NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID served as his stewards in the 110th Congress, the Democrats have drummed a steady beat toward expanding the role of government in every direction in our lives.

H.R. 2017, the Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act, is bipartisan legislation introduced by Representatives CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS and LORETTA SANCHEZ to fix the Food and Drug Administration's unworkable implementation of the menu labeling law. The Food and Drug Administration's regulatory framework is not just cumbersome for the food industry, it also impedes a business' ability to provide meaningful information that customers can use to make nutrition decisions.

The Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act is critical to avoid harming consumer choice, harming jobs, and harming small business. The Federal Government should not presume to know how restaurants, supermarkets, cafes, convenience stores, and entertainment venues can best serve their customers and run their businesses, yet the Food and Drug Administration has done exactly that.

For years now, many restaurants and retail food establishments have disclosed caloric information to their customers. This industry expertise should have been instructive to the Food and Drug Administration as it developed the Federal regulation. In fact, the Food and Drug Administration took 3½ years before finalizing a rule that virtually ignores serious concerns raised about the harm of an overly prescriptive, one-size-fits-all approach.

Not only did the FDA disregard the input of consumers and industry experts, it also extended the scope of the regulation far beyond what anyone could have imagined when they voted for this bill in March of 2010. If the Food and Drug Administration is allowed to implement the rule as it stands, the Office of Management and Budget has determined it will require more than 14 million—14 million—compliance hours, in addition to costs exceeding \$1 billion. Even the Food and Drug Administration acknowledged that initial compliance will cost almost \$400 million, with recurring costs as high as \$150 million per year. Likely, the actual costs for the private sector will far exceed those estimates.

Perhaps even more concerning than the costs, food service establishments. Food service establishments are going to face Federal criminal penalties for even the slightest failure to comply with the framework envisioned by the Food and Drug Administration.

Under section 403(a)(1) of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, food labeling must be truthful and not misleading. Food labeling that does not meet the Food and Drug Administration's standard for "truthful and nonmisleading"

is deemed “misbranded.” Under the U.S. Code, introducing misbranded food into commerce is a prohibited act, and the liable party shall be imprisoned for up to 1 year, fined not more than \$1,000, or both.

Food to which these menu labeling requirements apply is deemed misbranded if the Food and Drug Administration’s rule requirements are not met. It is not necessary that the person intentionally mislead customers. Under the Food and Drug Administration’s framework, merely adding an extra slice of pepperoni will render the calorie content on the menu misleading, and your chef is now a criminal.

People say that the Food and Drug Administration won’t put people in jail over this, so I don’t think there should be an issue in saying just that, that people will not be put in jail for an extra slice of pepperoni. I don’t think there is a problem with codifying that in statute. I think it will give great reassurance to food preparers in the industry.

The Food and Drug Administration’s regulation is applicable to restaurants and similar establishments that sell ready-to-eat food that are part of chains with at least 20 stores. This would include bakeries, cafeterias, coffee shops, convenience stores, delis, entertainment venues, food service vendors, fast-food take-out or delivery establishments, grocery stores, confectionery stores, quick service restaurants, and table service restaurants.

Although stores may be part of a nationwide chain, there is substantial variation between regional locations. For example, convenience stores noted in their testimony that, unlike a McDonald’s or a doughnut shop that have the same format everywhere they go, many convenience stores have different layouts based upon region, so coming up with a uniform standard would, in fact, be challenging. This means that all chains will incur individual costs for nutritional analysis and for menu labeling for each location, not just one time done at the national level.

Under the rule, the definition of a menu is applied broadly to mean any writing a customer uses to place an order. This approach would include everything from in-store menu boards to print advertising in the form of door hangers or circulars or online advertising. The rule requires that each menu item have a clearly visible calorie count, including separate calorie information for variable menu items such as toppings or flavor additives.

Pizza chains estimate that there are over 30 million combinations available to customers; and the calorie content for each option couldn’t fit on any menu board that I have ever seen. Grocers estimate that the rule would include hundreds of items in stores that are offered subject to availability and demand, things such as fresh produce, baked goods, seafood, making it vir-

tually impossible to have accurate menu boards without changing them on a nearly constant basis. Many of these businesses would likely stop offering the range of options that are currently available because it would simply cost too much to comply.

Clearly, the Food and Drug Administration’s regulation does not provide a workable framework for businesses. This rule should be about ensuring customers are provided with accurate, trustworthy nutrition information to help inform their decisions, all the while, enabling small businesses the ability to comply.

Representative MCMORRIS RODGERS’ bill is carefully constructed to create transparency for consumers, while maintaining the flexibility necessary for all regulated businesses to be in compliance. The Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act will establish a more reasonable standard for Federal regulation by applying nutritional disclosure requirements to establishments that derive more than 50 percent of their total revenue from the sale of food.

The bill also ensures that inadvertent human error will not subject a local franchise owner to crippling fines or possibly imprisonment. Nutritional information could be provided by a remote access menu for food establishments where the majority of orders are placed by customers off premises. Establishments with self-serve food may comply with the requirements for restaurants or place signs with nutritional information adjacent to each food item, and the bill clarifies that advertisements are not menus.

Yesterday, during the Rules Committee hearing, Ranking Member PALONE testified that it is important that consumers have information at the point of purchase. I disagree with this point. Consumers should have the information when they are placing their order.

A menu board may work for some businesses where customers order at the counter where they also pay; but for something like a pizza restaurant where most people are ordering online or over the telephone, having the calorie information when they pick up their order actually won’t be helpful to the consumer when they are actually making the decisions. This is an example of how the Food and Drug Administration did not consider the array of business types included in this rule, and this is why a legislative solution not only is necessary, but it is required.

The food retail sector employs millions of Americans, and it provides access to affordable, healthy options. The Federal Government must not impose arbitrary regulations that will cause unnecessary harm to businesses and customers. The businesses impacted by this rule widely support providing customers with the nutritional information to better inform their food decisions, but they want to do it in a practical and commonsense way.

□ 1245

This legislation provides clear guidance to small business owners, ensuring compliance and at the same time delivering that critical information.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. This is one of the strangest debates we have had in my time in the House here on the floor of the House. We are actually literally debating the fine print of menus in chain restaurants.

Frankly, I think the American people want to see this body address the real issues that they care about every day. They want our body to fix our broken immigration system and secure our borders. They want us to raise the minimum wage and make college more affordable. They want to make sure that Americans are safe and secure in their homes and that we can ensure for the next generation of Americans the same promise that our last generation has enjoyed in this country.

We know it is becoming even harder and harder for Americans to stay and thrive in the middle class, burdened with more and more college debt and with medical bills. It is time to improve that and make sure that we can restore a robust economy that works for all Americans.

The finer points of exactly the font size on menus is, of course, best left to the executive agencies. It is a complete waste of Congress’ time. There is a 400-page guidance from the FDA, and Congress is now going into that through this bill and literally doing things like adjusting font size and changing definitions. What a bizarre way to spend not only an hour for this rule debate but time for the actual bill debate, amendments, and the vote. I wonder how much taxpayer time we are spending on menu font size, which I don’t even know why we are even talking about that. How bizarre.

The Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act is advertised as a response to what some perceive to be FDA regulations they don’t like. Fine. Elect a different President. There actually will be a different President. One of the things this bill ironically does is delays these rules until there is a new President.

So, I don’t know, will Members of this body like rules better that are set by President Trump or President Sanders or President Clinton? I don’t even think the topics come up in their campaign on what font size they want on menus and where they want the calories listed. I haven’t heard it from any of my constituents.

Generally, people want information about calories and how much they are getting. They want to know that, if

they are getting a hamburger, it might make a difference if the smaller one is 300 calories and the bigger one is 500; maybe if I am watching my weight, I will order the smaller one.

That is generally what people want. These rules generally do that. But here we are using hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars changing a few things and saying, by the way, we want President Trump or Sanders to do this instead of President Obama.

I mean, why? The American people should be outraged. The American people look at Congress, and what do we have, like I think a 6 percent approval rating. Six percent of the American people are saying right on? Six percent of the American people want us to discuss exactly where it says how many calories your hamburger has at your fast-food restaurant? Maybe those 6 percent checked the wrong box on that congressional approval poll. But at least 94 percent of the American people think we ought to be doing something else, and so do I.

I think we should be working to balance the budget. I think that we should fix our broken immigration system and restore our borders. I think that we should grow the American economy, find a sustainable way to invest in infrastructure, find a way to provide a boost to the renewable energies economy, boost American exports in manufacturing, raise the minimum wage, make health care more affordable, and build upon the improvements of the Affordable Care Act.

But no, no. The Republican majority has decided we are going to spend the rest of the day today and tomorrow debating where and how on menus—and not even all restaurants, just some restaurants, with restaurants on all sides of this issue, by the way—that it says how many calories are in your hamburger.

While some say that they don't like the regulations, the reality is this bill actually delays and waters down the transparency that the American people want. Honestly, my constituents have not called about this. I don't think many of them care that much about where it says how many calories are in their burger. But to the extent they think about it, they just want transparency. They want to see it. So do I as a consumer, by the way.

When we work late nights here in D.C., I will order online from a delivery service. They will bring the food to my home. Sometimes I will go into their storefront, and sometimes those stores are chain stores that are under this.

Now, as a consumer, I like to see the calories at all those locations. What this bill would actually do is prevent that from happening. It would say, look, Mr. Store Owner or Ms. Store Owner of a Restaurant Franchise Chain That Delivers, you get 60 percent of your business at your door that comes in, 40 percent of your business is delivery, so you don't have to tell your delivery customers on your Web site how

many calories are in that burger. If I am one of their delivery customers, I lose out on that transparency because of the measures in this bill.

And the converse, what if 60 percent of their food is delivery food and 40 percent are walk-in customers? Now you are saying that if I choose to go there, walk-in customers, sure, maybe the calorie thing is somewhere, maybe it is tucked under a magazine dispenser or it is on some back wall in the restroom, but it is not right there on the menu where I can actually see how many calories are in the item of my choice.

The American people like our labeling. They like transparency. You go to the supermarket, every item, you pick it up, there is a label that tells you the calories, and it tells you the ingredients. People like that for restaurants. They certainly don't like Congress trying to modify the fine print on the font size on 400 pages of thoughtful rules around exactly how this should be done and punting it to the next President, whom we don't even know who that is going to be, to start a whole new rule-making process about something that is very simple.

People want to see how many calories are in what they eat. It is a very simple concept—very simple. People like it. People don't want us wasting time on it. Let's not waste time on it. Let's discuss the things people care about.

But, no, we are forced to, under this rule, spend even more time—and time is money. Time is money, not just of opportunity cost, but we could be talking about ending our budget deficit and restoring order to our border. We could be doing that. Not just the opportunity cost but actual cost. It costs money to keep this body up and running. We are paying our staffs, the lights are on, hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money to discuss exactly where and how the number of calories on your hamburger will be listed when there already are over 400 pages of rules which work and are still being fine tuned.

We had great testimony from the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, FRANK PALLONE, yesterday in our Rules Committee. He said that there are ongoing discussions with FDA, and they are well aware of some of these issues that can be improved.

Congress is best setting these broad directions, like the broad direction which I support which Congress actually did. This was part of the Affordable Care Act. If it were a separate vote, I would have been proud to support it too. We said chain restaurants need to label caloric intake. That is great. That is a broad direction. The details of exactly how to do it need to be figured out on the implementation side.

I can only imagine, if Congress got this involved with every single thing, this country would grind to a halt. Nothing could ever occur. No permit

would ever be granted. No approval would ever occur of anything. It is simply the wrong way to run the largest, wealthiest, most democratic, and most free nation on the face of the Earth by grinding the country to a halt over Congress—the Congress of the United States—setting font sizes on restaurant menus. What the heck are we doing? It is a wonder that 6 percent of people, Mr. Speaker, approve of this Congress. I think they checked the wrong box.

The whole point of this labeling measure included in the Affordable Care Act was to empower consumers to make healthier decisions about the food they eat by simply allowing them to know what is in it. That is the broad direction set by Congress, making sure that we have a public health impact. We need a certain level of standardization so consumers can compare nutritional information on restaurants, just as we do on packages in stores.

If companies that make packaged foods had free rein to invent serving sizes on nutrition labels, or to put the labels on the inside of the container instead of the outside where you can't really see it, would anybody in this body argue that those labels were no longer serving the public good for which they were introduced?

This is the same thing. This is the same thing as putting a label on the inside of a jar, rather than the outside, to game the system. It seems to me like an effort to deprive the American people of information they want to see. You don't improve Federal standards by making them unenforceable in a court of law. You make them irrelevant by making them unenforceable in a court of law.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of these people who wants to know what is in their food. Many of my constituents are too. I am proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Colorado, one of the fittest congressional districts in this Nation, one of the districts with the lowest obesity rates, and a district in which people pride themselves on nutrition, healthy lifestyles, and exercise. I am proud to be a representative of that district. My constituents want to know what they eat. Menu labeling, which has been implemented in five States and dozens of cities since 2006, empowers consumers to make healthy decisions and know what they eat, which has never been more important.

We all know that obesity and diabetes are on the rise. Last year, almost half of American adults had diabetes or pre-diabetes. Medical costs are in the hundreds of billions to treat these diseases and growing. Eating well is the most significant thing that a person can do as a preventative health measure to prevent themselves from developing these diet-related illnesses, including obesity and heart disease.

As it stands now, nutrition information is already available on pre-packaged foods. So when I cook at home, I know exactly what ingredients

are going into the meal I feed myself and my kids. It is right on the label. But when I go out to eat, I don't have the advantage of that same information.

In 2015, for the first time ever, Americans spent more money at restaurants than on groceries. Let me say that again: Americans spent more money at restaurants than on groceries for the first time in 2015. That is a big deal. An important part of the nutritional content that gives us sustenance comes from restaurants, and the American people want that same level of transparency at their restaurants.

With this particular bill, Congress would be moving away from the broad direction that it gave the FDA to basically micromanage over 400 pages of exactly, in what instances, where, and how labels need to appear to the detriment of transparency and access.

As my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) mentioned in the Rules Committee, the FDA solicited significant feedback from stakeholders over many years, both during the negotiations of the Affordable Care Act and, of course, over the course of developing a final rule. They have delayed implementation for 2 years already to give restaurants and the retail food community more time. I am talking about printing things. How overly generous can you get?

With this bill, the Republicans are seeking 2 more years of delay. It is important to point out it has already been delayed 2 years. Again, this is a typical example of why the American people are so frustrated with Congress. This is a bill that will effectively grind things to a halt. Grind what to a halt? Telling you how many calories are in your hamburger, something that people want to know. That is what it will grind to a halt. To what end? To no end. It is a bizarre, unusual waste of time for Congress to be even debating this.

If this bill were to pass and be signed into law—which it won't be because, of course, the President does not support this bill—it would postpone regulations for another 2 years, leaving an entirely new structure about exactly how the caloric intake on your menus is portrayed to the next President of the United States. Let's get this done.

Under this bill, the menu labeling provision would go into effect, at the earliest, in 2018 and would be significantly watered down. Why is Congress sticking our noses in over 400 pages of rulemaking regarding this issue? If we have issues with the FDA, bring them up appropriately in oversight hearings of the FDA. At most, legislatively, perhaps a funding restriction amendment in an appropriations process to run a particular aspect of this regulation that a majority of this body doesn't like might be a legislative way to spend 10 minutes on it and resolve it. Ten minutes. Maybe the American people would think it reasonable to spend 10 minutes.

They don't think it is reasonable to discuss this for 2 days. Hamburger calories for 2 days and exactly what font size and where it appears? What is going on here, Mr. Speaker? This is simply an inappropriate way, a shockingly out-of-touch way, for Congress to spend its time.

My colleagues who support this bill have said that it builds flexibility for compliance. They say that it can help clarify nutrition information. I don't agree with those remarks, but I am more concerned with the provision of micromanaging the way that bills this Congress have already passed are implemented.

I am worried this bill would make the provision of nutrition information more confusing for several reasons. In fact, I think that is part of the nefarious goal of this bill.

Where are caloric counts supposed to be displayed? This bill would allow the restaurant or retail establishment to publish this information on one menu board, and not necessarily at the point of sale. So instead of on the menu at the point of sale, they can stick it in the bathroom. They can stick it in the bathroom. If you don't go to the bathroom, you won't see how many calories are in your burger. That is what they could do under this rule. Who the heck wants that?

As Mr. PALLONE pointed out yesterday, H.R. 2017 allows retailers to publish nutrition information in the format that receives the majority of their customers, whether it was in person or online.

□ 1300

Just because I order food delivered to my home, I might not get to know how many calories are in my family's dinner. Or conversely, if other people order delivery and I go into a restaurant, I might not get to know how many calories are in a meal that I am feeding my family.

I don't see why we don't just publish the information in the store, on take-out menus, and online. They have it, they know it, print it. It is easy. Do it. People want to see it. It is transparency. It is like letting prepackaged goods put their label on the inside of the package where nobody can see it rather than the outside. Or people buy things, if you buy your packaged goods online—and some people do—saying: Oh, it is on the Web site, so it doesn't need to be on the label. If you go in the store, you don't get to know what is in this product.

The businesses that are required to implement these regulations aren't even corner delis or mom and pop shops. This isn't about them. This is about restaurants with more than 20 locations. The FDA has exempted any business smaller than that.

In fact, the rulemaking has many exceptions already, including exemptions for specialty items, for temporary menus, for custom orders, and for daily specials. All exempt. They had a

thoughtful process. They talked to restaurant owners. I haven't heard any complaints from my district about it, and people generally support the overall direction of transparency.

I am especially concerned with how this bill would eliminate mechanisms for enforcement by removing a provision requiring businesses to provide documentation of compliance. It means that it would be essentially impossible for businesses to be accountable for whether they are even complying with regulations. It would make these regulations in paper only, in name only. There would be no meaningful enforcement mechanism. If this bill were to become law, which it won't, it would effectively gut those transparency requirements.

The bill also prohibits civil lawsuits against businesses that attempt to deceive customers or circumvent the labeling process. If companies are willfully lying about what is in their products, in the calories and the nutritional content, of course, they should be liable for that—of course.

Should a company intentionally mislead with confusing labels, customers need a way to fight back. Instead, this bill calls for complete indemnity, and makes any labeling initiative meaningless because there is simply no reason to comply.

This bill allows restaurants to essentially invent their own nutritional information by using deceptive serving sizes and hide that information in bathrooms or on walls where consumers won't even see it, and not put it online or only put it online and not at the restaurant.

At the same time, if somehow customers are able to discern that an establishment is lying, it strips away the enforcement mechanism and civil liability from that.

What a colossal waste of time for the United States Congress to descend to the level of whether calories should be displayed in bathrooms, or on walls, or on menus in restaurants with more than 20 chains, when this Nation is in crisis and needs a responsible Congress to balance the budget and needs a responsible Congress to secure our borders and replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

It needs a responsible Congress to ensure the safety and security of the American people, it needs a responsible Congress to find a sustainable way to invest in infrastructure and growth, and it does not need a Congress to micromanage the font size of menus.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of excessive burdens placed on small businesses from Federal regulations.

The proposed menu labeling requirements by the FDA, which come from a provision of ObamaCare, will require restaurants, grocery stores, gas stations, and even movie theaters and miniature golf courses to list the number of calories in food and drinks they sell.

Thousands of small businesses will have to absorb the cost of providing new menu displays and calorie information. As a former small business owner, I can tell you this is money small businesses cannot afford.

Ultimately, the group that will pay the price for these new regulations is the American consumer through increased food and drink costs at their local restaurants and grocery stores.

Several large chain stores have welcomed these new regulations. I wonder why. They know that their small business competitors can't afford to purchase new menus and signs, placing them at a disadvantage to the larger chain companies.

I find it ironic that this administration that champions itself a small business advocate, continues to place additional burdens on small businesses at the advantage of larger corporations.

H.R. 2017, the Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act of 2015 remedies this glaring conflict and removes the unnecessary and expensive red tape so small business owners can continue to compete and grow our economy.

I encourage my colleagues to support small businesses by supporting this legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

First of all, none of what we are even talking about applies to small businesses.

I have friends that own restaurants in Colorado in Boulder and Fort Collins. I have a friend that has three restaurants and another one has one restaurant. I actually used to own a part of a restaurant. I don't recommend that business to anybody. It is a tough business. This bill doesn't apply to any of those people. We are talking about businesses with over 20 restaurants. We are talking about the big guys.

I think that is why, for instance, the National Restaurant Association isn't even in favor of this bill. They represent many of the restaurants that feel that this is a step forward. They want their customers to know what is in their food because, guess what, when you know what is in your food, you are more likely to dine out.

The fact that restaurants have surpassed grocery stores for meals just shows the importance of restaurants to the American people. People want to know what is in their food. This bill would impede that. It is Congress micromanaging the fine print of a thoroughly vetted and negotiated rule-making process that has already been delayed 2 years—it is Congress delaying it another 2 years—saying somehow this issue of exactly where in restaurants it displays the calories is so

important that President Obama can't be trusted with it, we have to trust President Trump or President Clinton or President Sanders. That is what this body is effectively saying. It is a colossal waste of this body's time. It is time for Congress to focus on issues that matter to the American people.

That is what I hear about. I think it is what my colleagues hear about when we have townhalls when we are out and about in our districts. I haven't heard a single constituent—we are not even talking one—who said that they want the number of calories on the menu items to be harder to see or posted in less places at restaurants—zero. I have heard from literally zero constituents that they want this.

I have heard from several that they like knowing what is in their food. I think that most constituents—who I haven't heard from at all on this issue—are just utterly dismayed that Congress is spending a day and a half even debating this. How bizarre this is when there are real life bread and butter issues that they face—putting food on their table, paying their rent, paying their college loans, replacing their car that burnt out, making sure they don't lose their job, and having to work a second job to make ends meet and make their mortgage. That is what people are facing out there.

The fact that what this Congress is debating is so far removed from that dinner table talk at a family's house is why this Congress has such a dismal approval rating, which will continue to get worse as long as we debate these kinds of bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a valuable member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I appreciate this time.

Yes, this country does have major problems, and certainly regulation is one of them. In fact, I just spent over an hour and a half of my time talking with the administrator of the EPA about the economic impact of that agency.

This is just another example of this government reaching out to require businesses to do things that, frankly, cost money and cost the economy. Every American deserves the opportunity at a good job, and we must grow this economy. That is why I am speaking today in support of H.R. 2017, the Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act.

This bill protects American small businesses from unnecessary costs and regulations, which, again, is the big problem we have with growing the economy. Mainly those in the restaurant and food industries are affected by this, establishing one-size-fits-all nutritional disclosure requirements.

As a small business owner for over 40 years, I know just how daunting new

regulations are. New regulations mean more money spent and countless hours of compliance.

It is estimated that if this regulation is implemented, it could cost American businesses \$1 billion to comply and 500,000 hours of paper. This is a serious issue. American small businesses do not have that kind of time, nor do they have that kind of money.

During a time of slow economic growth, we should not make it harder for Americans to start and stay in business. As we have seen in just about every industry, one-size-fits-all approaches do not work.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill, and encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2017. This bill is common sense. It is in the name.

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

Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to water down transparency and preventive health measures, we should be focusing on what we can actively do to make this country healthier, happier, and safer, like investing in child nutrition, an issue that has broad bipartisan support. In fact, just a couple of weeks ago, the Senate Agriculture Committee passed a bipartisan rewrite of the Child Nutrition Act, and there is widespread support for reauthorizing key child nutrition policies, like the Summer Food Service Program, which really helps some of our most at-risk families ensure that kids are at school ready to learn because they have had their nutritional needs met.

By some estimates, as few as 18 percent of students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch during the school year also receive a summer meal. We can do better. The time of year should never dictate whether or not a child goes hungry in this country.

A bipartisan group of Senators agree, and they have offered an innovative solution to the issue in the bipartisan Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act. The House and our Education and the Workforce Committee should focus on issues like summer meals, which actually make a difference for families, rather than trying to prevent calorie information from being displayed large enough or in the right place where people can actually see it. God forbid.

We also should be focusing on policies like the Farm to School Program, which provide support for our local farmers and at the same time give kids the healthy meals that they need.

Educating our next generation about eating well while simultaneously introducing them to the values of farmers and growing food in our culture and on our land is a double win.

It would be great if Congress could roll up our sleeves and get to work on issues that the American people care about, rather than debating how to hide calorie information from consumers. We should be discussing how to make better nutritional information available to more people, how to feed

more kids that go hungry, how to improve our public health, and, of course, the big issues that we actually hear about, securing our borders, making sure the American people are safe and secure, investing in infrastructure, and growing our economy. That is what this body should be focused on.

I was told by my staff person that zero constituents of mine have called or written in asking me to support this bill. Three have written in opposed to this bill. The rest of them—792,000 of them—don't think we should be debating this bill. They haven't opined on it, and they continue to grow disillusioned with a Congress that is debating for a day and a half how to best hide nutritional information from them rather than improve the quality of schools, make college more affordable, make sure that they can afford their mortgage, and do something about the fact that it is getting harder and harder to get by in our country every day.

Mr. Speaker, national standards are important. They create something that consumers can recognize and can understand. Nutritional labeling standards on menus promote consistency and increased transparency. Standards make compliance easier and less costly. By engaging stakeholders in dialogue, the FDA has tried to accommodate retailers that will be affected by this bill, and worked to put this feedback into the final bill.

□ 1315

Sadly, Members of this body have responded, instead, by preemptively introducing legislation that would not only weaken the guidelines but would delay them for 2 additional years on top of the 2 years that they have already been delayed. This bill would create more confusion than it addresses. It undermines the effectiveness of the regulation by limiting a consumer's recourse for action in civil court, and it does not make consumers and the American people any healthier.

For all of these reasons and more, prominent healthcare groups across the spectrum oppose this legislation, including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the Association of State Public Health Nutritionists, the American Public Health Association, the National Physicians Alliance, the Public Health Institute, doctors, and public health advocates.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2017 as well. Menu labeling provides the necessary information to make healthy choices when eating out. Easy access to accurate information about the foods we eat serves our Nation's public health.

By rejecting this rule, Congress will be sending the message to the rank and file on both sides of the aisle, who, hopefully, will join me in opposing this rule and in bringing this down, that Congress should have priorities that the American people have in that we need to get Congress to work on deal-

ing with the bread-and-butter issues that concern American families every day of the week, every hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill to help prevent mass shootings by promoting research into the causes of gun violence, making it easier to identify and treat those most prone to committing heinous acts.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bring down this rule and restore the faith of the American people and this institution and defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The simple truth is the faith of the American people does not hinge upon the fact that we will jail a chef for an inadvertent mistake made at a pizza restaurant.

Let me take just a few minutes to recap some of the history of the Affordable Care Act and, perhaps, a lesson in civics at the same time.

I am just a simple country doctor. My understanding of how a bill became law was, perhaps, relegated to the video "Schoolhouse Rock!" that I saw many years ago as a child with how a bill becomes law: You are just a bill on Capitol Hill. You go to committee. You get out of committee. You come to the floor. You go to the Senate. You go to a conference committee. You come back. You get voted on, and you are on your way. But, as Paul Harvey said, then there is "the rest of the story."

So let's examine the process for a moment.

We have the Affordable Care Act. Here is a bill that was sort of bumped around on Capitol Hill for a little over a year's time. Finally, it did get passed into law. We had a section in the Affordable Care Act, section 4205. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall which special interest wanted section 4205 placed into the Affordable Care Act. I feel fairly certain that there was a special interest that did want this language in the bill, because the entirety of the Affordable Care Act was, essentially, written by one special interest or another. Yet here is a section that was in the Affordable Care Act, that was duly voted on by the House and the Senate, and that passed in March of 2010. I voted "no"—let me be very clear on that—as did every Republican who was in the House of Representatives at the time.

Section 4205 is not a terribly long section, and it is not terribly difficult to read. Section 4205 goes on for, per-

haps, four pages, and it talks about nutritional labeling. Nutritional labeling, in and of itself, is not a bad thing; but because of the way the law is written, after its passage, it was then handed off to a Federal agency—a Federal agency that is composed not of elected Members of Congress, not of anyone who is directly accountable to any single American constituent anywhere, but the Federal agency sits down and goes about the work of interpreting what Congress intended when it passed the law and how we are going to make this work in and amongst all of the other Federal rulings and regulations that are out there.

The Food and Drug Administration sat down to go about the task of writing the rules and regulations that would govern this one section of the Affordable Care Act—this four-page section in the Affordable Care Act. They, indeed, published their work in the Federal Register on Monday, December 1, 2014. Since we are talking about font size anyway, it is 100 pages of very small font writing, three columns per page; so there is a lot of stuff here—it is pretty dense.

You have heard me mention that I am concerned about the fact that a hidden, inadvertent addition of a single slice of pepperoni on a pizza could send someone to jail for a year. That, actually, is not covered in the remarks in the Federal Register; so let me save people some time if they want to read about where the penalties arise. The penalties arise because, as a consequence of the language in the Federal Register, a law known as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, is amended as a result of this work.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, section 403, reads:

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

That is pretty broad.

Now, if the food is misbranded, that then invokes a second part under the "prohibited acts" in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Under section 331:

The following acts and the causing thereof are prohibitive: the introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, tobacco product, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

We go back to the word "misbranded."

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

Now we come to a food that has been misbranded and the penalty for such an act when we get to the section of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, section 303, under Penalties:

(a) Violation of section 331 of this title:

Any person who violates a provision of section 331 of this title shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or fined not more than \$1,000 or both.

Therein, Mr. Speaker, is the problem with the Affordable Care Act, as written and then interpreted and as it applies to existing law in the United States Code.

I would think that menu labeling, as a matter of course, is a marketing aspect. If you know that your restaurant is putting out food labeling that is accurate and upon which you can depend, great, as I may be more likely to go to such a facility; but, there, it is a voluntary choice. It goes from voluntary to compulsory under the language of the Affordable Care Act. Therein is the problem. That is the problem that Representative MCMORRIS RODGERS sought to correct of the inadvertent addition of a single food item in food that is prepared in a restaurant that has more than 20 facilities.

Think of a name brand pizza place. You may have a local franchise in your town. If you go there on a Friday night and if the calorie count is not identical to what has been posted on the menu board and someone checks, that chef could be imprisoned for a year. That is the reason that, indeed, constituents have written and that restaurant owners have written. They asked Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and she responded to their requests, and that is why we have a bill in front of us today.

The rule that is under consideration right now provides for the consideration of an important fix to a harmfully crafted law and to a poorly written regulation.

I applaud my fellow Energy and Commerce Committee member CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for her work and for doing all she could to bring all stakeholders together to craft a workable compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 611 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 5. 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. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence, 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. 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 recommend 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3926.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644) "An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes."

DEBT MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL
RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609 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. 3442.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1326

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. 3442) to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility, with Mr. BYRNE 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.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I would also like to thank Mr. MARCHANT of Texas for his leadership on this legislation.

H.R. 3442 was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in September of 2015, and it was passed with strong support. It is also highly relevant.

I have just come from our second hearing on the 2017 budget. Anything we can do to add clarity and stability to our budget and debt process is extremely helpful. The amount of debt this country currently owes is staggering—\$19 trillion and growing. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the debt will reach \$29 trillion in 2026.

Let's be clear about why this is happening. It is not because Americans aren't taxed enough; it is because Washington has a spending problem. As we look to the future, revenues will remain half a percentage point above their historical average as a share of the economy. Meanwhile, spending will rise from 21 percent of the share of the economy today to 23 percent in 2026, both of which are far above the historical average of 19.9 percent.

When Republicans took the House in 2010, this government borrowed 40 cents for every dollar it spent, and, today, it is 14 cents; but that is not good enough, because, under the current law baseline, it will go up to 21 cents per dollar in 2026. At this rate, if left unchecked, deficits will rise from over \$500 billion this year to nearly \$1.4 trillion in 2026. Congress needs to address this and consider real solutions to lowering the debt and bringing sustainability to our Federal Government. We can't do that if we don't have a debt management system that is consistent, transparent, and accountable.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act would create a system that allows Congress to make informed decisions about the debt ceiling and consider changes before it becomes a crisis.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress before the statutory debt limit ceiling is hit so that legislators have the information they need when considering the debt limit. That reporting would include the current State of the national debt as well as future debt projections and the administration's plans to meet future obligations.

The Secretary would also report proposals of the President's on how to reduce the debt in the short, medium, and long term and any proposals to improve the debt-to-GDP ratio.

Finally, the administration would have to submit a progress report if it requests multiple debt limit increases so that Congress and the American people can finally get information about the progress that is being made.

□ 1330

This legislation will also make the Secretary's reports available online so

everyone in America can access this important information.

We are at a time when serious decisions must be made about how to grow the economy and stop the increase in the national debt. We can't do that if we don't have the necessary information. So this means that we need to be on the same page about the drivers of our debt and to have an open discussion about our intention to reduce the debt.

This bill would take a process that has become, I think, chaotic and difficult for everyone and instead create a system—a good, smart, open system—that provides a consistent framework.

As others have said, the national debt is a shared responsibility, and we need to focus on ways to address it and move forward sensibly. The current path we are on just isn't sustainable. It will require all of us, both in the legislative and executive branch, to work together to find solutions.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act is an important step in improving this process. It not only provides clarity and transparency, but it also creates accountability and establishes a framework to discuss options and ideas on how to reduce this national debt.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman said this bill came out with strong support and it is relevant. Now, the vote in the committee—this was many, many months ago—was strictly partisan, and this bill is really a diversion. It was marked up at the same time as that Pay China First Act. Does anybody remember that irresponsible legislation that came to the floor that was passed by the Republicans and died the death legislatively it deserved?

So here we are with this bill, part of a two-package bill, that also is going nowhere. It is worse than that, because it is really a diversion, a diversion from what we really should be talking about. It requires the Treasury Department to provide to Congress information on the debt limit that we already receive, distracting from Republicans' repeated recklessness about default and reinforcing the false belief that the debt limit is a tool for managing the debt.

House Republicans refused to invite OMB Director Shaun Donovan to Capitol Hill this week to testify on the President's budget—an unprecedented action. We asked this morning in the Ways and Means Committee: Why did neither the House nor the Senate controlled by Republicans invite the OMB Director? Well, the chairman of the Budget Committee was there at the time and said something like: We don't have time.

That is really shameful. We are debating this bill together, which would require the Treasury Secretary to provide a report and come testify before

Congress on the very debt reduction proposals they are refusing to hear about now, including from the Budget Director. If nothing else, Republicans are proving they are consistent with their inconsistency.

If we were to request from Treasury a new report related to the debt limit, it should focus on the dire consequences of default. It should provide detailed information on the veterans who would not get the benefits they earned. It should tell how many doctors and hospitals who treat Medicare patients won't be paid for care they already provided. It should enumerate the Pell grants we will not pay to students who rely on them to pay for college. And it should explain and enumerate the catastrophic consequences of default to our economy.

That is the kind of information Congress might need the next time we debate the debt limit if Republicans once again propose default instead of responsible action. Instead, Republicans are insisting on a report that would distract from the danger of default and do nothing to help reduce the debt.

If the real goal is debt reduction, as I said, Republicans should welcome OMB Director Donovan to explain the administration's ideas, and then they should sit down with Democrats and take bipartisan action now, as we did during the Clinton administration, when bipartisan legislation generated record budget surpluses.

So the Republicans, I guess, are trying to divert the focus from their inability to take action to reduce the deficit and instead blame Treasury and the administration.

The administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy. They indicate, if the President were presented with H.R. 3442, his advisers would recommend he veto this bill.

Let me close by just saying how unfortunate it is to bring up this effort to obscure the problem instead of acting on legislation that is so badly needed, including addressing inversions that are going on one after another in this country. This, I think, demonstrates the total failure of Republicans to face up to what we are now facing. We should be acting on that instead of this bill.

Well, this is going to have the same fate as the Pay China First Act, such a terrible mistake it was. It is going nowhere. It will be strictly partisan.

So I say to the Republicans in this House, you talk about common ground; instead you bring forth something that essentially is a sham, and you can't stand together on what is essentially a sham.

Mr. PASCRELL, a distinguished member of our committee, at this point will control the remainder of the time on our side.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the

chairman and, of course, my good friend from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This week, the President sent his fiscal year 2017 budget to Congress and released it to the American people. His budget included numerous proposals to reduce the deficit by \$2.9 trillion and grow our economy. In fact, under President Obama's leadership, we have seen deficits shrink to stark lows, the smallest it has been in 7 years.

However, the chairman of the House Budget Committee has refused to hold a hearing on the President's budget with the Office of Management and Budget. This is the first time in 40 years that the President's budget will not be granted a hearing. We separate the powers, but we never separate respect.

Ignoring the fact that the President just sent deficit reduction proposals to Congress, rebuffing the OMB Director's request to testify, the House has instead gone to consider legislation that requires the administration to submit deficit reduction proposals and come and testify about the debt limit and the deficit. Something doesn't quite add up here.

I have tremendous respect for the sponsor of this bill. I think he is acting in good faith—I think it is logical, but I don't think it is true; not everything logical is true, you know—the author of the bill and my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee. But I believe this legislation misses the forest for the trees.

When nearing the debt limit, the most important thing for Congress to know is the catastrophic consequences of a default, yet this bill makes no mention of such a report. Instead, the legislation before us today asks the Treasury Department to report to Congress on things that Congress is most equipped to know. So they are asking us to hear what we already should know.

The drivers and composition of future debt—that is us—and how the United States will meet its debt obligations, that is what is important to us and that is what is important to the American people.

Just a reminder of our constitutional roles: the Congress has the responsibility to enact spending and revenue measures; the Treasury Department, part of the executive branch, executes the laws that we enact—not vice versa. They can't spend money that we haven't authorized.

This bill would create new statutory requirements for the Treasury Department that are unnecessary and duplicative. The Secretary of the Treasury regularly corresponds with the Budget Committee about the debt limit and provides regular updates about the status of our ability to meet our debt obligations.

If I might add just at this point, we know what the Constitution says about the debt limit. The 14th Amendment is very clear, section 4:

“The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions . . . shall not be questioned.”

That is what the Constitution—you know, we refer to the “we,” constitutionalists, only when it suits our purpose and supports our arguments. I think we should look at the Constitution as a document which affects everybody at any time in any place within our borders.

Now, the Treasury provides us with the following: the budget, the Mid-Session Review—in fact, it is online; the Daily Treasury Statement, online; the Monthly Treasury Statement, online; the Monthly Statement of the Public Debt, online; the Schedule of Federal Debt and the Financial Report of the United States Government—all of which, I am saying again, are available on the Internet.

At the time this legislation was brought before the Ways and Means Committee in September of 2015, Republicans were considering a default on the full faith and credit of the United States. A default would have catastrophic consequences, including a collapse of world credit markets and a destruction of job markets.

Should Congress fail to raise the debt limit, the Treasury will not be able to pay veterans' benefits, pay doctors, pay hospitals, take care of Medicare patients, pay salaries to our troops or Pell grants to students who need them. These are expenditures that have already been authorized by the Congress, but if we don't act on the debt limit, we simply can't pay them. We can't.

Fortunately, we were able to come together. We worked together, believe it or not. We suspended the debt limit through March of 2017. The report triggered by this bill, H.R. 3442, will be wholly duplicative of information Congress has already received from the Treasury Department, the Office of Management and Budget. So much for government efficiency.

Well, I believe, my good friend from Texas, what we can and should do is come together in a bipartisan manner on a budget—what we can and we should do. But I believe that we will instead see a deeply partisan and ideological budget for my good friends on the other side that has no chance of garnering any Democratic support. I hope that is not the motivation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his consideration and his speaking on the bill today and commend my colleague from New Jersey. We had a very lively discussion about this bill in the Rules Committee. Over the years, my colleague and I have been able to disagree very agreeably, and I trust that today will continue in that spirit.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, I introduced the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act because Congress and the administration need to focus on finding debt reduction solutions.

There is rarely a time that I appear in my district at a townhall meeting or even a gathering of just a few people where the subject of the debt of the United States of America is not the focal point of the discussion. I never go through a public meeting where someone doesn't raise their hand and say: What is Congress doing about the national debt?

When we began to contemplate this bill a couple years ago, we began to think about how we could put into law a process where Congress would not solve the debt problem, but we would begin a process where the committees of jurisdiction would have a full report from the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury about where we were with the debt and the plans of the administration and what they would do to reduce that debt.

When this bill was passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means in September, the national debt was \$18.1 trillion. Now it is over \$19 trillion. Debt held by the public is now roughly 74 percent of the economy's annual output. It is also a higher percentage than at any point in American history except for a very brief period around World War II. If current law remains unchanged, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that Federal debt held by the public will exceed 100 percent of GDP in 25 years. This is unsustainable.

Everyone knows that the national debt is increasing, but the existing strategy for dealing with the debt limit only fuels conflict and fiscal irresponsibility. This creates disruption and uncertainty, and it erodes the confidence in the American leadership and economy.

Five times in the last 5 years, the Treasury Department has had to employ extraordinary measures to avoid reaching the debt limit. These maneuvers are supposed to be a last resort. They were only employed six other times between the 1980s and 2011. Extraordinary measures have become the new normal, just like record levels of debt.

The goal of H.R. 3442 is to establish a new debt limit process that is more transparent, accountable, and timely. This legislation would allow Congress and the American people to take an early and accurate look at the debt and the statutory debt limit before it is reached, not after the press release that it has been reached is released.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from Texas says he gets asked all the time about the national debt.

He can give a very simple answer—because the Congress keeps spending money and not paying for it. That is how you incur debt; you buy things and you don't pay for them. They can be all sorts of things. They can be Social Security, they can be Medicare, they can be battleships, they can be health care, they can be roads, they can be bridges. If you don't pay for them—it shouldn't be any surprise—you incur debt.

Who spends money in the United States of America? The Congress. Under the Constitution, we are the ones who spend money. I say to my friend from Texas, he might also say, Well, when you create \$800 billion-plus of new debt by cutting taxes and not paying for them, you have less revenue, but you don't cut buying stuff, you have more debt. \$800-plus billion in December. I didn't vote for that bill because we didn't pay for it.

Now, I have been in office a long time. It is easy and takes no courage to cut taxes, no courage whatsoever. What takes courage is buying things—and if people want them—saying, we need to pay for them. We need to pay for them so our children don't pay for them, so our grandchildren don't pay for them because, guess what, they are going to have their challenges in their time, national security challenges, natural disasters like Katrina or Sandy challenges, Ebola, AIDS, health crises. They are going to have to have resources, and we are spending them.

I have been here sometime, longer I think than the gentleman from Texas, longer than my friend from New Jersey. There is one person in America who can stop spending in its tracks. I have been here 36 years. No President in the 36 years that I have served has had a veto overridden of a bill that spent too much money. Not one. Not one Republican President, not one Democratic President. So a President can stop spending in its tracks.

Under Ronald Reagan, we increased the national debt 189 percent. It was less than a trillion dollars when I came to the Congress of the United States. It was increased under Ronald Reagan 189 percent, the largest of any President.

Under George Bush, in 4 years, it was increased 55 percent; under Bill Clinton, in 8 years, 36 percent. But guess what, during the last 4 years, we had a balanced budget, the only time in the lifetime of anybody in this body that we have had 4 years of balanced budgets.

Now, my Republican friends will say, well, we were in charge of the Congress. For the last 6 years you were. But you were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency under George W. Bush, and the budget deficit was increased 87 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCARELL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the President says he is going to veto this bill, but the irony is—and the chairman sits on

the floor—the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has submitted a budget on behalf of the administration to respond exactly to the questions that this bill wants to ask.

For the first time in 41 years, the administration has been refused the opportunity to testify, which The Washington Post called, gratuitously, contemptuous. And then my friends have the audacity to bring a bill on the floor in the same week and ask the Secretary of the Treasury to come down and testify, talk about the debt when we know darn well why the debt is what it is.

It is our responsibility, because we incur it, to make sure that we pay our debt. That is our moral responsibility, as well as our constitutional responsibility. This is politics at its most contemptuous level. It is to pretend that somehow the President is responsible.

My friends, we ought to reject this bill not because of the bill itself, but we get this information, as has been so often said. We already get this information. You don't need the Secretary of the Treasury to come down here and give it to us. He testifies before the Committee on Ways and Means; he testifies before other committees.

Let's reject this bill because it is phony, not because substantively we don't need this information. We have it. It is redundant. It does what my friends on the Republican side so often say, we ought to not have redundant things.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the fact that my time has expired. This bill ought to expire with it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, our Nation is \$19 trillion in debt. That is more than \$58,000 for every man, woman, and child. Now, Tennesseans know that mounting debt burden in Washington is not just an economic concern.

This is a national security issue and it is a moral issue, one that the President is willfully choosing to ignore. His latest budget would cause our debt to spike to more than \$27 trillion over the next 10 years, and when the government maxes out its credit cards to pay for this runaway spending, the Obama administration routinely insists on a so-called clean debt limit hike, a blank check with no strings attached.

Mr. Chair, our constituents deserve better than that. They expect the Congress would assert its role as a coequal branch of government and leverage these opportunities to demand real cuts and to engage the administration in an honest conversation about Washington's spending addiction.

And that is why I support the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. This commonsense piece of legislation would require that the adminis-

tration come to here—yes, the people's House—before any potential debt limit increase and testify about the drivers of our debt and a plan to fix it. The Treasury Department would then be required to post this information on their Web site so that the American people can see the facts for themselves. After all, it is their money that we are spending.

Mr. Chair, this is about injecting some basic accountability into a budgeting process. Taxpayers and the next generation of Americans who will inherit this debt burden that we are accumulating today are owed at least that much.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

Mr. PASCARELL. How much time is remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, I just want to remind the young lady from the other side of the aisle, my good friend, that everything she has asked for is pertinent and important, but it is already on the Internet.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Amnesia. Amnesia, Mr. Chair, once again pervades this Republican Conference. Where were these great deficit hawks 2 months ago when they had an opportunity to vote on increasing the national debt? They were there raising their hand "aye" in favor of hiking the national debt. Today, they come forward with the audacity to say let's solve the runaway national debt problem; we want another government report to do it.

Yes, at Christmastime, these deficit hawks went on a spending spree right here in this House. Not a spending spree to provide more educational opportunity for our children, not a spending spree to provide more medical research dollars for our scientists and physicians, not a spending spree to do something about our crumbling roads or to build a competitive infrastructure, but a spending spree with tax expenditures from the Tax Code to stuff every silk stocking they could find. Anyone who had a powerful lobby, they were here to get an expanded or extended tax cut.

Here is what was said 2 months ago, and I quote:

"Budgeting in this country has pretty much become a joke. Members of Congress give heartfelt speeches—the same kind we are hearing today—"about being responsible. . . . And then time and time again, they cast votes that add billions and even trillions of dollars to the debt. The rampant hypocrisy is quite galling."

"How can lawmakers claim that their budget will achieve balance when they just passed a deficit-financed tax deal that blows a big hole in the budget?"

Those weren't the words of a Democrat. Those weren't the words of a progressive institution. They were the words of Maya MacGuineas, the president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a bipartisan organization. On their board is Mitch Daniels, Alan Simpson, and a host of Republicans.

That final bill that they voted for 2 months ago added \$830 billion to the national debt over the next 10 years, as they borrowed money from abroad to give it to Wall Street and other special interests. It will cost us about \$2 trillion over the next two decades.

One of the biggest items in that budget was a giveaway to Wall Street banks, the same Wall Street banks that helped bring this country to its knees in the economic crisis. Yet they came in and they got a tax break in order to encourage shipping more jobs overseas, which is what that particular tax break does.

They come back to us today, having added to the debt so much. Never seeing a tax break for a special interest that they didn't like—to borrow from Will Rogers—they come to us today and say give us a report, give us another speech.

When we had the Treasury Secretary in front of our committee all morning, our Republican chairman was candid. He was cordial, but he was candid in saying that everything that the Treasury Secretary was offering was dead on arrival, would never see the light of day.

This is a wasted endeavor that ought to be rejected.

□ 1400

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, Mr. MARCHANT has gotten people's attention this afternoon. I am really surprised at how lively and engaged our friends are on the other side of the aisle.

So, it begs the question: What is so provocative about this bill? What is so provocative and incendiary? Apparently, having the administration come with a plan, as it relates to the debt, is a provocation.

I don't think our friends on the other side of the aisle have to take the bait. In fact, the ranking member said it came out with only Republican votes. If I were a Democrat, I wouldn't admit that it only came out with Republican votes. I would be trying to claim credit for this.

Why? Because I come from the State of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what happens when you avoid problems. The State of Illinois has avoided problems year after year after year. My home State now has a \$100 billion unfunded pension liability. That is a fact. Illinois has a crisis.

What Mr. MARCHANT is proposing is very simple and very clear. If this is

provocative, I don't know how to deal with it. It requires the administration to lay out a proposal to reduce the debt in the short term: 1 to 2 years.

The criticism of the administration's current budget is that it never balances. Ever. Think about that. Hello. Never. There is never a balance.

So, what he is saying is they have got to come in and show how they are going to deal with this. Short-term, medium-term, understanding its relationship debt to GDP; all of these things are so important.

We are told: Hey, go to the Internet. That is where your information is. No; what we need is for the administration to understand the information on the Internet—if that is where it is—and come in and present it in a cogent and clear way.

Yes, Congress has the primary responsibility. Yes, the House Republicans have articulated a view that says we can balance this, we can deal with these programs, and we can deal with these cost drivers. We have been met time again by a stiff arm from the President of the United States, who has now redefined the concept of balance. Balance used to mean one plus one equals two. Now the administration says that balance is—what was their latest vernacular—long-term fiscal sustainability. That is ridiculous.

Representative MARCHANT needs to be congratulated. This is a great idea. We ought to be celebrating this. If I were a Democrat, I wouldn't admit to voting against it.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just heard something from my good friend from Illinois that bears repeating, which is to have the administration come and testify on their deficit plan.

The President's budget includes \$2.9 trillion in deficit reduction. You have refused a visit from the administration to discuss it. How is that for provocation?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. MARCHANT, my good friend, for introducing this legislation.

Before I address the legislation, I want to talk very briefly about the President's budget.

The President has, indeed, introduced a budget. It raises over \$3 trillion over a 10-year period of time. It increases spending. It increases the interest payments on the debt so that they approach \$1 trillion at the end of 10 years.

We thought it was appropriate to save the President the embarrassment of bringing him before our committee, because when you put that budget on the floor, which we have done in the past, the President gets two votes from

his own party. Just two. So we thought it was appropriate to save the President that embarrassment.

I want to commend my friend, Mr. MARCHANT from Texas, for introducing this legislation, H.R. 3442, today. This is really a simple and straightforward piece of legislation. The bill enhances accountability, reduces potentially disruptive risks to our economy, and would help Congress reach real debt reduction solutions that the American people so clearly desire and deserve.

Under this act, as we approach any debt limit, the administration would have to appear before Congress and provide testimony on what is driving that national debt so that we know that they actually appreciate the drivers of that debt; relate a clear, unambiguous series of proposals on deficit and debt reduction, which they don't do—by the way, the President's budget never balances—and update Congress on progress being made toward debt reduction, which is a principle that we believe and the American people believe is important, but, apparently, this administration does not.

As Budget chairman, I can tell you there is nothing more troubling than the ever-increasing spending that happens around here, especially in the automatic programs. That is why I am heartened that this bill would require the administration to project the fiscal health and the long-term sustainability of major programs like Medicare and Social Security, that, by the way, are going broke unless something is done.

This bill will help further educate the American people on the dire need to save and strengthen and secure these programs. Our budget—the proposal that we put forward—has proposed positive solutions. We need the administration to be a cooperative partner in getting solutions enacted. Forcing them to confront these challenges will be helpful. This bill will do that.

It is pretty simple, Mr. Chairman. House Republicans have been proposing action our Nation needs to take in order to get spending under control and reduce our debt. It seems only fitting and proper that the administration should have to do the same. That is why I am urging a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard something very interesting. When I hear things interesting, I like to repeat them.

So, we are going to save the President the embarrassment. The ranking member, SANDY LEVIN, mentioned that. He said today that is less than a lame excuse: to save the President embarrassment.

You should be embarrassed balancing the budget on the money from the Affordable Care Act, which you have recommended we destroy. How is that for embarrassment?

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the issue of the Nation's deficit is a real concern, but let's be honest: the issue of the country's deficits are of greater concern to our constituents at home than they appear to be to many people in this Chamber.

Our constituents understand and support some government spending is necessary to keep our country going strong. Our constituents understand that some debt is needed. Like government, they incur debts, too: a mortgage, a car loan, a student loan, credit card debt, a small business loan. They also get alarmed when they see deficits that are too high.

So, that is why it is the job of Congress and the President to develop a budget and raise and spend the necessary revenue to operate the government while also meeting the demands of our constituents.

This week, President Obama submitted his budget plan to the Congress for review. Within that budget is a plan to sensibly cut the Nation's deficit by \$2.9 trillion.

I think there are some good ideas in the budget. Maybe others disagree. But Congress should at least discuss it. Yet, earlier this week, they refused to allow the White House to come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit.

We are spending time and taxpayer money to debate a bill to mandate the White House come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit when, earlier this week, these same folks refused to allow the White House to come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit.

It is a telling action by my Republican colleagues, as they want to look like defenders of the taxpayers' money by demanding answers on how to reduce the deficit—which is a good thing—while blocking the ability for us to actually get any answers on how to reduce the deficit.

Because they refuse to invite the White House Budget Director to discuss the budget, let me share with you a few things that White House officials would have said if they were invited to speak before the Congress on the budget and the deficit.

Do you remember the \$800 billion TARP funds paid to the Nation's largest banks by the Bush administration? The banks have repaid the money—with interest—under President Obama.

Those trillion-dollar annual deficits that started under President Bush's administration, in part due to the TARP fund and in part due to the Republican recession of 2007–2009, are gone.

More Americans are working now than ever in the history of the United States, with private businesses adding over 14 million jobs under the policies of Democrats. One of those policies was supporting the U.S. auto industry.

When my Republican friends wanted to destroy and bankrupt Detroit, Democrats voted to save the U.S. auto industry. Today, the American car industry is on fire and has added over 645,000 American jobs since 2009.

Now, Republicans will argue they are pushing forward to eliminate annual deficits and not increase the debt. But that simply is not true. The Republican budget, while theoretically balancing in 10 years, increases the national debt by \$3 trillion in that time period, which necessitates an increase in the debt ceiling. Therefore, Republicans, despite their claims and their rhetoric, have to increase the debt ceiling or risk the U.S. being in default.

So, Republicans claiming they won't raise the debt ceiling are either not being honest about raising the debt ceiling, not being honest about their budget, or they want the U.S. to not pay its bills and be in default. Which is it?

Additionally, the Republican budget eliminates \$5.5 trillion in spending on programs like student loans, unemployment insurance, child support programs, as well as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. At least they detail these cuts, such as ending Medicare as you know it.

Even more sinister, their budget—which every one of them brags about supporting—includes \$1.1 trillion in spending cuts that are not even detailed, except to say they will go after retirement programs for Federal employees, military personnel, and veterans. They very cleverly hid those cuts in a footnote in their budget.

I am wondering on what page of their phony budget they create unicorns, because everything else in their so-called budget is one big, giant fairy tale.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's not fool the American people. They know what exactly is going on here.

They want to have it both ways: they want to call the White House on the carpet and say they want to discuss the Nation's deficit, and, at the same time, this very week, give the Budget Director an invitation to come before the Congress and talk about the budget and the deficit.

The American people are asking: What is going on? They know exactly what you are doing. Once again, you are using rhetoric, but not addressing the real problems of everyday Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get down to the American people's business and get the answers we need and that they demand.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think a careful review of the bill will reflect that this bill's effective date will be 2017.

While I cannot say with any certainty who the President will be or which party it will be, I would remind the House that this bill puts the responsibility on the administration, regardless of which party holds the White House, and it is an ongoing responsibility that will further the discussion and collaborative nature of our solutions to this debt.

□ 1415

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. I thank the gentleman from Texas very much.

Mr. Chair, I had some prepared remarks, but the opposition just brought up rhetoric and unicorns in the same sentence, and so I feel obliged to respond with a couple of preliminary remarks. I will just make four.

The rhetoric is easy to come by in this city, but the facts are very clear. I have never seen a Democrat budget that has been smaller than a Republican budget. Every year they turn in a budget that is significantly bigger than ours. That is just fact number one.

Fact number two, our budget balances in 10 years. I have never seen, in my history here, a Democrat budget that balances in any time horizon—and we are talking about the debt.

Point number three, we are talking about the President and his commitment to fiscal sanity. I have never heard the current President mention our unfunded liability problem, which is in the \$100 trillion range. That is the most serious number and economic challenge our country faces. I have never heard our President bring that up as a problem to solve.

And finally, when it comes to fiscal restraint on the other side, the winner of the New Hampshire primary on the opposition side is calling for 90 percent tax rates and free everything.

So, when it comes to rhetoric, those are just four simple facts I offer to the other side when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

I want to move forward and commend Representative MARCHANT for putting this bill forward. This country desperately needs to have an honest conversation about our fiscal problems, the full range, from the debt of \$19 trillion to the unfunded liabilities at \$100 trillion. Total outstanding public debt exceeds \$19 trillion. We just passed that this week or so. The unfunded liabilities are multiples of that.

Deficits are exploding, in the \$500 billion range per year. Deficits by 2026 will be about \$1 trillion a year. That will bring the total debt to about \$30 trillion in a decade. All of this is on the back of our children. If we continue on the path of the status quo, we will end in a debt crisis as China is in now.

That is why I support this bill, because it advances the dialogue exactly when Presidential leadership is most needed, when the debt limit looms. Having leadership from a responsible President could make a world of difference.

Of course, talking isn't the end goal. Talk must spur action. These problems get harder to solve the longer we wait.

According to CBO's 2015 long-term budget outlook, if we wait 10 years, the costs will be nearly one-third greater as a percentage of GDP, and even larger in dollar terms. That is why it is so important we address this critical issue head-on now.

It is also getting harder to address the drivers of debt. Annual spending bills cover only 30 percent of Federal spending, and it will be 22 percent in 10 years.

The rest of Federal spending is on autopilot. Back in 1966, autopilot consumed 34 percent of Federal revenues. By 2026, autopilot spending is on track to be 98.7 percent of revenue in a vastly larger economy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BRAT. Some say it is all demographics. That is a narrow view. As society changes, our institutions have to keep up. That is what we are trying to do in this bill.

We cannot continue to ignore the looming fiscal debt crisis until it becomes catastrophic. Let's address it now while we can still make meaningful reforms. I thank Congressman MARCHANT for taking steps in that direction by proposing this bill.

Let's come together, pass this bill, and continue with the reforms that will make the economic outlook for our children and for future generations greater and brighter. Our fellow citizens expect no less.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is a member—a distinguished member, at that—of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3442, and I do so because the bill imposes burdens on Treasury that are totally unnecessary and will do absolutely nothing to improve our national debt.

It is Congress that makes spending and revenue decisions, and it is Congress' responsibility to raise the debt limit, when needed, to enable Treasury to fulfill the debt obligations that we have made. If you owe, you pay.

Rather than wasting our time on a redundant report by Treasury that does nothing to grow the economy, we should focus our time on creating jobs and strengthening families.

I can think of many things that we could be talking about: raising the minimum wage, creating summer jobs

for youth, creating jobs through infrastructure development, supporting businesses to hire more workers, and increasing grant aid to families so that they can afford college.

Although our economy has demonstrated some solid labor market trends, we know that there are still individuals who are not benefiting from the tremendous economic recovery that we are experiencing.

For example, the University of Illinois at Chicago just completed a study that showed that half the African American males in the city of Chicago between the ages of 20–24 are not working and not in school. And we could be using this time—our time—to figure out ways to bring these individuals into the labor market so that they become productive citizens, rather than reviewing another report that tells us nothing that we don't already know.

So I oppose the legislation not because it is such bad legislation, but it is just a waste of our time, energy, and effort. We need to be figuring out ways to solve problems.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), one of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015.

This bill isn't about budgets. I have listened today. It is about a process, a process to keep our eye on the debt by all Members of Congress. Americans want us paying attention to our national debt.

Our collective debt has now surpassed \$19 trillion, which is \$58,000 per American. Sadly, these numbers are only a tip of the iceberg as they don't include, as my colleague from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) indicated, tens of trillions of dollars of unfunded liabilities stemming from some of our entitlement programs.

To me, this is inexcusable. We need an accurate accounting of our country's financial health, and this legislation is a sorely needed first step only, a first step to start the dialogue in finding a solution to this growing problem.

H.R. 3442 will require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide a report to Congress prior to the debt reaching the statutory limit. The report must include historic, current, and projected levels of debt, the drivers and composition of future debt, and how the United States will meet the debt obligations if the debt limit is raised.

As someone who has spent nearly 30 years in the business world, I know the importance of leveraging debt to grow a business and, in this case, to move the government forward. I understand that sometimes we have to borrow. But if I showed up to a bank without an explanation and plan to repay my obliga-

tions, I would be laughed out of the building. If I told the bank, "The financial statements are on the Internet," "I have sent them to you already," or, "You already have them," the laughing would stop and the debt would be called.

Why should raising the national debt limit be any different? The Treasury should have to present a plan to Congress.

This straightforward legislation is not divisive. It will apply to both Democrat and Republican administrations. It will not even affect the current administration.

Let me be very clear. Our debt is not a Democrat or Republican problem. This is an American problem.

As I travel throughout my district in Ohio, I hear from my constituents regarding their concerns about the direction of our country and what we are leaving our children and grandchildren. Congress must work together to put our national debt back on a sustainable path. That is what this legislation starts the process of doing.

I would like to commend Mr. MARCHANT for his leadership on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Texas for bringing this bill to the House.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Budget Committee since I arrived in this House 5 years ago, and I have listened to testimony on every single budget the President has submitted to this Congress. Among all the calls of the redundancy of this legislation, I want to just encourage my colleagues to read the five short pages that are this bill. It says this:

Not more than 60 days and not less than 21 days before the debt ceiling is to be raised, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit the following: a detailed explanation of proposals of the President to reduce the public debt in the short-term, which is the next fiscal year; the medium term, the next 3 to 5 years; and the long term, the next 10 years.

Five years I have served in this institution; five budgets of this President I have looked at. Not one reduced the debt by one penny this year, next year, 10 years from now, or 100 years from now. This is not redundant.

What Mr. MARCHANT is asking of not this President, but the next President, whoever he or she may be, is to not promise the American people everything on their children's credit card, that if you are going to come to the American people and ask for a credit line increase on America's credit card, you ought to offer at least some semblance of a plan for paying the bill back.

I have heard the charge of hypocrisy here on the House floor. Again, I serve on the House Budget Committee. Every

single year, this House, Republicans and Democrats, pass budgets that balance. Every single year, this House, Republicans and Democrats, pass budgets that plan not just to pay back a penny of debt, but all of the debt.

We can't expect less from our next President. We have to expect more. Republican or Democrat, the next President, before coming to ask for the debt ceiling to be increased, should come with a plan for eventually paying that debt back.

Mr. Chairman, it is embarrassing to me that a clean debt ceiling increase is part of the national parlance. I have got seventh, eighth and ninth graders back home who know what a clean debt ceiling is.

We should never have a clean debt ceiling increase. We should never raise the American people's credit line without a plan for paying it back. Not once, Mr. Chairman, have we considered a bill on the floor of this House that has the requirement that Mr. MARCHANT is proposing today.

The burden will fall on us to implement it, but leadership falls to the White House as well. Don't come and ask the American people for more money until you come with a plan for eventually balancing the books. That is not too much to ask, Mr. Chairman. In fact, it is too little to ask, but it is a fantastic first start.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1430

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman on the other side has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, from a few speakers today on the other side, I have heard "Apocalypse Now." Both sides of the aisle, I think, want to get to a day when we balance the budget. We did it several years in a row at the end of the Clinton administration.

I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are well-intentioned in drafting this legislation. I believe they wanted to focus attention on the ways to address our debt and deficit. I agree. I believe that instead of toying with default—because that sends a horrible, horrible message to the world economy—we should do our job as Members and discuss real, long-term solutions to our budgetary challenges.

In fact, I think my good friend from Texas would agree we had an outstanding discussion in the Rules Committee because I never heard that discussion on the floor of the House. Maybe I missed it. I don't know; did I miss it?

Our discretionary spending, which we use to make critical investments in the infrastructure, education, and laying a foundation for our Nation's future for our kids and our grandkids' economic

growth, that discretionary spending is at the lowest level since 1940. Even the gentleman from Virginia, who started to refer to it anyway, said a few moments ago, only talked about 30 percent discretionary money. But it was wrong what he said. We have not done anything to our insurance programs or entitlements.

The Affordable Care Act here rears its head again, extending Medicare for 12 more years. I think that is a pretty big deal in talking about one of these mandatory costs that we have, 12 years more because of the Affordable Care Act.

By the way, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, what are you going to do with the people who don't have insurance anymore? What are you going to do about the 12 years we have extended for Medicare? Perhaps that is all in this phantom budget we have out there.

Cost increases moving forward will be driven by mandatory programs—you know it, and I know it—like Social Security and Medicare, mostly due to an aging population. We started to address this problem with the Affordable Care Act. We have a long ways to go.

Many Members of this body have reasonable proposals to address the growing cost of health care and Social Security on both sides of the aisle. So I believe we would be better served working together and debating together than sitting here today talking about another report that tells us what we already know.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the continued debate on the bill. This bill is very simple. The bill does not try to talk about the past. It doesn't try to address the Reagan administration or the Clinton administration or the Bush administration or the Obama administration.

It tries to look forward and say that the Secretary of the Treasury, 21 to 60 days before he announces that we will reach the debt ceiling—in this case, next year it will be March of 2017, so about this time next year—if this bill is made law, the Secretary of the Treasury will appear before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee—they could meet jointly—and give a plan from the administration on what the administration intends to do about the national debt.

It is important to know what the intentions of the current administration are about the national debt. The report will first provide a detailed accounting of the state of the national debt. It would include the composition and trajectory of the debt as well as the administration's plans to meet the obligations in the event that Congress agrees to raise the debt.

Second, it would just say here is the administration's proposal to reduce the

debt in the short term, the medium term, and the long term. The answer from the administration may very well be we have no intention whatsoever of addressing the debt in the short term, the medium term, or the long term. If that is what the Treasury Secretary wants to report to Congress, that could be his report.

Third, if the administration requests subsequent debt-limit increases, the Secretary would be required to provide a progress report on prior debt reduction proposals.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury to put all these documents online so the American people can read the report for themselves.

The Nation owes \$19 trillion. The debt is growing every second. Addressing the debt is a shared responsibility, and we should use all available tools to manage this responsibility.

This type of process is not new. In fact, today, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve is appearing before the Senate and earlier this week appeared before the House. Under the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, it required the Federal Reserve Chairman to appear before Congress to give a statement on monetary policy. I don't think it is too much to ask for one meeting a year for the Secretary of the Treasury to come to Congress and state his or her opinion and view about the national debt and the administration's plan on how it plans to reduce the debt.

In fact, this bill would be a simple, first step to addressing that problem. I urge the House to pass this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3442

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 "Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY REPORT TO CONGRESS BEFORE REACHING DEBT LIMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3131. Report before reaching debt limit

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not more than sixty days and not less than twenty-one days prior to any date on which the Secretary of the Treasury anticipates the public debt will reach the limit specified under section 3101, as modified by section 3101A, the Secretary shall appear before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to submit the information described under subsection (b).

“(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PRESENTED.—In an appearance described under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit the following:

“(1) DEBT REPORT.—A report on the state of the public debt, including—

“(A) the historical levels of the debt, current amount and composition of the debt, and future projections of the debt;

“(B) the drivers and composition of future debt; and

“(C) how, if the debt limit is raised, the United States will meet debt obligations, including principal and interest.

“(2) STATEMENT OF INTENT.—A detailed explanation of—

“(A) proposals of the President to reduce the public debt in the short term (the current and following fiscal year), medium term (approximately three to five fiscal years), and long term (approximately ten fiscal years), and proposals of the President to adjust the debt-to-gross domestic product ratio;

“(B) the impact an increased debt limit will have on future Government spending, debt service, and the position of the United States dollar as the international reserve currency; and

“(C) projections of fiscal health and sustainability of major direct-spending entitlement programs (including Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid).

“(3) PROGRESS REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A detailed report on the progress of implementing all proposals of the President described under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The report described under this paragraph shall only be submitted if a Secretary has already appeared at least once pursuant to this section during any term of office for a particular President.

“(c) PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall place on the homepage of the Department of the Treasury a link to a webpage that shall serve as a repository of information made available to the public for at least 6 months following the date of release of the relevant information, including:

“(1) The debt report submitted under subsection (b)(1).

“(2) The detailed explanation submitted under subsection (b)(2).

“(3) The progress report submitted under subsection (b)(3).

“(4) Such other information as the Secretary reasonably believes is necessary or helpful to the public in understanding the statutory debt limit, Government debt, and the reports and explanations described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of analysis for chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3130 the following:

“3131. Report before reaching debt limit.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-420. 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 MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 4, after line 3, insert the following:

“(B) the historical levels of Federal revenue, including corporate and individual Federal income taxes as a percent of the gross domestic product;”.

Page 4, line 4, strike “(B)” and insert “(C)”.

Page 4, line 6, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply asks that, in the spirit of this bill and the context of examining the debt, we take a look at Federal revenue trends, which are a critical part of the conversation we are having. Specifically, this amendment asks Treasury to include in their report the historical levels of Federal revenue, including information on corporate and individual Federal income taxes.

While we may disagree on the merits of the underlying bill, I hope that we can agree that it is important to have a complete picture of the Federal budget when looking at debt and deficit issues. When we look closer at our current revenue policies, a fuller picture emerges. This picture could change our perspective on the need to cut programs that Americans hold so high and, instead, raise questions about the need to close loopholes that prevent us from investing in areas of the budget that support the middle class and working families.

Here are a few reasons that we may want to consider changes to this conversation:

Corporations used to contribute \$1 out of every \$3 in Federal revenue. Today, it is \$1 out of every \$10. At the same time, corporations are more profitable than almost ever before.

American taxpayers are losing about \$90 billion every year due to offshore tax loopholes.

In the 1950s, corporate taxes were about 6 percent of the economy. Today, they are 1.9 percent.

All in all, Federal revenue contributed by corporate taxes has dropped by two-thirds over the last six decades.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also allow Treasury to look at individual tax rates so that we can examine if the wealthy are really paying their fair share. Currently, many tax loopholes are reserved for wealthy Americans. These tax giveaways are leaving the middle class to pick up their tab.

Some multimillionaires and billionaires are paying a lower effective tax rate than the average American family. This is wrong. Hard work should never be taxed at a higher rate than making money off Wall Street.

Our Tax Code is full of tax loopholes and tax breaks benefiting big corporations and the rich. When they don't pay their fair share of the taxes, the rest of us pick up the tab. American families end up paying higher taxes or getting fewer services, and the country goes deeper into debt.

If corporations and the rich paid their fair share, then the economy will work better for everyone. Instead of making seniors pay more for Medicare or cutting Social Security benefits, we should close loopholes that allow large corporations to hide profits offshore. Instead of cutting funding for repairing our roads and bridges, we should end huge tax subsidies to oil and gas companies making record profits. Instead of cutting funding for teachers and firefighters, we should ask multimillionaires and billionaires to pay at least as high a tax rate as those public servants pay.

America's richest corporations should not be able to dodge fair taxes to pay lower rates than middle class families.

It is time to address corporate tax dodging and invest in America again. If we close these tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas and hide profits offshore, we can raise billions of dollars to invest in America. We could make our classrooms less crowded, improve roads and bridges, and provide more security for the American people.

Unfortunately, the bill we are voting on today leaves out this entire conversation and, instead, offers false choices of austerity or default.

Please, I hope my colleagues will join me in asking for a fuller picture of our tax policies by supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H.R. 3442 brings very valuable information and transparency to the debt-limit process. The amendment offered by Mr. GRIJALVA would strengthen the legislation by requiring the administration to report additional information on Federal taxes and revenue.

However, I will note that revenues are above their historical average as a share of GDP, so the problem surrounding the unsustainable trajectory of our national debt isn't that Americans are not taxed enough; it is that Washington spends too much.

With that said, I support the text of the gentleman's 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. 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 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) any reduction measures the Secretary intends to take to fund Federal Government obligations if the debt limit is not raised, including—

"(i) notifying the Congress when the limit has been reached; and

"(ii) notifying the Congress when the Secretary has begun taking such measures and specifying which measures are currently being used.".

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) the plan of the President for each week that the debt of the United States Government is at the statutory limit, to publicly disclose, on the website of the Department of the Treasury, the following:

"(i) All reduction measures currently being used by the Secretary to avoid defaulting on obligations of the Government.

"(ii) With respect to each reduction measure, whether or not such measure is currently being used—

"(I) the total dollar amount of such measure that has been used; and

"(II) the total dollar amount of such measure that the Secretary estimates is still available for use.

"(iii) The date on which the Secretary estimates that all reduction measures will be exhausted, and the Government will begin defaulting on its obligations.".

Page 6, after line 2, insert the following:

"(d) REDUCTION MEASURES DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'reduction measures' means each of the following:

"(1) Directing or approving the issuance of debt by the Federal Financing Bank for the purpose of entering into an exchange transaction for debt that is subject to the limit under this section.

"(2) Suspending investments in the Government Securities Investment Fund of the Thrift Savings Fund.

"(3) Suspending investments in the stabilization fund established under section 5302 of title 31, United States Code.

"(4) Suspending new investments in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund or the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund.

"(5) Selling or redeeming securities, obligations, or other invested assets of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund or the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund before maturity.

"(6) Such other measures as the Secretary determines appropriate.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this

amendment on a very important bill, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Texas. I believe the bill is necessary. My amendment, hopefully, will provide some additional information.

As we know, Congress has the authority to set the debt limit. The President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, however, has the apparent authority to set the date to which all the cable networks peg their doomsday countdown clocks. We saw this firsthand in 2011 and 2013.

Even if receipts, expenditures, or use of extraordinary measures change their internal projections of the exhaustion date, Treasury is not required in any way to provide regular, independently verifiable updates to Congress or the American people. Instead, the elected officials charged with making the ultimate decision on increasing the Nation's maxed-out credit card are expected to simply take Treasury's word for it—sometimes months after an initial estimate.

My proposed amendment is very simple. It would require that Treasury provide a weekly reporting of the extraordinary measures and the projected exhaustion date per our Nation's debt limit.

□ 1445

It is a matter of transparency. But it is also exactly the information we need as Members of Congress to fulfill our constitutional responsibility on this issue.

Consider just how long the use of extraordinary measures lasted in 2015. They were originally utilized on March 15, yet the Treasury set November 3 as the date of exhaustion—over 7 months later. That creates, I believe, a lot of uncertainty, and Treasury continues to control the entire process. Transparency is always a better policy.

Mr. Chairman, to further illustrate why this is needed, just last week, a report was issued by the House Financial Services Committee that found that apparently the Department misled Congress regarding their capabilities and plans concerning debt payments back in 2011 and 2013.

Without going into too much detail, the findings of the report, I believe, are clear. The Treasury did not report to Congress the specific actions they could take once the debt limit is reached.

I urge the House to support my amendment to help ensure the American people and Congress are equipped to make informed judgments on this critical issue of the Federal debt limit.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats don't want to default. We believe we should get our deficits under

control now and not at the moment of default.

I believe my Republican colleagues continue to run from deadline to deadline, creating great anxiety. I don't know if you all noticed how the markets are reacting today with the situation in Europe and in China. We are not doing so well, yet we continue this notion of bringing back before the people, before the world, the notion that we will have a default someday and we will prioritize the payment of default, creating the notion or the idea that somehow the U.S. Government might even default on its bills someday. That in and of itself is very destabilizing, and we will have an amendment coming up a little later on this afternoon.

In fact, this President—our President—has a proposal in his budget to cut an additional \$3 trillion from our Nation's deficit on top of the \$4 trillion in deficit reduction that has already been enacted into law. In fact, this President—President Obama—cut the \$1 trillion Bush deficit in half—in more than half—in 4½ years.

America is moving forward. But the underlying issue is the Republicans are afraid that if they allow the White House to come here to the Hill in the form of a budget director to testify on the budget, these pesky little facts will become more commonly known to the American people.

I only have last year's Republican budget to go by—I wait with bated breath for the 2016 budget to come out—but all I have is the 2015 budget. Although there is some transparency that would make cuts in order to balance the budget—they make cuts in Social Security, they make cuts in Medicare, they make cuts in Medicaid and other health—they would entirely eliminate the Affordable Care Act. We all know what complications come with that—no pre-screening; if you are under 26, you would no longer have your parents' insurance; those who already have preexisting conditions would be discriminated against by insurance companies. We know all the bad things that you all want to see come to fruition.

But then you also have another less transparent line that says: other mandatory cuts, to the tune of \$1.1 trillion. You don't spell out what that means. But I would imagine—and I have to assume—it would mean making mandatory cuts to our veterans, to military personnel, and to Federal employees, just to name a few. To get \$1.1 trillion in additional cuts, those are where the cuts would come from.

That may be your platform—you want to make cuts in veterans, in military personnel, and in Federal employees. Those are cuts you are going to propose. You should just make it more transparent. The American people are looking for transparency. They want the debate. We know the cuts you are ready to propose right now in terms of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act.

Let's be honest, you want to cut military and Federal employee pensions, but you are not spelling it out here. I wonder how the folks nearby in Virginia or in Maryland feel about the cuts you want to make in Federal employee pensions. You don't actually spell it out in your budget. You call it "other mandatory cuts."

The American people should assume what that means. We are just trying to give a little more transparency to what your cuts actually mean. They mean cuts to military and Federal employee pensions. Just a little honesty, just a little transparency. That is what the American people are looking for.

Democrats oppose the GOP plans of threatening default or the Pay China First Act bill, which means no Social Security checks, if that were to go into effect, no doctor reimbursements from serving Medicare patients, and it calls into question the paying of our troops. What it really does, though, is it calls into question what we have prided ourselves on as Americans, and that is that we pay our debts. We don't even create the suspicion.

Alexander Hamilton is rolling in his grave today because you are even creating the suspicion that you would not pay the American people's debts. We have an obligation to do our work, to do our business, not for shenanigans, but to get the people's work done. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this bill doesn't really further or advance getting the people's work done. It is just creating more bureaucracy and more time on the floor taking up more precious time in debate, but that is where we are at.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This amendment that Mr. HUELSKAMP has offered requires the administration to report on extraordinary measures on a weekly basis so that Congress will have the most up-to-date information available.

I can tell you that at the very heart of this bill, as I began to put it together a couple of years ago, was the very fact that through a press release the Secretary of Treasury could come out and pick some date out of midair and say we were going to reach the debt ceiling. Then we would go month after month after month not knowing whether he would come out again with another press release that says: Well, it will be next week.

It is my opinion—and I agree with Mr. HUELSKAMP—that the Secretary of Treasury needs to inform Congress what extraordinary measures he or she is using that week to extend the debt limit deadline.

It is a great amendment, and it adds to the bill.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate support from the gentleman

from Texas, I appreciate support from the Ways and Means Committee, and I certainly appreciate the comments across the aisle of the need for transparency.

We are an information vacuum on this issue as Members of Congress and the American people. This simply requires a weekly report so folks outside of the Department of Treasury know what is happening with our Nation's credit line.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) if the President recommends that Congress adopt, in general, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States to help control the accumulation of future debt."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, it is very fitting today that we are considering this bill. It is the same week that the President released the final budget of his administration—a budget that would add nearly \$2.6 trillion to our national debt over the next 5 years. In fact, this President has never submitted a budget to Congress that would balance.

Few Americans may realize this, but just last week, our national debt reached \$19 trillion—Mr. Chairman, \$19 trillion. When the President came into office in 2009, the debt stood at \$10.6 trillion. That is nearly doubling our national debt in just 7 years' time.

Mr. Chairman, we are on a high-speed train, careening towards a fiscal cliff. Soon it may be too late to slow this train down.

If I could, in the name of all that is fiscally sane, I would enact an amendment to the Constitution right now requiring us to balance our budget. But, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, our Constitution requires two-thirds of our colleagues here in Congress to approve that amendment, which history and previous votes on constitutional amendments have shown is a very difficult bar to reach. While this measure may not be the balanced budget

amendment that our country desperately needs and deserves, it will help draw a very clear line of distinction in the sand.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that my colleagues from Virginia and Ohio and Alabama and I are offering would simply require the President to tell the American people whether or not they support a balanced budget amendment when he or she asks for a debt ceiling increase. It is as simple as that. This is about transparency and about being open with the American people about where you stand on this very critical issue.

It would provide a very clear contrast if the President asked to raise the debt ceiling by trillions of dollars in this case, but offers no support for a measure that would put an end to our Nation's debt problems for good.

Make no mistake, time is quickly coming when our Nation will have to make the decision if we want to restore the fiscal health of our Nation to a state of stability and prosperity for future generations, or go down the same road of nations like Greece that have been shattered by their debt woes. When that day comes, the American people deserve to know who is standing where.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have three children. I hate it when they come to me on Sunday night and say: Dad, I have a paper due tomorrow, can you help me out with it? In many respects that is how I feel my Republican colleagues are treating government today. They are like children that need to be forced to do their homework, forced to do their job, and they are doing it always at the last minute.

In many respects, some of the amendments we are talking about today are memorializing the notion of running government from deadline to deadline. We really shouldn't be doing that. You don't make good judgments. I dare say that my children's papers aren't as good when they wait until the last minute to do them, and I suspect that maybe we don't run government when we go from deadline to deadline. We shouldn't run our government this way.

Democrats have taken the action to lower the deficit and restore the economy. Democrats don't want to default. I believe we should get our deficit under control now and not the moment of default. I know I may sound a little bit like the gentleman running for President, Mr. RUBIO, because I am going to be repeating myself a little bit here, but I think some of the facts bear repeating.

That is where the President again has proposed \$3 trillion in deficit reduction on top of the \$4 trillion in deficit reduction that has already been enacted into law. Again, this President

cut the \$1 trillion Bush deficits by more than half in just 4½ years.

America is moving forward. America doesn't need to be great again. We already are great. We have the ability to deal with our fiscal problems if we stop doing it from deadline to deadline and address them in a smart and healthy way.

The underlying issue is Republicans are afraid that if they are allowed to bring the White House again here before us today to testify on their budget that they have proposed, that again pesky facts will get in the way. I will just point them out again.

□ 1500

We have a little yellow line going through it here.

Other mandatory cuts in the Republican budget are to the tune of \$1.1 trillion. Again, I don't know exactly what they are, but I can only assume that those cuts are to the military personnel's and veterans' pensions and to Federal employees' pensions.

I don't know how many fellow employees who live in the Virginia area, for instance, are paying attention to the debate today or how many of those who live in Maryland are paying attention to the debate today. I suspect, if they are, they are a little concerned about this one line that is highlighted, because it would include, under the Republican budget for 2016, mandatory cuts to veterans', to military personnel's, and to Federal employees' pensions. I just think we need to be more open about what those cuts would be to balance the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing personal against the person who is offering the amendment. Again, I just think it further moves forward this notion that we are going to continue to operate the government deadline to deadline. The American people are sick and tired of the government's operating in this way. They want a more thoughtful government. This is not an answer to that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by Mr. NEWHOUSE would absolutely strengthen H.R. 3442.

By requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress information on the debt ceiling, the President recommends that the Congress adopt a balanced budget amendment. This would add more clarity to the process. Therefore, I recommend to the Members that they vote "yes."

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, once again, I would suggest that my Republican colleagues need to be more clear, more transparent.

The gentleman just mentioned transparency. The Republican budget is begging for transparency. The American people want to know exactly what is meant by "other mandatory cuts to the tune of \$1.1 trillion." Where do those cuts end up being made? Again, I can only suggest it is to veterans', to military personnel's, and to Federal employees' pensions.

People living in the greater Metropolitan Washington, D.C., area, those who live down by Norfolk, Virginia, and other heavy military as well as governmental personnel areas, have to question—and I hope they are questioning—what the Republicans mean by those mandatory cuts. I believe it means veterans', military personnel's, and Federal employees' pensions will be cut if the Republican budget is enacted into law.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, this is a very simple amendment that just requires the administration to state whether or not it would recommend that Congress adopt a balanced budget when it asks for a debt ceiling increase. Our national debt is one of the biggest threats that exists to our Nation. The American people need to know where the administration is and where Congress is on this important issue.

When the President ran in 2008, he promised that his administration would be the most transparent administration yet. This helps him keep that promise. Today, it is all about transparency—letting people know where we stand.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chair, 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 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) an economic forecast of the negative consequences of failing to raise the debt limit, including costs associated with public health and safety."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It merely ex-

pands the report the Treasury Secretary must submit per the underlying bill to include an analysis of the economic costs of failing to raise the debt limit, especially with regard to the costs to our Nation's public health and safety.

I agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle that misguided deficit spending poses a serious risk to our Nation's long-term financial stability. It is crucial that we get our fiscal house in order. Simply raising the debt limit without discussing strategic ways to increase revenues and cut costs is unacceptable. Equally unacceptable is not acknowledging the serious short- and long-term costs of failing to raise the debt limit, causing the country to enter into default.

Federal tax dollars fund a variety of programs in every single one of our congressional districts, programs that are essential to the continued well-being of our constituents. Seniors rely on Social Security checks and on Medicare reimbursements. Veterans depend on their much-needed VA benefits. State and municipal police forces receive funding through Department of Justice grants. Our Nation's hospitals receive Federal tax dollars.

It is not an exaggeration to say, if the United States of America defaulted on its loan obligations and if it could not pay its bills for expenses already incurred, the health and safety of its citizens would be put at risk. If America were to enter into default, what would happen? Would the Social Security Administration be able to cut checks? How many Americans would be unable to obtain essential medications? Would the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the TSA, or State and local police units furlough agents and officers? How many fewer cops would be on the beat to keep our communities safe?

All too often, our debates in Washington about the national debt and deficit are not grounded in reality. We simply analyze economic concepts in the abstract, but our decisions and our debates have real, immediate, and lasting impacts on the daily lives of our constituents.

If we are going to engage in a discussion on the pros and cons of raising the debt ceiling, let's keep in mind the real, on-the-ground consequences that the decisions will have on everyday Americans.

If we are going to require the Treasury Secretary to report on the costs of the growing national debt, let's be fair and require that the report discuss the immediate and lasting costs of failing to raise the debt ceiling on our Nation's public health and safety.

The bill's author, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT), stated his goal was to have a comprehensive discussion of the debt ceiling. A comprehensive discussion must include not only the long-term costs of continued deficit spending, but the short-term costs of default, as well as its far-reaching ripple effects.

This amendment is one of common sense and is intellectually honest and fair. It would have zero budgetary impact, and it would ensure the report is as meaningful as possible; so I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require the administration to speculate on the impact of default on our Federal debt. It doesn't call for any specific report. It doesn't call for any specific numbers.

It is not the point of H.R. 3442 to speculate. H.R. 3442 is a sensible step in creating a process to consider the debt limit with information and transparency. I do not feel like this amendment gives any support to that priority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. DUFFY. 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 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, add the following:

"(D) whether the Administration acknowledges that it is technologically capable of paying only principal and interest on the national debt, as opposed to other obligations, in the event that the debt limit, as specified under section 3101, is reached."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for all of his good work on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as all of us know in this institution and around the country, we are \$19 trillion in debt. We borrow around \$3.8 billion a day, and we spend about \$250 billion a year to service our debt. One of the tools that we have in this Congress is the debt limit in order to get the administration to help reform the way we spend.

In 2011, Congress challenged President Obama. When he asked to have an increase in the debt limit, we said let's have a decrease in how much money we spend. As a political fight played out, the administration promised that chaos would ensue across the global markets if the debt limit were reached, and it also said that any proposal that would prioritize payments through the Treasury for principal and interest on our debt could not be taken seriously. Mr. MCCLINTOCK had a bill that would have done just that.

The Committee on Financial Services, the committee on which I serve, did an investigation, and we found that, though they said Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill could not be taken seriously, they actually had a plan to do just what Mr. MCCLINTOCK had recommended, which is, if the debt limit is reached, prioritize payments. They weren't being honest with the American people, because what they wanted to do was to use the argument of chaos to put pressure on Republicans to cave and not demand that we reform the way that we spend.

My amendment here today is very simple. All it says is let's make sure that the Treasury comes clean and tells the American people whether it can pay principal and interest before other obligations so that America does not default on its debt. It is very simple. No one here wants to hit the debt limit, and no one wants us to be the next Greece or Puerto Rico, but that is going to take working together in order to make sure we have budgets that balance at some point in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, as I read it, this amendment requires the Treasury to notify Congress about which obligations it would be able to pay were Congress to choose to default and prioritize debt as a vision in the Pay China First bill, which the House has twice passed on a party-line vote.

First, a bill that plans for default sends a very disturbing signal to the world economy. Here is what we have with us: the gentleman, apparently, through the Speaker and the sponsor of this bill, in good faith, wants to pay China first before vets, before Medicare payments, before salaries for our troops, et cetera. The gentleman wants to pay China first. Of all of the people lined up who are going to get paid, the gentleman wants to pay China first. Excuse me for repeating myself.

The intent of the amendment is to accuse the Treasury of deceiving Congress about its ability to prioritize debt payments. The Treasury does not currently have the capability to prioritize between types of payments in the event it does not have enough cash

on hand to pay all of the bills due on a particular date. That is how it works.

□ 1515

In such an event, Treasury would likely hold all of its bills until it has enough cash on hand to pay those bills. This would repeat daily in a cascading fashion. The result would be disastrous, a first-time immediate default on U.S. credit.

Let me repeat the 14th Amendment. It is clear, simple, and concise. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution, section 4, says:

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law"—that is us—"including debts incurred for payment of pensions . . . shall not be questioned."

I think that to even entertain the idea of default is counterproductive. To entertain the idea sends a real message to the financial markets all over the world, including our own. I think that is a disturbing thing. I don't think you want it, and I don't think we want it.

Now, when you look at how the debt was incurred, when you look at that graph about what contributed to this \$19 trillion, zillion, gabillion dollars, you are talking about, it could be very interesting in case of history—history is important here. History 101—what contributed to that debt: two wars unpaid for, two tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 unpaid for, plan B Medicare prescription drugs unpaid for.

Look, we passed legislation on this floor. We are all culpable here, Democrats and Republicans. So when you stand up and pontificate—you don't have to be in a Presidential election either—and you pontificate about those guys simply want to tax and spend, you have short memories. You have selective memories. We have that at times, too, ourselves on our side.

Well, you are talking about something pretty darn fundamental, and that is the budget, and that is the deficit of this country. This is an absolutely unnecessary amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I remind the gentleman from New Jersey that there is no such thing as a gazillion dollars. Having said that, we are talking real money here. We are talking trillions of dollars in debt, no doubt.

I think the gentleman made reference, as well, to the Constitution and spelled out that we shouldn't even hint at the notion of not paying our debt; yet that is exactly what this amendment would do, similar to legislation that passed here last year and the year before that that would suggest that maybe the United States won't pay its bills. That is not going to happen.

Even in your own budget, you would raise the debt ceiling by \$3 trillion in order to pass your budget. So you know you are going to raise—if you had your druthers, you would raise the debt ceiling as well.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin also had to understand that these are debts that are already owed, not future debts. They are debts we already owe that we have to pay back to make sure the world understands the U.S. pays its debts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that this bill guarantees that we pay our debt. That is exactly what this bill does. So I would note that the Democrats are making the argument for me.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the law that established the Treasury Department already instructs it to manage the revenue to support the public credit. This already includes prioritizing payments to assure the national debt is always honored, as the Constitution commands. Without this, a stalemate on the debt could endanger the Nation's credit.

Well, during recent debates over raising the debt limit, the Treasury Department denied that it can prioritize to preserve the Nation's credit. Thanks to the Financial Services Committee's investigation, we now know this was a deliberate and calculated lie told to increase pressure on Congress. Emails revealed that Federal Reserve officials were incredulous and appalled that the administration would make such statements because they ran a severe risk of panicking credit markets.

This amendment simply requires that, when we approach the debt limit, the Treasury Department tells Congress and the public what it is actually preparing to do to assure this Nation's creditors that their loans to this government are completely secure.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), someone who has worked very hard on this issue as well.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important amendment.

Frankly, the opposition to this amendment is baffling. During the debt ceiling debate last year, the administration repeatedly told Congress and the American people that, if we don't raise the debt ceiling, we would default on our Nation's bills, that the seniors would miss their Social Security checks, that interest on the debt would go unpaid, and that it would all bring the U.S. economy to its knees. This, as it turns out, wasn't true.

Contrary to their posturing, recently exposed documents have shown that the administration was planning to prioritize payments in the event the debt ceiling was reached, the very thing they told us they couldn't do. This is beyond partisan politics. It is fear-mongering.

Very simply, my colleague's amendment requires this administration and future administrations to acknowledge

their ability to prioritize payments after hitting the debt limit. It is a good idea.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DUFFY. May I ask the chairman how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 seconds remaining.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that \$800 billion from ObamaCare to Medicare came from Democrats; \$250 billion a year in interest goes to China.

Let's balance the budget. I would love to see the Democrats' plan to balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DUFFY. 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. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. MESSER. 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 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) any extraordinary measures the Secretary intends to take to fund Federal government obligations if the debt limit is not raised, a projection of how long such extraordinary measures will fund the Federal government, and a projection of the administrative cost of taking such extraordinary measures."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) for his great work on this important bill, a bill that seeks to make the administration accountable for the out-of-control national debt which others have said just hit a staggering \$19 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, like the underlying legislation, the amendment I am offering today holds this administration and future administrations accountable, too. Many don't realize the enormous power Congress has given to the Treasury Department to use so-called extraordinary measures when we are about to hit the debt ceiling.

To pay our bills and delay hitting the debt limit, Treasury has the authority

to take more than \$350 billion out of government accounts, including government worker pension and retirement accounts. This is an incredible power, shifting around hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars and dodging the limit Congress has placed on borrowing.

Our Constitution says that Congress, not the administration, has the power of the purse. So these extraordinary measures, which in effect enable the Department to run up bills or IOUs beyond the debt limit, should be transparent. Congress and the American people have the right to know what Treasury is doing with our money. At present, it is astonishing how little transparency the Department is statutorily obligated to provide.

Very simply, my amendment requires the Treasury to report on what extraordinary measures it intends to use if the debt limit is not lifted. It requires them to project how long such measures will fund the Federal Government so Congress and the American people know well before we near the limit how long those measures will last.

It requires the Treasury Department to estimate the administrative costs associated with taking any extraordinary measures. If moving all this money around costs additional money, we should all know about it.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about brinksmanship once again. I think this is a very unhealthy debate we are having because this is the not the way we should be running government anyway, from deadline to deadline.

As I mentioned earlier, we should be sitting down and working these issues out and not having the world on the precipice of seeing the Nation default. No good will come of it, and absolutely no good comes from talking about it because it will never happen. We will not do it. We will not allow our country to default.

They continue to talk this way because it is the way they are running government, whether it is the government shutdown or the debt limit or the highway trust fund or the Export-Import Bank or the FAA, which we are going to be taking up soon. I am sure that that will go to the last second before we will ever actually act. They will probably do a delay and do it a little later on in the year because that is the way we operate around here. It is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I point out there is a reason why the President has proposed a \$3 trillion cut in the deficit on top of the \$4 trillion that has already been enacted into law. It is to lower the national debt. We are working toward it.

In fact, this President cut the trillion-dollar Bush deficit in half in less than 4½ years.

One last time, I want to point out that we see the Republican budget. We understand the clarity in terms of the cuts you would make to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act.

There is one portion here, “other mandatory cuts,” and I suspect we know what they are as well. They are cuts to veterans’, military personnel’s, and Federal employees’ pensions—veterans’ pensions, military personnel’s pensions, and Federal employees’ pensions.

I suspect people who live around Richmond, Virginia, or down by Norfolk would be very concerned about those cuts you may propose, as well as those folks who live in Virginia and Maryland surrounding Washington, D.C. A lot of Federal employees work around here. I know there are a lot of military employees as well. I think they are concerned about their pensions, the ones that you want to cut in the Federal Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am just looking for a little more transparency.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for introducing the amendment. I know it is in good faith.

I am looking at my favorite chart since I have been here about what causes the public debt. I hear all of these folks talking about it—in both parties running for President—about the public debt, and I don’t know what public debt they are talking about, to be very frank with you.

Let me tell you what the public debt is all about that we are talking about: \$19 trillion and rising. Most of the debt that we carry from year to year—and we have to pay interest on that debt, as you well know—comes from either the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 combined with the two wars we never paid for. I mean, those are the facts. I didn’t make them up.

So we have very little in the discretionary part of the budget. It is only 30 percent of the total budget. We do have a solution to part of the problem in that we extended Medicare for one of those mandatory costs for 12 years. That is what the ACA did.

I am telling you we ought to learn what the facts are, and then maybe we would reduce the number of bills as well as the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their arguments seem to be summarized this way: that somehow if we just would all go bury

our head in the sand that we would be better off.

I mean, the reality is this: our Nation does have a \$19 trillion debt. The reality is that every time this Congress had set a debt limit for our spending, we have breached that debt limit and had to raise another one. The reality is, as we have approached these debt limits in recent years, the Department of the Treasury has taken what they call extraordinary measures, doing it under the law to try to lengthen the amount of time until we hit that debt limit.

This amendment is really a very modest one. All the amendment says is, if the Department of the Treasury is going to take extraordinary measures to avoid the limit on debt that has been set by Congress, that they ought to tell us all what they are doing. They ought to define what it is. They ought to define how much time we are going to buy with these extraordinary measures, and they ought to tell us what it costs as we juggle all this money around. Because when you start juggling money around, as everybody knows in their own life and in their own bills they have to pay, it costs money. That is all this amendment does.

□ 1530

That is all this amendment does. All this amendment does is make sure that as we approach the next debt limit and the Department of the Treasury takes the next extraordinary measures—we can bury our head in the sand and say it won’t happen, but our entire Nation’s history says it will—that we ought to define what they are going to do. They ought to tell us, tell the American people. They ought to explain how much time that buys, and they ought to say how much it costs. I hope my colleagues can support that.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of burying one’s head in the sand. I think an example of that is not asking the OMB Director to come up to the Hill to talk to the Congress about the President’s budget.

As I mentioned before, the President’s budget proposed \$3 trillion in additional cuts to the Federal deficit. I may not agree with all the cuts the President is proposing, but I think it is a healthy thing for the President’s representative, the Director of the OMB, to come before the Congress and speak about that; yet the other side of the aisle has refused to allow the OMB Director to come speak to the Congress to talk about these issues.

So there is hypocrisy and then there is hypocrisy. Talk about putting your head in the sand. There is not enough sand for you all to put your heads in.

The facts are the facts. Reductions are taking place. Accept it. They may not be pretty. The President is proposing them. At least listen to him before you totally disregard it before he

has an opportunity to speak to you all. That is what has happened.

Again, I know what the Republican budget says. It says cuts to veterans’ pensions, military pensions, as well as to Federal employee pensions. That is what your budget does. Be honest about it. You talk about Social Security cuts. You make a lot of cuts, but at least talk about the other miscellaneous mandatory cuts, which really hurt people. I am not going to support that. You all may. It is in your budget. I am not going to support that. Democrats are not going to support that. You all may support that, but you have to respond to your constituents when you force these cuts down their throats.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded that all remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining on my side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, this debate is a remarkable one. There is only one group here that has a budget that balances. For the fifth or sixth or seventh year in a row, we will be submitting a budget that balances.

The gentleman speaks of the President’s budget. The President is going to have the unique historical legacy of having never offered a budget that balances, ever. This one doesn’t. His others haven’t. The truth is that, when the President’s prior budgets have been put on this floor, they have received virtually no votes, like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is the truth.

Again, back to this very simple amendment. All it does is say, when the Department of Treasury uses extraordinary measures, they should be clear with the American people about what they are doing, how much time that buys us, and what it costs. It is a commonsense amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114–420.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 4, line 21, strike “and”.

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

“(D) projections of earnings of individuals, including salary and wages by decile, and
“(E) projections of consumer spending and the impacts of such projections on gross domestic product.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Treasury Secretary's report to also include individual salary and wage information as well as projections of consumer spending and the impact of spending cuts on the gross domestic product.

Stagnant American wages in recent decades are, without a question, the country's most central economic challenge, and the issue of wealth and income inequality continues to be a persistent strain on our economy and, indeed, our society. Raising wages is the key in strengthening the middle class, reducing income inequality, and moving families out of poverty.

I am offering this amendment because we have to start getting realistic about the priorities of the American people.

When Americans sit around their dinner tables, their number one discussion is not about the national debt. Their number one concern and discussion is providing for their families and how they are managing their own budgets. Many are seeing that, while costs are rising, their paychecks are not. Everyday items are becoming unaffordable, and workers are sick and tired of working full time and still struggling to get by.

Since 1979, the vast majority of American workers have seen their hourly wages stagnate or, indeed, decline. From 1973 to 2013, hourly compensation of a typical production worker rose just 9 percent, while productivity increased 74 percent. In short, people are working harder and harder, and their paychecks are getting smaller and smaller.

America now has more wealth and income inequality than any major developed country on Earth, and the gap between the very rich and everyone else is wider than at anytime since the 1920s. Shrinking American paychecks are the root cause of rising income inequality, and a host of issues have come with that.

Wages drive our economy and consumer spending amounts to more than two-thirds of U.S. economic activity. A rise in consumer spending would provide a needed boost to the U.S. GDP. It is time to stop suppressing wages through policy choices that are slanted toward helping the wealthy. It is time to recognize that our decisions have a direct impact on a person's paycheck.

Any report attempting to look at long-term fiscal issues of this country must examine why 58 percent of all new income since the Wall Street crash has gone to the top 1 percent. We should be considering how every decision will impact a family's income, and the fact that the underlying bill does not include information on wages is an injustice to struggling American families.

I urge you to support this amendment and show the American people that the Members of Congress are not just fighting for policies that protect the wealthy but, indeed, for policies that protect us all.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, the goal of the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act is to create a sound process for considering the Federal debt limit. This amendment is not focused on that goal and, instead, asks for the administration to speculate about unrelated and impractical issues such as projection of wages at various percentiles. Instead, we should be spending our time focused on the drivers of our debt and how to come up with a credible solution to slow the trajectory of our debt.

I oppose this amendment and ask that Members vote "no."

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the bill overall is a push to continue to deal only with austerity as a plausible budgetary policy for this country. We can see what that austerity only has done to our country so far. This is how we ended up with sequestration. This is how we stifled GDP growth and harmed our overall economic recovery.

The best way to address our long-term debt is to maximize our economic potential. We can't cut our way to prosperity. Instead, we should focus on protecting American workers and families so that they have the wealth necessary to make our economy grow and prosper again.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) how delayed action by Congress to raise the debt limit and the threat of default impacts the economy, including, but not limited to, the impact on the gross domestic product (GDP), interest rates, employment, household wealth, and retirement assets."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to help Congress better understand how the mere threat of default would impact our economy.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act gathers information from the Treasury about our Nation's debt but omits critical details; namely, the consequences for the country when my friends in the majority play a game of chicken with the full faith and credit of the United States.

When the majority threatened the default in 2011, it was American families who paid the price. Household wealth fell by \$2.4 trillion. Consumer and business confidence plunged. The S&P 500 dropped 17 percent, \$800 billion in retirement assets were wiped out, and our credit rating was downgraded, all thanks to Republicans threatening to force an unprecedented default on America's debt.

If the extreme wing of the Republican Party is going to hold the economy hostage over the debt limit, they should at least understand the damage they are causing. My amendment requires the Treasury to include in its report to Congress the impact that the threat of default and congressional delay would have on the economy.

The report would include the estimated effect on the gross domestic product, interest rates, employment, household wealth, and retirement assets. Honestly, I hope we never have to see this impact assessment produced. I hope we never again have to convince Republicans that raising the debt limit is a basic responsibility of Congress, not a bargaining chip. But their record says otherwise.

The next time Republicans seek to score political points and push a radical agenda by threatening not to pay America's bills, I want the public to understand the cost of that threat. I think we will find pretty quickly that the American people have no appetite for petty politics when it comes to the debt limit. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act focuses on creating a process of transparency and accountability to

deal with the debt ceiling. This bill gets Congress, the administration, and the public on the same page about why we continually find ourselves in this position. Raising the debt limit without any plan to get our debt under control in the future is not a plan.

This amendment does not advance that goal. Instead, it goes in the opposite direction and attempts to focus our attention on the potential effects of brinksmanship.

I urge Members to vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does address the issue at hand. It does address the threat, just the mere threat of brinksmanship with paying our Nation’s bills. History has shown that just the mere threat of defaulting on our bills has brought about damaging consequences to our economy and to the welfare of our people.

I urge my colleagues to support my 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 California (Mr. TAKANO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAKANO. 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 California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-420 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 234, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moulton

NOES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Bartletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

NOT VOTING—15

Bonamici
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Pallone
Pocan
Reed
Smith (WA)
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1605

Messrs. GOHMERT and HUELSKAMP changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. KATKO, MCNERNEY, and DOGGETT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 176, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—240

Abraham Griffith Pearce
 Aderholt Grothman Perry
 Allen Guinta Pittenger
 Amash Guthrie Pitts
 Amodei Hanna Poe (TX)
 Ashford Hardy Poliquin
 Babin Harper Pompeo
 Barletta Harris Posey
 Barr Hartzler Price, Tom
 Barton Heck (NV) Ratcliffe
 Benishek Hensarling Reichert
 Bilirakis Hice, Jody B. Renacci
 Bishop (MI) Hill Ribble
 Bishop (UT) Holding Rice (SC)
 Black Huelskamp Rigell
 Blackburn Hultgren Roby
 Blum Hunter Roe (TN)
 Bost Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)
 Boustany Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)
 Brady (TX) Issa Rohrabacher
 Bridenstine Jenkins (KS) Rokita
 Brooks (AL) Jenkins (WV) Rooney (FL)
 Brooks (IN) Johnson (OH) Ross-Lehtinen
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam
 Buck Jolly Roskam
 Bucshon Jones Ross
 Burgess Jordan Rothfus
 Byrne Joyce Rouzer
 Calvert Katko Royce
 Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Russell
 Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Salmon
 Chabot King (IA) Sanford
 Chaffetz King (NY) Scalise
 Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Schweikert
 Coffman Kline Scott, Austin
 Cole Knight Sensenbrenner
 Collins (GA) Labrador Sessions
 Collins (NY) LaHood Shimkus
 Comstock LaMalfa Shuster
 Conaway Lamborn Simpson
 Cook Lance Sinema
 Costello (PA) Latta Smith (MO)
 Cramer LoBiondo Smith (NE)
 Crawford Long Smith (NJ)
 Crenshaw Loudermilk Smith (TX)
 Culberson Love Stefanik
 Curbelo (FL) Lucas Stewart
 Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Stivers
 Denham Lummis Stutzman
 Dent MacArthur Thompson (PA)
 DeSantis Marchant Thornberry
 DesJarlais Marino Tiberi
 Diaz-Balart Massie Tipton
 Dold McCarthy Trott
 Donovan McCaul Turner
 Duffy McClintock Upton
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Valadao
 Duncan (TN) McKinley Wagner
 Ellmers (NC) McMorris Walberg
 Emmer (MN) Rodgers Walden
 Farenthold McSally Walker
 Fitzpatrick Meadows Walorski
 Fleischmann Meehan Walters, Mimi
 Fleming Messer Weber (TX)
 Flores Mica Webster (FL)
 Forbes Miller (FL) Wenstrup
 Fortenberry Miller (MI) Westerman
 Foxx Moolenaar Whitfield
 Franks (AZ) Mooney (WV) Williams
 Frelinghuysen Mullin Wilson (SC)
 Garrett Mulvaney Wittman
 Gibbs Murphy (PA) Womack
 Gibson Neugebauer Woodall
 Gohmert Newhouse Yoder
 Goodlatte Noem Yoho
 Gosar Nugent Young (AK)
 Gowdy Nunes Young (IA)
 Granger Olson Young (IN)
 Graves (GA) Palazzo Zeldin
 Graves (LA) Palmer Zinke
 Graves (MO) Paulsen

NOES—176

Adams Boyle, Brendan
 Aguilar F.
 Bass Brady (PA)
 Beatty Brown (FL)
 Becerra Brownley (CA)
 Bera Bustos
 Beyer Butterfield
 Bishop (GA) Capps
 Blumenauer Capuano

Clay Huffman
 Cleaver Israel
 Clyburn Jackson Lee
 Connolly Jeffries
 Conyers Johnson (GA)
 Cooper Johnson, E. B.
 Costa Kaptur
 Courtney Keating
 Crowley Kelly (IL)
 Cuellar Kennedy
 Cummings Kildee
 Davis (CA) Kilmer
 Davis, Danny Kind
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick
 DeGette Kuster
 Delaney Langevin
 DeLauro Larsen (WA)
 DeBene Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lee
 Dingell Levin
 Doggett Lewis
 Doyle, Michael Lipinski
 F. Loebsack
 Duckworth Lofgren
 Edwards Lowenthal
 Ellison Lowey
 Engel Lujan Grisham
 Eshoo (NM)
 Esty Lujan, Ben Ray
 Farr (NM)
 Fattah Lynch
 Foster Maloney,
 Frankel (FL) Carolyn
 Fudge Maloney, Sean
 Gabbard Matsui
 Gallego McCollum
 Garamendi McDermott
 Graham McGovern
 Grayson McNerney
 Green, Al Meeks
 Green, Gene Meng
 Grijalva Moulton
 Gutierrez Murphy (FL)
 Hahn Nadler
 Hastings Napolitano
 Heck (WA) Neal
 Higgins Nolan
 Himes Norcross
 Hinojosa O'Rourke
 Honda Payne
 Hoyer Pelosi

NOT VOTING—17

Bonamici Hudson
 Brat Pocan
 Castro (TX) Huizenga (MI)
 Cohen Lieu, Ted
 Fincher Moore
 Herrera Beutler Pallone
 Pascrell Schultz
 Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1610

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mr. BRAT. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 72, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:
 Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, during the rollcall vote No. 72 on the Duffy Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 245, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—171

Adams Gabbard Moulton
 Aguilar Gallego Murphy (FL)
 Ashford Garamendi Nadler
 Bass Graham Napolitano
 Beatty Grayson Neal
 Becerra Green, Al Nolan
 Bera Green, Gene Norcross
 Beyer Grijalva O'Rourke
 Bishop (GA) Gutierrez Pascarell
 Blumenauer Hahn Payne
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Pelosi
 F. Heck (WA) Peters
 Brady (PA) Higgins Pingree
 Brown (FL) Himes Price (NC)
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa Quigley
 Bustos Honda Rangel
 Butterfield Hoyer Huffman
 Capps Cárdenas Israel
 Capuano Capuano Jackson Lee
 Cárdenas Carney Jeffries
 Carney Carney Johnson (GA)
 Cartwright Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kind
 Connolly Kirkpatrick
 Conyers Kuster
 Courtney Langevin
 Crowley Larsen (WA)
 Cuellar Larson (CT)
 Cummings Lawrence
 Davis (CA) Lee
 DeFazio Levin
 DeGette Lewis
 Delaney Lipinski
 DeLauro Loebsack
 DeBene Lofgren
 DeSaulnier Lowenthal
 Deutch Lowey
 Dingell Lujan Grisham
 Doggett (NM)
 Doyle, Michael Lujan, Ben Ray
 F. (NM)
 Duckworth Lynch
 Edwards Maloney,
 Ellison Carolyn
 Engel Maloney, Sean
 Eshoo Matsui
 Esty McCollum
 Farr McDermott
 Fattah McGovern
 Foster McNerney
 Frankel (FL) Meeks
 Fudge Meng

NOES—245

Abraham Buchanan Crawford
 Aderholt Buck Crenshaw
 Allen Bucshon Culberson
 Amash Burgess Curbelo (FL)
 Amodei Byrne Davis, Rodney
 Babin Calvert Denham
 Barletta Carson (IN) Dent
 Barr Carter (GA) DeSantis
 Barton Carter (TX) DesJarlais
 Benishek Chabot Diaz-Balart
 Bilirakis Chaffetz Dold
 Bishop (MI) Clawson (FL) Donovan
 Bishop (UT) Coffman Duffy
 Black Cole
 Blackburn Collins (GA)
 Blum Collins (NY)
 Bost Comstock
 Boustany Conaway
 Brady (TX) Cook
 Bridenstine Cooper
 Brooks (AL) Costa
 Brooks (IN) Costello (PA)
 Cramer Cramer Flores
 Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxy
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
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long

NOT VOTING—17

Bonomici
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Davis, Danny
Fincher
Herrera Beutler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1613

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
TAKANO) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 190, noes 227,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOES—227

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

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lummi
Lujan
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)

NOT VOTING—16

Bonomici
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hudson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1618

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois
changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no
further amendments, under the rule,
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAR-
TER of Georgia) having assumed the
chair, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia,
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.
3442) to provide further means of ac-
countability of the United States debt
and promote fiscal responsibility, and,
pursuant to House Resolution 609, he
reported the bill back to the House
with sundry amendments adopted in
the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or-
dered.

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Huizenga (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Pallone
Pocan
Reed

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1618

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois
changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no
further amendments, under the rule,
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAR-
TER of Georgia) having assumed the
chair, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia,
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.
3442) to provide further means of ac-
countability of the United States debt
and promote fiscal responsibility, and,
pursuant to House Resolution 609, he
reported the bill back to the House
with sundry amendments adopted in
the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or-
dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3442 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 4, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 25 and insert the following:

“(C) an analysis of the following:

“(i) Long-term revenue lost from tax avoidance and evasion resulting from tax loopholes exploited by businesses, including corporate inversions, base erosion, unlimited deferral of foreign earnings, and loopholes that encourage the offshoring of jobs and profits.

“(ii) Long-term revenue lost from tax avoidance and evasion resulting from tax loopholes abused by the wealthy, including carried interest, estate tax rules, capital gains rates, and deductions and exemptions that widen income and wealth inequality among individuals.

“(iii) Long-term revenue lost due to unfair policies in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including those specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), which contribute to growing tax avoidance and evasion by American businesses and individuals who are increasingly more discouraged by corporations and wealthy individuals not being required to pay their fair share of taxes.

“(iv) Long-term revenue lost due to unfair policies in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which harm middle-class workers and families and the long-term revenue effect of a shrinking middle class.”

Page 5, line 16, strike “information, including” and all that follows through line 2 on page 6 and insert “information.”

Mr. MARCHANT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to address a problem that has impacted our country for generations, some of our problem-solving colleagues have devised a surefire remedy. They are demanding another government report. Instead of actually voting to prevent more debt when they had the opportunity, they want a report.

Approval of this motion will not kill the report, it will not kill the bill, nor

will it send it back to committee. Rather, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended, but it will be a more complete report that more completely describes the problem with which we are dealing.

Some of my Republican colleagues have a near insatiable desire for tax cuts that don't pay for themselves. They don't mind borrowing from foreign sources to provide more tax preferences to Wall Street or the privileged few. This motion would simply expose the cost of this false ideology. It would add a requirement that the public just find out how much these special-interest tax loopholes cost.

Specifically, this report would be expanded to include inversions. These are schemes by which some multinational corporations are renouncing their American charter, their American citizenship, in order to dodge taxes, while continuing to remain in America and claim the benefits of being American, paid for by their business competitors and other taxpayers. We have had a recent string of these inversions, which are really perversions of our Tax Code by those who refuse to pay their fair share of the cost of national security and other vital services.

American corporation Johnson Controls, for example, has announced its intent to merge with Tyco. Tyco was once an American citizen, before it became a citizen of Bermuda, before it switched to become a citizen of Ireland—all the while being managed in New Jersey. And Pfizer, the largest pharmaceutical company, is seeking the luck of the Irish—the Irish taxes, that is—but it certainly refuses to charge Americans lower, more reasonable Irish pharmaceutical costs.

These are the same companies that are insulted by the notion that they ought to pay a higher rate on their earnings than the people who clean up the boardroom at night.

The Republican chairman of a Houston oil services company wrote me a long time ago rejecting this notion as unfair and unpatriotic.

He said:

We are proud of our country, and we are willing to pay U.S. taxes to receive the wonderful benefits of U.S. citizenship. My strongly held view is that if companies want to be headquartered in some tax haven, then the management should give up their U.S. citizenship and move there.

I agree. But that is not what happens. With our current tax loopholes, they don't have to move much more than a mailbox and few staff members.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court thinks that corporations are people for many other purposes, I agree with former Secretary Hillary Clinton's proposal to treat these charter-changing corporations as individuals like the super rich individuals who turn in passports and leave America. Apply an exit tax to previous profits that these corporations want to take out of the country.

There is much more that the Treasury Department can and should do

now, since what it has done so far under existing legal authority has not accomplished very much.

Today, let's just get a report about it, about a giant rip-off of America. Corporations which are shipping their jobs and profits overseas while paying their lobbyists and their chief executive officers more than they pay the United States Treasury in taxes in any given year have made a pretty good investment for themselves, but it is not too great for the rest of us. They could not do it without enablers in this Congress.

American companies who stay in America and contribute to building American manufacturing in America deserve to have a level playing field. They help keep us secure at home and abroad, and they deserve to be treated fairly. In order to create more opportunity for all, we need more responsibility from all. Let's at least get a report about it.

That is all that this motion to recommit does is to ask for a report to go along with the report that they are seeking from the Treasury Department to tell us what is happening, how our middle class—our working Americans—are having to pay more because some others won't pay their fair share.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to reject this motion to recommit and adopt the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. It is a commonsense solution to Washington's debt-crisis mentality.

H.R. 3442 creates a process to bring transparency, responsibility, and consistency to the debt management process. Regardless of whether a person supports raising the debt ceiling or not, everyone should support a process that gives us more information to make an educated decision.

□ 1630

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act requires the administration to report on the state of the national debt before the debt ceiling is reached. It also requires the administration to make recommendations and report information about how to reduce the debt and how America can meet its future obligations.

This accountability will give Congress the information it needs when considering the debt limit. All of this information will be made public online.

H.R. 3442 is a strong first step to move government away from its current crisis approach and changes the focus into coming up with solutions for our debt problem. I am a firm believer in H.R. 3442.

I urge all Members to reject this motion to recommit, and support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3442, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 611; and adoption of the House Resolution 611, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 238, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—179

Adams	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Aguiar	Gabbard	Nadler
Ashford	Gallego	Napolitano
Bass	Garamendi	Neal
Beatty	Graham	Nolan
Becerra	Grayson	Norcross
Bera	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Payne
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Peters
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Pingree
Bustos	Himes	Polis
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Capps	Honda	Quigley
Capuano	Hoyer	Rangel
Cárdenas	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Carney	Israel	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cicilline	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kildee	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kilmer	Schiff
Conyers	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Costa	Kuster	Serrano
Courtney	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Cummings	Lawrence	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lee	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Levin	Speier
DeFazio	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Takai
Delaney	Loeb sack	Takano
DeLauro	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lowe y	Titus
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
Dingell	(NM)	Torres
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Lynch	Vargas
Edwards	Maloney,	Veasey
Ellison	Carolyn	Vela
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Eshoo	Matsui	Visclosky
Esty	McCollum	Walz
Farr	McDermott	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Foster	McNerney	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
	Meng	Yarmuth
	Moulton	

NOES—238

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Griffith	Pearce
Allen	Grothman	Perry
Amash	Guinta	Pittenger
Amodei	Guthrie	Pitts
Babin	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hardy	Poliquin
Barr	Harper	Pompeo
Barton	Harris	Posey
Benishek	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Black	Hill	Ribble
Blackburn	Holding	Rice (SC)
Blum	Huelskamp	Rigell
Bost	Hultgren	Roby
Boustany	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bucshon	Jolly	Rothfus
Burgess	Jordan	Rouzer
Byrne	Joyce	Royce
Calvert	Katko	Russell
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (IA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Schrader
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (NY)	LaHood	Rouzer
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Cuberson	Love	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Denham	Lummis	Stutzman
Dent	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Marchant	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Marino	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Tipton
Dold	McCarthy	Trott
Donovan	McCaul	Turner
Duffy	McClintock	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McMorris	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Walden
Farenthold	McSally	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Messer	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mica	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westerman
Fox	Moolenaar	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gibson	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gohmert	Newhouse	Yoder
Goodlatte	Noem	Yoho
Gosar	Nugent	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Nunes	Young (IA)
Granger	Olson	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Bonamici	Huizenga (MI)	Roskam
Castro (TX)	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Moore	Wasserman
Fincher	Pallone	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Pocan	Westmoreland
Hudson	Reed	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1636

Mr. POMPEO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DOGGETT. 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 267, noes 151, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—267

Abraham	Esty	Love
Aderholt	Farenthold	Lucas
Aguiar	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Allen	Fleischmann	Lummis
Amash	Fleming	MacArthur
Amodei	Flores	Marchant
Ashford	Forbes	Marino
Babin	Fortenberry	Massie
Barletta	Fox	McCarthy
Barr	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Barton	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Benishek	Garamendi	McHenry
Bera	Garrett	McKinley
Bilirakis	Gibbs	McMorris
Bishop (GA)	Gibson	Rodgers
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	McSally
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Meadows
Black	Gosar	Meehan
Blackburn	Gowdy	Messer
Blum	Graham	Mica
Blumenauer	Granger	Miller (FL)
Bost	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Brat	Griffith	Mullin
Bridenstine	Grothman	Mulvaney
Brooks (AL)	Guinta	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Neugebauer
Brownley (CA)	Hanna	Newhouse
Bucshon	Hardy	Noem
Burgess	Harper	Nugent
Bustos	Harris	Nunes
Byrne	Hartzler	O'Rourke
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Olson
Chabot	Hensarling	Palazzo
Chaffetz	Hice, Jody B.	Palmer
Clawson (FL)	Hill	Paulsen
Coffman	Himes	Pearce
Cole	Holding	Perry
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Peters
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Peterson
Conaway	Hunter	Pittenger
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Pitts
Cooper	Hurt (VA)	Poe (TX)
Costa	Issa	Poliquin
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Posey
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe
Cuellar	Jones	Reichert
Culberson	Jordan	Renacci
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce	Ribble
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rice (SC)
Delaney	Kelly (MS)	Rigell
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Dent	Kind	Roe (TN)
DeSantis	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Dold	Kline	Rokita
Donovan	Knight	Rooney (FL)
Donovan	Kuster	Ros-Lehtinen
Duckworth	Labrador	Roskam
Duffy	LaHood	Ross
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rouzer
Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Royce
Emmer (MN)	Latta	Ruiz
	Lipinski	Russell
	LoBiondo	Salmon
	Long	Sanford
	Loudermilk	Scalise
		Schrader

Schweikert Thornberry
 Scott, Austin Tiberi
 Sensenbrenner Tipton
 Sessions Torres
 Shimkus Trotter
 Shuster Turner
 Simpson Upton
 Sinema Valadao
 Smith (MO) Vela
 Smith (NE) Wagner
 Smith (NJ) Walberg
 Smith (TX) Walden
 Stefanik Walker
 Stewart Walorski
 Stivers Walters, Mimi
 Stutzman Weber (TX)
 Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)

NOES—151

Adams Green, Gene
 Bass Grijalva
 Beatty Gutiérrez
 Becerra Hahn
 Beyer Hastings
 Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA)
 F. Higgins
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa
 Brown (FL) Honda
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Huffman
 Capuano Israel
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick
 Connolly Langevin
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Courtney Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lawrence
 Cummings Lee
 Davis (CA) Levin
 Davis, Danny Lewis
 DeFazio Loeb sack
 DeGette Lofgren
 DeLauro Lowenthal
 DelBene Lowey
 DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham
 Deutch (NM)
 Dingell Luján, Ben Ray
 Doggett (NM)
 Doyle, Michael Lynch
 F. Maloney,
 Edwards Carolyn
 Ellison Maloney, Sean
 Engel Matsui
 Eshoo McCollum
 Farr McDermott
 Fattah McGovern
 Foster McNerney
 Frankel (FL) Meeks
 Fudge Meng
 Gabbard Moulton
 Gallego Murphy (FL)
 Grayson Nadler
 Green, Al Napolitano

NOT VOTING—15

Bonamici Huizenga (MI) Smith (WA)
 Castro (TX) Lieu, Ted Wasserman
 Cohen Moore Schultz
 Fincher Pallone Westmoreland
 Herrera Beutler Pocan
 Hudson Reed

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1642

Mr. DOGGETT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1017, COMMON SENSE NUTRITION DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2016, THROUGH FEBRUARY 22, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 611) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1017) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A, and providing for proceedings during the period from February 15, 2016, through February 22, 2016, 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 237, nays 178, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—237

Abraham Duncan (TN) Kline
 Aderholt Ellmers (NC) Knight
 Allen Emmer (MN) Labrador
 Amash Farenthold LaHood
 Amodei Fitzpatrick LaMalfa
 Babin Fleischmann Lamborn
 Barletta Fleming Lance
 Barr Flores Latta
 Barton Forbes LoBiondo
 Benishak Poxx Long
 Bilirakis Franks (AZ) Loudermilk
 Bishop (MI) Frelinghuysen Love
 Bishop (UT) Garrett Lucas
 Black Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Blackburn Gibson Lummis
 Blum Gohmert MacArthur
 Blum Goodlatte Marchant
 Bost Gosar Marino
 Boustany Gowdy Massie
 Brady (TX) Brat Granger McCarthy
 Brat Bridenstine Graves (GA) McCaul
 Brooks (AL) Graves (LA) McClintock
 Brooks (IN) Graves (MO) McHenry
 Buck Griffith McKinley
 Bucshon Grothman McMorris
 Burgess Guinta Rodgers
 Byrne Guthrie McSally
 Calvert Hanna Meadows
 Carter (GA) Hardy Meehan
 Carter (TX) Harper Messer
 Chabot Harris Mica
 Chaffetz Hartzler Miller (FL)
 Clawson (FL) Heck (NV) Miller (MI)
 Coffman Hensarling Moolenaar
 Cole Hice, Jody B. Mooney (WV)
 Collins (GA) Hill Mullin
 Collins (NY) Holding Mulvaney
 Comstock Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Conaway Hultgren Neugebauer
 Cook Hunter Newhouse
 Costello (PA) Hurd (TX) Noem
 Cramer Hurt (VA) Nugent
 Crawford Issa Nunes
 Crenshaw Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Culberson Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (OH) Palmer
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam Paulsen
 Denham Jolly Pearce
 Dent Jones Perry
 DeSantis Jordan Peterson
 DesJarlais Katko Pittenger
 Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS) Pitts
 Dold Kelly (PA) Poe (TX)
 Donovan King (IA) Poliquin
 Duffy King (NY) Pompeo
 Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL) Posey

Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 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

NAYS—178

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)

Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bonamici
 Buchanan
 Castro (TX)
 Cohen
 Fincher
 Fortenberry
 Herrera Beutler

Reed
 Smith (WA)
 Joyce
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1649

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 237, noes 174, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—237

Abraham	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Allen	Garrett	McHenry
Amash	Gibbs	McKinley
Ashford	Gibson	McMorris
Babin	Gohmert	Rodgers
Barletta	Goodlatte	McSally
Barr	Gosar	Meadows
Barton	Gowdy	Meehan
Benishek	Granger	Messer
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Mica
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Miller (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)
Black	Griffith	Moolenaar
Blackburn	Grothman	Mooney (WV)
Blum	Guinta	Mullin
Bost	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Boustany	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Brady (TX)	Hardy	Neugebauer
Brat	Harper	Newhouse
Bridenstine	Harris	Noem
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Nugent
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Nunes
Buck	Hensarling	Olson
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo
Burgess	Hill	Palmer
Byrne	Holding	Paulsen
Calvert	Huelskamp	Pearce
Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Perry
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Pittenger
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Pitts
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Poe (TX)
Coffman	Issa	Poliquin
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Posey
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe
Conaway	Jolly	Reichert
Cook	Jones	Renacci
Costa	Jordan	Ribble
Costello (PA)	Katko	Rice (SC)
Cramer	Kelly (MS)	Rigell
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Curbelo (FL)	Kline	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Rokita
Denham	Labrador	Rooney (FL)
Dent	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Roskam
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rothfus
Dold	Latta	Rouzer
Donovan	LoBiondo	Royce
Duffy	Long	Russell
Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Love	Sanford
Ellmers (NC)	Lucas	Scalise
Emmer (MN)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Farenthold	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	Marchant	Sessions
Flores	Marino	Shimkus
Forbes	Massie	Shuster
Foxx	McCarthy	Simpson

Sinema	Turner
Smith (MO)	Upton
Smith (NE)	Valadao
Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Smith (TX)	Walberg
Stefanik	Walden
Stewart	Walker
Stivers	Walorski
Stutzman	Walters, Mimi
Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Thornberry	Webster (FL)
Tiberi	Wenstrup
Tipton	Westerman
Trott	Whitfield

NOES—174

Adams	Galleo
Aguilar	Garamendi
Bass	Graham
Beatty	Grayson
Becerra	Green, Al
Bera	Green, Gera
Beyer	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hahn
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)
Brown (FL)	Higgins
Bustos	Himes
Butterfield	Hinojosa
Capps	Hoyer
Capuano	Huffman
Cárdenas	Israel
Carney	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Jeffries
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Chu, Judy	Kaptur
Cicilline	Keating
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy
Clay	Kildee
Cleaver	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kind
Connolly	Kirkpatrick
Conyers	Kuster
Cooper	Langevin
Courtney	Larsen (WA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)
Cummings	Lawrence
Davis (CA)	Lee
Davis, Danny	Levin
DeFazio	Lewis
DeGette	Lipinski
Delaney	Loebsack
DeLauro	Lofgren
DeBene	Lowenthal
DeSaulnier	Lowey
Deutch	Lujan Grisham
Dingell	(NM)
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray
Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)
Duckworth	Lynch
Edwards	Maloney,
Ellison	Carolyn
Engel	Maloney, Sean
Eshoo	Matsui
Esty	McCollum
Farr	McDermott
Fattah	McGovern
Foster	McNerney
Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Fudge	Meng
Gabbard	Moulton
	Murphy (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei	Fleming
Bonamici	Fortenberry
Brownley (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Hudson
Castro (TX)	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Joyce
Cohen	Lieu, Ted
Fincher	Moore

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1655

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 71 on the Kelly of Illinois Amendment to H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 72 on the Duffy Amendment to H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 73 on the Grijalva Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 74 on the Takano Amendment to H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 75 on the Motion to recommit H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 76 on the final passage of H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 77 on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2017. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

My vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 78 on H. Res. 611—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2017—Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3442, DEBT MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3442, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the RECORD regarding my

vote during yesterday's consideration of the Democratic motion to recommit on H.R. 3293, rollcall 69. While my vote was recorded as "no," it was my intention to vote "aye," as I strongly support scientific research into causes and the prevention of gun violence.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 571

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 571.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING WEEK

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of National Court Reporting and Captioning Week, which is taking place next week.

Court reporters and captioners are highly specialized professionals who record our most important public events and provide vital closed-captioning services to nearly 48 million Americans.

My own parents met in court reporting school and went on to start a small, successful business. The training is rigorous. Certification requires one's ability to type at a rate of 225 words per minutes. A court reporter is transcribing this very moment in Congress.

The New Hampshire Court Reporters Association recently celebrated its 30th anniversary, but the profession's history in the United States extends much further. Because of court reporters, we have an accurate record of the first days of our country as our Founding Fathers drafted the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

I would like to thank court reporters and captioners for their service, enabling public participation in our democracy—a cornerstone of representative government in the United States.

□ 1700

TRIBUTE TO SANFORD "MAN MAN" HARLING III

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sanford Harling III, a widely known and well-loved 12-year-old from Norristown, Pennsylvania, affectionately known as "Man Man."

Sanford tragically died after he selflessly dove back into the flames of his own burning home to rescue his father, who was bedridden while recovering from hip surgery. Unbeknownst to Man Man, his father had already escaped through a second-story window.

Although this courageous 12-year-old never reemerged from the smoldering ruins of his home, his memory now resonates well beyond his community thanks to this remarkable act of heroism.

While the honor and recognition that Sanford deserves cannot return him to the embrace of his family, perhaps his shining example will inspire other deeds of lifesaving bravery and devotion. He will be forever remembered in our community and our country as a hero.

I offer my deepest sympathies to the Harling family and to everyone who knew and cherished this young man's character.

SUPREME COURT STAY ON CLEAN POWER PLAN

(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, every day hardworking American families are living with greater burdens placed upon them by their own Federal Government. As our constituents struggle to pay their bills and realize the American Dream, they do so under a weight of taxes and burdensome regulations from Washington.

This week, the working guy or gal actually got a reprieve from one of these costly burdens when the Supreme Court placed a stay on President Obama's so-called Clean Power Plan. The \$480 billion plan—yes, that is billion, with a B—would increase electric rates for millions of Americans. In Kansas, electric utility rates may spike by 30 percent.

At townhall meetings with constituents, I rarely have a constituent come up and ask for a 30 percent increase in their electric rates, yet Washington will make Americans foot the bill once again.

What do we get for the \$408 billion in hidden taxes and higher electric utility rates? A potential one one-hundredth of a degree reduction in global temperatures.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Supreme Court for placing a hold on this Big Government tax on my constituents. Finally, a win for the little guy.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT SECTION 702 AND SPYING BY NSA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the NSA is using a loophole in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to spy on Americans without a warrant. Under section 702 of FISA, government agents may seize information from databases on suspected foreign terrorists.

While seizing the information on these terrorists, NSA also seizes data

on Americans without a warrant, data that includes emails, texts, and voice communication. This is an unlawful interpretation of FISA.

It was never the intent of Congress that section 702 would be used to create databases of information that would later be searched for information on American citizens without a search warrant and without that individual's knowledge.

I have introduced legislation that would prohibit warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens.

The NSA has and will continue to violate the constitutional protections guaranteed to every American unless Congress acts. Until we fix this and make the law clear, citizens will never be sure or safe that their private conversations are secure from the eyes and spies of government.

The Bill of Rights cannot be trampled upon in the name of national security, whether the NSA likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring attention to the recent outstanding achievements of the University of Texas at Austin. This public university, which I represent, has continued to fulfill the Texas Constitution's mandate that UT be a "university of the first class."

I regularly meet with President Greg Fennes and Chancellor Admiral William McRaven. I would like to praise them for their continued dedication to upholding the core values of UT—particularly the students' and faculty's cutting-edge research and development of new technologies.

A top public university, UT has conducted \$650 million worth of innovative scientific and scholarly research. In the past few years, the Cockrell School of Engineering has invented new technologies, including a device that will improve physical therapy for patients recovering from spinal cord injuries.

The Dell Medical School, under the leadership of neurologist Dean Clay Johnston, is planning to reinvent medical education and healthcare thinking. They are transforming the way we learn about health.

The students at UT are taught by some of the most brilliant minds in the country. More than 200 members of the National Academies and 12 National Medal of Science recipients serve as UT professors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the University of Texas at Austin on these impressive accomplishments. Our country is proud of Texas' flagship university. What starts at the University of Texas truly does change the world.

I say, "Hook 'em."

In God we trust.

HONORING CLAIRE BENTON

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Claire Benton of Minnetonka for earning the Congressional Award Silver Medal. The Congressional Award is given by Congress to recognize initiative, service, and achievement in young people.

In order to earn the Silver Medal, Claire needed to complete over 400 hours in voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration. Claire served her community by volunteering at her local public library and spending time as a counselor at an adventure camp. She also reached the physical fitness goals by participating in cardiovascular and endurance activities that helped her increase her running distance from 8 miles to 20.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Award was established in 1979 in order to inspire young people like Claire and recognize their efforts to better themselves. Claire's hard work and dedication inspire other young people to become future leaders in service to their community.

Congratulations, Claire.

SUPREME COURT REJECTS
EXECUTIVE OVERREACH

(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, yesterday we saw the Supreme Court reject yet another of President Obama's executive overreaches.

The President's effort to unilaterally micromanage electrical power plants across the Nation, without any legal authority to do so, would drive up energy costs in virtually every community and nearly half a trillion dollars in additional costs.

In just the last few months, Federal courts have rejected the President's amnesty plan, his EPA's waters of the U.S. power grab, and now his power plant regulation. The message of these decisions is clear: the President should abandon his efforts to end-run around Congress, which in nearly every case have been found to violate the law, and work with Congress, the people's House, to address the issues facing our Nation.

JOB LOSSES IN THE COAL
INDUSTRY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of some recently laid-off coal miners from Somerset County, Pennsylvania.

For 7 years, President Obama has been targeting their jobs and, in the process, sacrificing the families and communities who depend on those jobs. The Obama Administration is using the EPA to conjure up regulations to all but eliminate a major part of the energy industry in western Pennsylvania.

What do you say to a hardworking, middle class dad, who has a wife, three kids, and a mortgage, whose livelihood has been taken away? This particular dad's job is but one of 40,000 jobs that have been lost in coal country. This assault on good, family-sustaining jobs is one of the reasons the average family income has never fully recovered from the Great Recession.

Yesterday, Fed Chair Janet Yellen testified about headwinds facing the economy. I suggest there are a number of manmade anthropogenic—to borrow a phrase—headwinds, and the EPA's regulatory assault is one of them.

Sacrificing the livelihood of hardworking Americans for some personal political philosophy is unconscionable. I will continue to fight against the President's war on middle class jobs.

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE
MICHAEL GARVER "MIKE" OXLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. I include in the RECORD two eulogies that many of us actually heard personally given in Findlay, Ohio, when we attended a very wonderful service for our colleague, Mike Oxley, recently. These two specific eulogies are from his son, Elvis, and from Jim Conzelman, who is his long-time devoted chief of staff.

[Jan. 5, 2016]

EULOGY OF MIKE OXLEY

O-H-I-O

My name is Michael Chadd Elvis Oxley, son of Patricia and Mike, husband to Jennifer, and father to Maximus Garver Oxley. I stand before you this afternoon to mourn the loss of and celebrate the life of my father.

As the joke goes, "How do you know if someone is vegan or does Cross Fit?" They'll tell you.

Bob Hope
Beachboy Al Jardine
Orville & Wilbur Wright
General William Tecumseh Sherman
Archie Griffin
Wendy's
Cooper Tire
Marathon Petroleum
Kroger

Victoria's Secret

You may have heard of these, they're from Ohio. And so was one Michael Garver Oxley.

Everyone in this church knows, on average, between 300-500 direct or indirect accounts of where my father's golf ball landed, what club was implemented at the time, and the associated weather conditions, so I won't focus on that today.

Looking back now, I see how supremely fortunate I am to have had Mike Oxley as my father. I can go to YouTube, LexisNexis or the Hancock County Historical Museum Oxley Government Center, click a button and see my father in action again. 99% do not have that beautiful blessing, and for that privilege I am thankful and humbled.

However, if I may make one request of you when you have a chance: I want your personal stories. Not for attribution, not for publication. I want the insider view into my father from your perspective. I want meat. For instance, a member of the Real Miami staff reached out to me and said how charmed she was that rather than sitting at the big donor table, Dad sat with the staff to ask them about their Miami experience, and it touched her heart. A former Member shared with me yesterday that Dad politely brokered a meeting between him and a Committee Chair so that a public flare up would soon be quelled and that closure could be reached on an important issue.

I know all too well where Dad's ball landed, or how the press statements were presented. I selfishly want this living history to be the very marrow on which I can chew when I miss him the most. I want more in a time when I have less.

When my father was, so we thought, in his final days in October, Dad pulled me close and reminded me that I tended to get things wrong the first time, but the second time I got them right. He told me he loved me and was proud of me, which is all I could have ever asked for.

My father and I had grown closer in my 30's once I had found the love of my life, earned my MBA, and started my own business—all things I did right the second time—our relationship elevated to a much higher level.

The next day Dad awoke and decided it was time to have cataract surgery. By that afternoon, with renewed ability to clearly see his Grandson and Buckeye football, Dad had a new zeal for life and a new inspiration to get better. Thank you, Dr. Harry, for extending my father's quality and quantity of life.

Quote: "When the New York Giants, a team you would give your right arm to beat, and vice versa, sends you a gift—that's something. When everybody down to the groundskeepers and those boys in white coats remember you with trophies—that's something. When you have a wonderful mother-in-law who takes sides with you in squabbles with her own daughter—that's something. When you have a father and a mother who work all their lives so you can have an education and build your body—it's a blessing. When you have a wife who has been a tower of strength and shown more courage than you dreamed existed—that's the finest I know."

"So I close in saying that I might have been given a bad break, but I've got an awful lot to live for."

Most of you may not know that quote because it is the third stanza after a much more memorable, pithy truth:

"Fans, for the past two weeks you have been reading about the bad break I got. Yet today I consider myself the luckiest man on the face of this earth. I have been in ball-parks for seventeen years and have never received anything but kindness and encouragement from you fans."—Lou Gehrig July 4, 1939.

To me, there could be no more fitting parallel to Dad on so many levels.

Dad's Bucket List was largely accomplished:

Retired the Roll Call Trophy

Visited most continents multiple times

Propelled significant legislation in telecom reform, brownfield cleanup, spectrum auction, fractions to decimals, terrorism risk insurance, and anti-fraud.

Mentored hundreds of aspiring politicians on both sides of the aisle.

Raised countless funds for charities and fellow candidates.

Rode an ostrich in Ohio, a camel in Egypt, and Air Force One with Reagan.

Fostered the love of golf in his grandson.

And shared all of these experiences with his life partner of 44 years.

He did everything he could to enjoy one last reunion, one last round of golf, and one last embrace of his family. It was that fighting spirit for which he was known in life as he will be in death.

I am so thankful for this outpouring of love and affection and on behalf of the Oxley family we sincerely appreciate you celebrating Dad's life today. This will not be easy for any of us for a while, but I know we will regularly convene over martinis (see thrus) in order to help one another through this. That would be Dad's will.

On the night before he passed, my father texted me "Are you awake?" which indicated he wanted me to check in on him. This was a simple request to fulfill and I did. Retrospectively, I look at that one layer deeper. "Awake" in the ancient Greek is "Gregorio" and it takes on a more metaphysical definition—conscious, active, focused, vigilant.

Thanks to you, Dad, I am awake. I am very awake.

Good afternoon friends and family of Team Oxley!

I am Jim Conzelman and had the honor serving as Mike Oxley's Chief of Staff from August of 1981 to January of 2007.

Pat, Chadd, Jennifer thank you from all of us for sharing "The Ox" with us for so many wonderful years.

Over the past couple of days, notes have poured in regarding the passing of our friend Mike Oxley. Allow me to read a couple of them to you.

"He was a dear friend, one of the true good guys . . . a rarity in this town, a man of integrity, a great American!" It goes on and on. Heartfelt notes that mean so much to this family.

Simply put, Mike was an extraordinary human being. He was comfortable in his own skin. I remember once Mike telling the staff they could schedule him in any event in the district, "just do not put me in blue jeans and boots and send me to a farm to talk AG issues. That dog won't hunt."

If you were to look at our office photo album, you would see Mike on many a farm in Ohio's Fourth Congressional District wearing slacks, white shirt with rolled up sleeves talking substantive AG issues with farmers. Mike was very comfortable. He was not a phony, it came through and they loved him. You can understand why.

He enjoyed people and respected them as human beings. In all the years I have known Mike I never heard him talk down or poorly about another person. This was especially true with his colleagues in the House. It just wasn't in his DNA to tear someone else down to make himself look better. He was as comfortable talking to friends and neighbors as he was to colleagues in the House, the Senate and even the President of the United States.

Mike won in a special election in 1981. President Reagan invited him to come to the

White House to meet and have a photo op in the Oval Office. Over breakfast he told son Chadd that he was going to meet the President. Chadd, ever the capitalist, gave Mike his autograph book and asked him to have the President sign it with just his name.

The meeting went very well, but ran way over schedule because of Mike's ability to connect with the President. He almost forgot to have the book signed but at the last minute remembered. That night at dinner Chadd was given his book back. To Chadd with best wishes Ronald Reagan. Chadd was not happy. "Dad I only wanted the President's name. Now with mine on the page it has decreased value if I want to sell it later."

Mike also connected with President George H. W. Bush. He talked to the President, then Vice President to come out to Ohio to do a political event. After the dinner speech, the Vice President and Mrs. Bush mingled with Mike and Pat's friends. The Oxleys had been asked to ride with the Bushes in the motorcade and return to Washington with them on Air Force 2. The Secret Service Agent had strict instructions . . . when the VP departs you must be with him. As time went by, Mrs. Bush left the room, Pat Oxley left the room, the Vice President left the room. Mike was engaged in conversation with friends and became totally engrossed in the conversation. Nothing else mattered to him at that time than talking to his friends. I told him . . . "sir you must leave."

"In just a minute", Mike replied. "No Mike NOW." He ran out catching the just as the motorcade pulling out. But that was the way Mike was. When he was talking to you, you were the most important person in the room and you knew it.

Another amazing attribute of Mike's was his optimistic outlook on life. Most of this optimism was due to his beautiful bride, Pat Oxley. Pat you never get enough credit for being the only one that kept Mike ever optimistic and grounded. Thank you PAT for all that you did.

Do you realize how difficult it was to be an upbeat Republican in 70's and 80's? House Republican's got beat ALL the time . . . in committee, on the floor of the House and even on the field with the Republican Congressional Baseball team.

But Mike was always the optimist. He knew we would eventually win and was always looking for opportunities that would help others in our great country . . . such as distant learning, telemedicine, saving Marathon Oil in his hometown of Findlay from a hostile takeover, keeping the Abrahams M-1 Tank in Lima from being mothballed and of course making corporate governance stronger with his signature Sarbanes Oxley legislation.

With each of these endeavors, Mike always came prepared. At any hearing, any markup, any meeting he always knew his facts and what to say and when to say it. Mike always made a point, but never at anyone's expense. He would show up on time or early to meetings because it was a right thing to do. You would usually find him chatting with staff or witnesses and would stay to the bitter end of a meeting or hearing long after most had left. He would look you straight in the eye and regale you with stories of that 4 letter word . . . golf, or baseball talking about his beloved Detroit Tigers or basketball in the House gym and beating Congressman Ed Markey, now Senator Markey in the free throw contest. It should be noted Mike never told us when Ed beat him in the contest.

He was always prepared with the follow up . . . returning phone calls, and thanking folks for their hard work. Many here today have legislative red-lines they worked on with personal thank you note from Mike.

One former staffer told me, "I was a no body and he thanked me. I will treasure this forever."

All of these Oxley attributes set an example whether it was professional or personal he always did the right thing.

Mike loved his family. First decision after being elected to Congress was moving Pat and Chadd to DC.

If you look at the official portrait Mike insisted on having the family photo in it. This was PJ and PM. (pre Jennifer Oxley and pre Max Oxley). If he was Chairman today, I know he would have figured out a way to have their likeness photo shopped . . . No artist shopped in.

All in all future politicians will go to campaign school to study and learn the Oxley Model.

Treating people as human beings and with respect. Being optimistic and looking for opportunities to leave this world a better place than you found it.

Being prepared to engage with life . . . showing up on time, thanking everyone, communicating face to face with people.

Setting an example by always doing the right thing.

HOPE . . . This is why he was a great Congressman, great Chairman and a great friend to all of us.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that the important thing is "not length of life, but depth of life." From his family to his friends to his accomplishments, I can't think of a person who led a deeper, fuller, richer life than Mike Oxley.

You all know Mike loved music . . . music of the 50's 60's 70's . . . 80's no so much. He could identify all the artists and could sing all of the lyrics. He was seldom wrong. Allow me close with a song that was #1 in 1973 that written and sung by the late John Denver. It goes like this—

Sunshine on my shoulders makes me happy,
Sunshine in my eyes can make me cry.
Sunshine on the water looks so lovely,
Sunshine almost always makes me high.
If I had a day that I could give you,
I'd give to you the day just like today.
If I had a song that I could sing for you,
I'd sing a song to make you feel this way.
If I had a tale that I could tell you,
I'd tell a tale sure to make you smile.
If I had a wish I could wish for you,
I'd make a wish for sunshine for you all the while.

Thank you Mike for touching our lives and making the sun shine on all of us.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mike Oxley, who served in this body for 25 years and who, sadly, passed away from lung cancer on January 1 of this year. Today would have been Mike's 72nd birthday, and he will be missed by those of us who had the pleasure and the honor of knowing him. I served with Mike in this House for 12 years, from 1995 to 2007, and I will always remember that time very fondly.

Mike Oxley was a lot of things: an attorney, an investigator, a leader, a competitor, an avid golfer, and so many more things. He was dedicated to serving his community and serving the people of the State of Ohio and the people of our entire country.

Mike graduated from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, in 1966. Speaker RYAN, my son, and many other distinguished people are graduates of Miami University in Oxford. Mike graduated with a degree in political science and

obtained his law degree from Ohio State University.

Following law school, Mike was a special agent with the FBI, working primarily in Washington, Boston, and New York. In that position, he learned a number of investigative skills that he would later use here in Congress.

After his time with the FBI, Mike returned to Ohio and began a private law practice, but he was called to service once again when he was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives in 1972. He served in the Ohio House until 1981, when he was elected to Congress in a special election to fill a vacancy upon the death of Congressman Tennyson Guyer. Mike would represent the people of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District for the next 25 years.

Upon his retirement from Congress in 2007, Mike continued to find ways to serve our Nation when he was in the private sector. He was a member of the board of trustees for the University of Findlay. He remained active at his alma mater, Miami University. Most recently, he was a senior adviser on the board of directors of NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc.

After being diagnosed with non-small cell lung cancer, a type of lung cancer usually affecting nonsmokers like Mike, he joined the board of directors of the Lung Cancer Alliance. He would dedicate much of his remaining time in fighting lung cancer, including serving as chairman of the Lung Cancer Alliance board, beginning in 2014.

Mike was a very good man. He really was. He was a family man. In fact, his wife, Pat; his son, Elvis; his grandson, Max; and other families members; as well as his chief of staff, Jim Conzelman, are with us in the gallery this evening.

As they know, he loved life. He had a very infectious laugh. He was a golf enthusiast. He loved sports of all sorts and regularly played pickup basketball with other Members.

For many who served with him, we will never forget his dedication to the congressional baseball team and the baseball game. He viewed the game as a chance for Members from both sides of the aisle to put aside their differences and engage in a friendly contest of America's pastime, all while raising money for charitable causes. But that didn't mean he didn't want to win. He did.

In fact, he was so dedicated to the game that he was always trying to recruit new players to improve the Republican's prospects on the diamond. Not surprisingly, in the eight games that Ox managed the Republican team, we beat the Democrats seven times. We have gone downhill from there.

At times, though, Mike's competitive streak may have gotten the best of him. In the 1994 game, Ox was playing first base when then-Representative, now-Senator SHERROD BROWN was racing to beat out a ground ball. As Ox reached for an errant throw, the two men collided and Mike broke his arm.

You would think that might discourage him from playing in the future, but the very next year there was Ox taking the field again and leading the Republican team.

That is who Mike Oxley was: a true competitor who never backed down from a challenge. Yet he approached challenges, whether it was the congressional baseball team or a divisive fight here on the House floor, with a positive, optimistic demeanor, a smile on his face, and usually a kind word for those in the opposition. Put another way, he would disagree without being disagreeable, which is an admirable trait and an invaluable skill in all areas of life.

Here is what I will remember most about Mike Oxley: he was a friend, a colleague, and, more importantly, he was a decent, genuine family man who was gracious and well-liked by everyone who had the pleasure of serving with him.

He will be missed.

□ 1715

To Mike's wife, Pat, his son Elvis, his grandson Max, and the entire Oxley family, please know that those of us who knew Mike are saddened by your loss, but we appreciate the time you allowed us to spend with him here in the United States Congress. You are in our thoughts and our prayers. God bless all of you.

There are many other Members who will be sharing some of their remembrances here during this Special Order. I would like at this point to turn to one of our colleagues also from Ohio who was a very, very good friend of Mike Oxley and just a great American himself, the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, how significant and beautiful that today, the day of Mike Oxley's birth, we celebrate his glorious and beautiful life. Thank you, Pat. Thank you, Chadd Elvis. Thank you, Jennifer and grandson Max. Thanks to all of you for sharing Mike Oxley with us, as Mr. CHABOT said: It was really a special, special honor.

I met the Ox when I was a senior in college, a congressional staffer for then Congressman John Kasich. I got asked to help staff an event that Congressman Oxley and Congressman Kasich did here in Washington, D.C. It was called a Washington Fly-In. Here this Congressman by the name of Mike Oxley met me and was as nice to me as he was to his colleagues at this fly-in, as a young guy who came in for this event from Ohio.

Ironic that 15 years later—we didn't know—that I would be his colleague. He treated me the same then, the same throughout the time that I knew Mike. The way that he treated people was kind of inspirational for a really important guy. He led in that way, too. His staff treated people, whether they be here in Washington or back in Ohio, with the same type of respect that their boss treated people.

After that election in 2000, we had a freshman orientation. I replaced the man that I had worked for in the 1980s and early 1990s, John Kasich. I was at this freshman orientation filling out this form for committee assignments.

Another Congressman from our delegation, who seemed to be the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, came up to me and said: Well, you know, just fill out that form and put Financial Services, a brand-new committee to be chaired by Mike Oxley, and Education and Workforce, a committee that is going to be chaired by me, as your committees because that is what you are going to get.

I said to then Congressman Boehner, well, Committee on Financial Services sounds really good, Committee on Education and the Workforce not so much.

So I filled out my form, and I put Committee on Financial Services among some other committees. I excluded Education and the Workforce. About 10 days later, I got my committee assignments, Committee on Financial Services and Committee on Education and the Workforce.

I told my new chairman, Mike Oxley, the story. I said: Was this thing wired? In his glorious, special way, he got that grin, and he just laughed, as Mike Oxley often did. He was such a cheerful guy. He was a special chairman.

I didn't realize then how lucky I was to have Mike Oxley as a chairman for 6 years on this brand-new committee. Every year that went by, more and more Members wanted to be on this committee. It was obviously an important committee, but they also wanted to be on a committee chaired by Mike Oxley. His disposition was great, but he also was such a team guy. It was just in his blood that he wanted to get things done, and he wanted to help the team, the team being our Republican Conference, the team being the Congress, the team being members of the Committee on Financial Services.

I remember one day we were doing a delegation meeting, and during the meeting Mike said: I am going to do an event for one of the members of our Committee on Financial Services. If you have nothing going on, why don't you join me? I am driving. We get into his car, and out blares Beach Boys music, which obviously was one of Mike's favorites.

As we are listening to the song, I am thinking how ironic, this makes so much sense. It made sense then; it makes sense now, going back to a simpler time. Mike was pretty simple in how he was a Congressman and how he was a chairman. It wasn't about him. It was never about him. That is why he was such a great mentor.

It was about moving the issues forward. He put newer members or subcommittee chairmen in charge of issues. He helped us through it. When the light shone, he ignored it. He shared it, he put us out in front. It was about the team.

As Mr. CHABOT mentioned, he was a great manager for the congressional

baseball team for the Republicans. He was a manager as our chairman. He was a great manager as our chairman. We learned a lot. We learned a lot from Mike Oxley—not just members of the committee, but staff members, so many people who have come through this building, who have come through the Rayburn Building. He was a mentor.

He made a lot of people who touched his life better. He made me better as a Member of Congress. He made me better as a person, and I appreciate that, Pat. We thank you for having you share him with us. God bless you all.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman. We greatly appreciate the gentleman's comments here this evening.

I now yield to another gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fellow Ohioan who had distinguished service in this body for 25 years and made a huge difference for everyday Americans for 25 years. Today would be his birthday, Congressman Mike Oxley, Chairman Mike Oxley, who made a huge difference.

I did not have the honor of serving with Congressman Oxley, but what I did have was a chance to meet him and have him be an adviser and a mentor. When I got here and got on the Committee on Financial Services, a committee that he was formerly the chairman of, he took me under his wing. He introduced me to hundreds of people. He helped me find my way here. He helped make sure I got on the path to being a good legislator. He did that, not really knowing me before that.

He became a great friend, a great mentor, and a great adviser. I am really thankful that he was willing to share his time and energy and talents with a guy like me. I want to thank his wife, Pat, his son Chadd, and all the whole Oxley family for letting him share his life, even after he left Congress, with folks who were coming in brand new, trying to make a difference.

He will be remembered as somebody who made a difference for all Americans who wanted to figure out how to make sure they could invest their life savings and not be taken advantage of. Obviously, the famous bill that bears his name was part of a bipartisan response to the Enron crisis. He deserves the credit for saving our financial system and making sure it was safe and sound in the future for all Americans.

He would always take on tough issues. He would always work with people across the aisle. That is who he was and what he did. He served the people of his district proudly, and he worked to bring people together. He was loyal, optimistic, and pragmatic. Even though he was a strong Republican, he would work with Republicans and Democrats to get things done. I think there is a lot that we could all emulate from Mike Oxley's service. We could learn a lot today and in the future.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Pat, and the entire Oxley family

during this difficult time. Even during his time when he had lung cancer, he was optimistic and happy and helping other people. I know he has got to be a tough guy to lose and not have around every day because he brightened everybody's day. I know I miss him, and I know you will miss him, and America misses Mike Oxley, and they should.

I hope that in saying good-bye today, we can honor his incredible legacy that he left and the difference he made for America into the future. I just want to remember Mike Oxley as the incredible patriot and friend and mentor that he was and say Godspeed, Mike Oxley.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman. This is a bipartisan evening, so I would now like to recognize our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to say some words for a very, very, very good man, Mike Oxley. When I came to Congress in the year of 2002, I was assigned to the Committee on Financial Services, and that is where I met Mike Oxley. Our lives intertwined. He was a tremendous help to me on that committee as I was breaking in.

I am very delighted, and it opened my eyes to a world which I was only dimly aware when he asked if I would join him as one of the Members to travel to Scotland and to Europe and to be able to visit and to sit with other bankers and financial people to learn the importance of finance, to learn how it is important for the United States to stay totally in front and to maintain our financial system as the most powerful system in the world.

In order to do that, you have to get across the world and talk with other financial systems. I found out, and it took me going over there to the Bank of Scotland to realize why Mike Oxley wanted to do that, because very few people knew—and I didn't know—that the Royal Bank of Scotland was the fifth largest bank in the United States. To go to Europe and to meet with the finance ministers in Europe, in Brussels, in Paris, and the reason for that was because there was the emerging markets of derivatives and swaps, which was just a burgeoning part of the economy. Now it is an \$800 trillion piece of the world's economy.

I went and learned so much there. We went to make sure that the United States had what would be seen as equivalency, to be able to deal with these other nations and their financial systems and banking systems. Then to come back, and roughly 8, 9 years later, and I am sitting now as the ranking member on the subcommittee in Congress that deals with derivatives and swaps. Quite honestly, ladies and gentlemen, when I went with Mike Oxley, I did not know what a derivative was.

Now, Mike and I became friends. When you travel with people, you get to know them, you get to share things

with them. I came back, and Mike Oxley comes to me one day. I am wondering what this is about.

He said: David, I have got to see you; David, I have got to see you.

I said: Mike, what is it? What is it?

He said: I heard that your brother-in-law is home run king Hank Aaron. Can I meet him?

Everybody knows that Mike Oxley loved baseball. He loved baseball I am sure almost as much as he loved politics. I know his family knows how much he loved baseball.

I said: Sure, sure.

It was a great evening when Hank came back up. I had dinner, and I invited Mike Oxley to join me and his guests with me and my wife and Hank Aaron, my wife's brother, for dinner at The Capital Grille. Ladies and gentlemen, what an evening that was. I mean, to be there and to hear Mike Oxley and home run king Hank Aaron talk baseball, two great Americans loving America's pastime.

I remember at one point Mike Oxley said: Hank, can I ask you a question?

So Hank said: Sure.

He said: Who was the toughest pitcher who ever pitched against you?

Hank said: All of them, all of them.

Mike said: All of them, all of them.

We would carry that story many times in our conversations.

He said: Oh, man, I will never forget that, when Hank said "All of them."

A great man. You know, we all live a life. There are three things that we all are going to see on that gravestone: the year we were born and the year we died, but then there is that other thing. There is that dash in the middle, and the question in everybody's life is, what did you do with your dash, that period from when you were born to when the Lord calls you home.

□ 1730

Mike Oxley did a tremendous amount. One of the things he did was touch my life. Mike Oxley helped me. Mike Oxley was my friend.

I know everybody joins me in saying from the bottom of our hearts to the family, to this Congress, to the people of America: We thank God for sending Mike Oxley our way.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank Mr. SCOTT for his tribute to our colleague and friend, Mike Oxley.

I learned something here this evening. I did not know that I had Mr. SCOTT's brother-in-law's picture up on my wall. He was here in Washington 15 years ago or so, and I was like a kid meeting one of his heroes. I got a picture with him, and it is hanging on my wall.

I yield to my colleague also from Ohio, Mr. LATTA.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, to Pat and Elvis, again, you have heard such great tributes not only at the funeral not too many weeks back, but this last week in the memorial service in Findlay, and with the Members here tonight.

I will go back. I can remember Mike's first race that he ran for the

Ohio General Assembly. I was in high school at the time. I used to drive my dad around the district, so we would run into each other quite often while we were campaigning.

I know that one of my aunts from Putnam County thought that Mike was just about perfect. She used to rave about Mike all the time. That is the type of person he was. He had an infectious smile, a great laugh, and he could connect with people.

As you have heard from many of the folks speaking here tonight, that is what made Mike such a great individual. He knew how to reach out and touch people and how to get those people to work together and make things actually work.

One of the times I will never forget is back in 1981, after Tenny Guyer passed away, the election was taking place that summer. I was studying for the bar at the same time, but I can still remember everything that was going on. They were tough times. Having gone through a special election myself, I know what those things are like. Mike was one of those kinds of individuals that things didn't affect him; he just went into it and got things done.

One of the things I mentioned just last week at the memorial service is what my dad taught me years ago. There are two types of people that get into public service. There are folks that want to be politicians and there are folks that want to be true public servants.

He said to always remember what the difference between a politician and a public servant is. A politician is a person who goes out there and sees how much they can take from the people they represent for their own benefit, while a public servant sees how much they can give of themselves back to the people they represent. That was Mike. He was that true, dedicated public servant.

With redistricting over the years, I have several of the counties that Mike represented. I can tell you that when I am out, it is quite often that I have people come up to me and tell me about something that Mike did for them. I don't care if it was Social Security, a veteran's case, or Medicare, you name it, people remember those things because Mike was out there. He was a very caring person because, again, he never forgot the folks back home.

When you talk about the folks back home, Mike never forgot his roots in Findlay, Hancock County. Hancock county is my dad's home county. There are great people that live there.

Mike and Pat were very, very generous to the University of Findlay and one of the buildings there. Mike, as the chairman mentioned, served on the Board of Trustees. He was very, very influential with his service. He gave of his time. He wanted to make sure he left things better than he found them. He did this with helping Miami University, his alma mater, and with the Findlay-Hancock Community Founda-

tion, where Mike and Pat were so generous in establishing a scholarship.

One of the things I would really like to talk about is that one of the things Mike really believed in was the Hancock Historical Society. They established the Mike Oxley Government Center. I remember the day the Center was dedicated not more than 2 years ago. Then-Speaker Boehner came up. It is one of those things that I think people need to go and see.

Again, Mike truly wanted to leave things better than he found them. He also believed the best way to do that is to educate our kids. There is an interactive center where people can go in—especially children—and learn about their government.

Mike said this is the greatest form of government that the world has ever seen. To make sure you have that government go on to the next generation, you have to make sure that the children and those students know what to do when they become adults. Sometimes it is too late once they become adults and don't learn these things.

At the Oxley Government Center, it is in perpetuity now. The children in Hancock will have that opportunity to learn about the greatest form of government the world has ever created and make sure that it does continue on. He really, truly believed that our children are our future.

To get into it again, as my dad said, you want to make sure that you are a true public servant, to give of yourself not 90 percent, not 100 percent, but 110 percent. That is what Mike did.

Again, that legacy is going to continue on because the people back home will never forget it. As I am out in the district that Mike represented, as I said, I hear it from his former constituents. It is not that they just like Mike, they loved him.

Again, Pat and Elvis, from the bottom of our hearts Marcia and I offer our deepest sympathies. The world was a much better place because Mike Oxley was in it.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his very nice remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Dr. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank Mr. CHABOT for his leadership on this issue.

It is funny that the gentleman should call me Dr. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, because I do have my doctorate from the University of Miami. One of the rivalries that I enjoyed with Mike Oxley is that he would wear this obnoxious Miami shirt whenever we were at the Congressional Baseball Team practice. I said: That is the fake Miami. I would wear my University of Miami T-shirt and he would remind me all the time that Miami University was the first.

I am so pleased and so honored to be part of this Special Order that has been organized by my dear friend, Mr. CHABOT of Ohio—he really is; we have such similar backgrounds—in remembrance of a colleague and a dear friend,

the late Congressman Mike Oxley. I am not from Ohio. As you heard, I am from Florida.

Mike and I served together here in the people's House for over 15 years. When I got here in 1989, Mike had already been serving for a few years, and I looked upon him with great respect. He was a man who was driven by his commitment to his constituents. I was always very impressed with that.

He served his great State of Ohio and our Nation with great dedication, integrity, and efficiency. These were qualities that were seen in his work throughout his years of service in the United States Congress.

As chair, as we heard, of the Financial Services Committee, Mike was known to reach across the aisle. You have heard speaker after speaker talk about how bipartisan he was in ensuring that every American could prosper.

He worked on bills ranging from the interest of the financial sector to the improvement of commerce to the enhancement of emergency management always with the consumer—always with the American people in mind. It was during his tenure that we were able to pass bills like the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act that allows consumers access to free credit reports, which reduces identity theft.

Mike Oxley was a born leader, a natural leader. He was coauthor of a bill that sought to fight corporate fraud. We thank him for that. He was guided by the principle of economic prosperity and what made America great. His legislative record and legacy speak for themselves.

He was a kind man. He was good to all of the Members. That is why so many of us are here saying good things about him. He deserves that and more. He was enthusiastic about public service. He had a work ethic that is sorely missed in the people's House.

I had a special relationship with Mike because, as I pointed out, he was a player and then manager of the Congressional Baseball Game, which I foolishly joined many years back when I was younger and thinner and fitter.

Encouraged by Mike, I actually became the first woman to get on base in this traditional game. Mike made sure that this charity—it really is a charity game—was able to generate thousands of dollars for various charities around this great town.

Though Mike is no longer with us, we should not be mourning the loss of a life, but celebrating an extraordinary life lived. May Mike's memory live forever in our hearts and in our minds.

Mr. CHABOT is doing the same thing that Mike Oxley would do by leading this great tribute to a Member of Congress. I thank Mr. CHABOT for his leadership.

And I thank Mike. I know that you are enjoying a good, cold beer and a great baseball game in heaven.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman very much for her very nice remarks this evening.

I yield to another Buckeye, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), chairman of the Freedom Caucus and a dear colleague of ours.

Mr. JORDAN. Normally, I don't have prepared remarks when I come to the floor, but I thought when you are honoring someone like former Congressman Oxley, it is best to have them in written form.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Ohio and across the Nation in paying tribute to former Congressman Michael G. Oxley, who passed away at the beginning of the year after a battle with lung cancer. I thank my colleague from Cincinnati, Mr. CHABOT, for putting together this Special Order on what would have been his 72nd birthday.

Mike was one of the finest and most respected public servants Ohio has ever known. He was tireless in his promotion of his hometown of Findlay and all of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District: its people, businesses, and institutions.

His work on behalf of Lima's Joint Systems Manufacturing Center, commonly known as the Tank Plant, helped preserve that vital facility and its skilled workforce for a long, long time, ensuring that it remains open today to make the armaments that our Armed Forces need to keep our great country safe.

I am grateful to my colleagues who have already spoken about some of Mike's many accomplishments. I want to share something perhaps lesser known about this individual: his long-time connection to Buckeye Boys State, a week-long educational exercise for high school boys hosted by the American Legion of Ohio.

Mike attended this program as a young man, and always said that it helped prepare him for a career in public service. From 1978 through 2006, he was the keynote speaker at the graduation ceremony—an event that he often said was one of his favorites of the year.

In these speeches, he encouraged Boys Staters to develop a clear vision, set high goals, work hard, and act with integrity at all times. These life lessons, no doubt, inspired the many thousands of young men who have had the privilege of attending Boys State during that timeframe. Mike took great pride in being inducted into the Buckeye Boys State Hall of Fame, an honor shared by a select few, among them being Neil Armstrong.

Of course, the titles Mike held most dear were of husband, father, and grandfather. Our prayers continue to go out to his family. I know they are joining us here today. We offer them our sincerest condolences at this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, we remain grateful that decent men like Mike Oxley are willing to commit their lives to public service and to inspire others to do the same.

□ 1745

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I thank Chairman CHABOT for the opportunity to visit this day about our friend and old colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this body in May of 1994 in a special election; and I can't remember whether it was that day or the next day or the day after, but that is when I met Mike.

He had a way of charming and disarming you, a way of being warm. Mike, from that very first moment, referenced me as "Big Frank." Now, I am not sure whether he was representing height or girth, but that was his affectionate term.

He noted to me in that first conversation we had that he, too, had been a "special election baby" and that I was pursuing the route that he pursued, not coming in as a part of a big class, but coming in by myself, as he had done in 1981, getting to know the Members, working the way to the committee that I would want to be on, as he had done.

He had a very open-arms sort of a fashion. Now, I will confess that, even at that point, I understood in those days, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, an E&C guy, the unique nature of that committee. But he was always kind and warm to me.

And when, as the result of a great compromise—actually, a statement, when we became a part of the majority then not that many months later—because Mike had served in the minority from 1981 until we became the majority in 1995, in January. He had served in the minority. He understood both sides of the perspective.

Ultimately, in the great compromise of 2001, when he came to be chairman of what used to be the Banking and Urban Affairs Committee, the Financial Services Committee, and brought substantial new jurisdictions to the committee, Mike made a huge difference.

Suddenly, it went from the committee that Members wanted off of to one of those committees that everyone wanted to be on. Suddenly, it became a committee of action that wasn't just a constant battle over whether Karl Marx or Adam Smith was right, but a committee that made a difference.

And the way he worked with both Republicans and Democrats, the way he addressed the crises that we dealt with—Sarbanes-Oxley being a major example of a piece of reform legislation that no one ever thought would occur; that was Mike Oxley.

As my friends have said before and my friends will say after me, an amazing fellow, a charming personality, a kind of individual that I would describe as an old-school Member of Congress, an old-school chairman.

What do I mean by that? Someone who cared about this place and cared

about the Members. Sometimes that is absent now in what we do. But he cared about the institution, and he cared about the membership. He cared about the country, and it was demonstrated in his work product.

I am a better person, a better Member of Congress, for having served with Mike from the day I walked in here in 1994 until his retirement at the end of 2006, a better Member.

I think this place is better for him having been a Member.

The only regret I have is that there are not more Mike Oxleys out there; there are not more Mike Oxleys out there. But, you know, his legacy, I think, should lead all of us to try and emulate the way he conducted himself, the way he focused, the way he worked. If we do that, then his spirit will live on.

Again, Chairman CHABOT, thank you for the opportunity to come and visit about my friend and the fellow that I served with for half of his career in Congress.

And to the family, thank you for having shared him with us for all those years, all those years. Thank you.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his tremendous remarks here this evening. And we really do appreciate his recollection of his time shared up here with Mike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio especially for taking the time to organize this very appropriate tribute to Mike Oxley.

Do you ever get one of those people that you walk into a room and you make eye contact, and you just get a smile on your face? That was Mike Oxley.

It was just that moment which, that sense of fun was part of that original contact. And I can remember it as fresh today, the first time I met Mike Oxley.

But it wasn't as a Member of Congress that I really became aware of Mike Oxley. It was some years ago, in a previous time, when I had been a United States attorney serving in the Department of Justice.

It was a very serious time for our country because it was in the immediate aftermath of the Enron crisis, one in which Americans all over the country, and many small investors, began to have a concern about the integrity of the very institutions which they had entrusted some of their resources.

As a member of the United States Attorney's Office, I was appointed by the President to be sitting with other U.S. attorneys and a number of cabinet members on something called the Corporate Fraud Task Force. It was the group, under the auspices of Michael Chertoff, which was responsible for initiating the investigations and the prosecutions into those who had committed the corporate misdeeds.

But, at the same time, we were aware that while we were going backwards

and looking at conduct that had taken place, the real challenge was moving forward. How do you instill a sense of confidence back in the very institutions which people have relied on for their economic confidence?

It was a guy on a committee here in Washington, D.C., who understood the essence of what this was all about. And it wasn't a huge, 2,000-page bill with all kinds of regulations en gros; it was a bill that was built on a very simple principle.

I think, in many ways, it reflected who Mike Oxley was, from his days as an FBI agent, but somebody who knew that, when you were in a position of power or responsibility, you had that responsibility to those below you, and your obligation and your word needed to be connected with that.

And when it really drilled down it, that was the essence of what Sarbanes-Oxley was all about, the idea that you would certify, if you were the fiduciary, that you knew the accuracy but, really, the underlying integrity of that information because it represented the little people.

So when I came to see Mike Oxley for the first time, and it was by the good fortune to be part of something called the Ripon Society, and his former chief of staff, Jim Conzelman, runs that program. And I was invited in, as a young freshmen Representative, to become part of this organization which has a tremendous purpose.

You see a guy named Mike Oxley for the first time. You know of him, but you have never really met him. And I think about that reputation. Gee, this guy is a pretty important guy. What it is going to be like?

But he is the kind of guy that sits you down and says: Hey, why don't you sit here and have a cup of coffee with me. And it's a funny story about a golf game he may have had, a couple of observations about some of the things you might be thinking about as a young Member of Congress, and an arm around your shoulder and says: If you ever need me, let me know. I'm happy to be there for you.

Anytime I ever saw Mike Oxley from that point forward, it was that same sense, a little smile, probably a little story about his last round of golf, and always a warm feeling.

Mike is going to leave quite a legacy. But when you think about what it stands for, the two things that I saw in him in the very end, first and most significantly, the work that he had done with that bill which will not only bear his name moving forward but will forever leave that sense of responsibility and integrity associated with our fiduciary responsibilities in that financial space.

But it was also this powerful guy, Mike Oxley, who used that influence that he had, after he had contracted cancer, to turn that into a positive and make that a part of his mission in life, to use that influence he had to gather other people around him who were pow-

erful and wealthy and, otherwise, to focus on moving forward with finding the way that we can continue to treat and ultimately cure those with cancer.

It is a tremendous legacy and one in which I would hope any one of us, as one of my previous colleagues had said, we wish that we could fill that dash between the beginning of life and the end of life with such fullness, with such integrity and such fun.

Thank you, Mike, for what you did for all of us.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for his very poignant remarks this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON). And one of the things that JOE BARTON is known for—he is known for many, many things around here—but one of the things he is known for was when Mike Oxley was no longer the coach of the baseball team, he turned over the reins to JOE BARTON.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate being one of the eulogists for Mike Oxley.

I am going to go at this a little bit differently than the other speakers. I am going to talk about Mike Oxley as the baseball player and manager of the Republican baseball team.

I didn't get here until 1985. I assume that Mike immediately became the starting first baseman for the Republican baseball team when he got elected in the special election.

The photograph to my left shows the baseball team from 1992. And in his beloved Cincinnati Reds uniform, next to some skinny kid from Texas, is Mike Oxley. Carl Purcell of Michigan was our manager. I was on that team. Mike was on that team. Dan Schaefer of Colorado, who later became the manager; Jack Fields; Jim Nussle; Governor John Kasich, who is now running for President; CHRIS SMITH, who is still in the House; Rick Santorum, who later became a Senator and a Presidential candidate; Dean Gallo. And the skinny guy on the very left is the current chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, FRED UPTON.

Mike was a hard-hitting first baseman. He was a very good player. And my favorite story on the baseball team, we were playing out in Virginia at the old Four Mile Run Park, and we weren't playing in the fancy Nationals Stadium like we are today.

Mike was in his customary position at first base. I was the pitcher. They hit a pop fly down the first base line. And the Democratic runner who had hit the fly was running to first base, and he ran into Mike.

Mike fell to the ground. He didn't catch the pop fly, and he began writhing around on the ground, holding his wrist.

You know, we have to be honest. Mike was known as somewhat of a jokester and a prankster, and I thought he was kidding. I didn't think he had hurt himself. So I went over and kind of kicked him in the ribs and said, get

up, let's get going. He said: No, no. I'm hurt. I'm hurt.

They took him to the bench, and we finished the inning. Even when we got over onto the bench, he was still holding his wrist. And I kidded him again. I said: Mike, come on. You have got to get back in the game.

Well, they took him to the emergency room; and, as his wife, Pat, knows, he had broken his wrist. He actually broke his wrist. So from then on, I never kidded him about things like that.

When Dan Schaefer, who was the manager right before Mike Oxley, retired, the tradition on the baseball team is that the current manager picks the next manager.

□ 1800

So Dan Schaefer called Mike and me into his office and said: Which one of you two wants to become the next manager?

We both said that we wanted to become the next manager. Mike had seniority on me by 2 years—maybe 3 years.

I said: Well, I will be the assistant coach, and, Mike, you can be the manager if that is the way Dan wants to do it.

Mike looked at me, and he said: I will only do it one time.

I said: Okay.

Well, that one time turned out to be about 12 years. He was the manager for 12 years. Every year he would say to me: Joe, this is the last one, the last one.

But about the time he became manager, we became the majority. We elected a bunch of really good baseball players: J.C. Watts, who had been an all-American quarterback at Oklahoma; Steve Largent, who was in the NFL Hall of Fame; Chip Pickering; Zach Wamp—really good players. So we won 10 or 11 games in a row against the Democrats, and Mike enjoyed being the winner. So as those guys began to retire, Mike decided that it might be time to turn it over.

I have right here the last trophy that the Republicans won. It is true that we actually used to win baseball games. We have lost six in a row. But when Mike was the manager, we won, I think, 10 or 11 in a row. The trophy is in my office. There is Mike Oxley, the manager, and JOE BARTON, who is the assistant coach, the last trophy that the Republicans won.

He was a great manager, he was a great player, and he was a great guy.

Now I want to switch over from his baseball career to his legislative career. He is remembered as the chairman of what we now call the Financial Services Committee. Before that, Mike was on the Energy and Commerce Committee. When the Republicans took the majority in 1995, Tom Bliley became the chairman. Mike Oxley became one of his subcommittee chairmen, one of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee chairmen. I served on Energy and Commerce with Mike Oxley.

He was an excellent subcommittee chairman. He did his homework. As has been pointed out, he was very bipartisan. He worked with the others, the Democrats, on the other side of the aisle.

After Tom Bliley retired, we term-limited our chairmen to three terms or 6 years. So in 2001, we had to pick a new chairman for Energy and Commerce. Billy Tauzin had been on the committee as a Democrat. He had switched parties and was a Republican. So the top two contenders to be chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee were Mike Oxley of Ohio, longtime Republican, excellent legislator, and Billy Tauzin of Louisiana, who had been a Democrat and then became a Republican.

It was a pretty hotly contested race. It divided the committee. It divided the House. I was on the steering committee at the time representing Texas. It was a close vote. Billy Tauzin was picked to be chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee; but because of the esteem and respect that Mike Oxley was held in—he had served on what was called the Banking Committee, but he had never been a subcommittee chairman—he was elevated to be chairman of the Banking Committee and given the securities jurisdiction that had long been at Energy and Commerce, renamed the committee the Financial Services Committee, and he became the chairman of the Financial Services Committee and did just an outstanding job there. Sarbanes-Oxley is probably the most notable legislative achievement in his tenure as chairman.

He was a great person and a good friend. I never saw him down or unhappy. He was great on the floor, he was great in committee, and he was a super guy on the baseball field.

After he retired, he continued to frequently come by and visit when we were practicing. When he became ill, he kept a very, very upbeat demeanor. The last time I talked to him on the telephone was right before he passed, and by that time he couldn't speak—or he couldn't speak very well. He could just whisper.

He said: I appreciate you calling.

I told him I loved him.

I really respect Mike Oxley. He helped me a lot as a young Congressman. We had a lot of fun on the baseball team. He was a great legislator. His family should be very proud of him. He will be missed. We will also honor him.

Hopefully this summer, if he is looking down from Heaven, he will watch us beat the Democrats, and we will finally begin the Oxley winning tradition again in the charity baseball game.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

There are so many Members that have had an opportunity to speak here this evening. We only had an hour, unfortunately, and we would like to go on a lot longer, but our hour is nearly up.

So let me just conclude by saying to Mike's family—his wife, Pat; his son, Elvis; and to his grandson, Max, whom he loved so much; and to all his family, including Jim Conzelman, his chief of staff, who was actually, let's face it, family, and to all the other family members—I think you all know by the testimony, the reflections, and the personal stories that you heard here this evening that Mike really was a beloved figure in this House, the people's House. He will be missed. He will be long remembered. We know that you all love him very dearly, and we loved him too.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Ohio and across the nation in paying tribute to former Congressman Michael G. Oxley, who passed away at the beginning of the year after a long battle against lung cancer. I thank my colleague from Cincinnati, Mr. CHABOT, for putting together this special order in Mike's honor on what would have been his 72nd birthday.

Mike was a friend, mentor, and one of the finest and most respected public servants Ohio has ever known. He was tireless in his promotion of his hometown of Findlay and all of Ohio's Fourth Congressional Districts—its people, businesses, and institutions. His work on behalf of Lima's Joint Systems Manufacturing Center (commonly known as the Lima Army Tank Plant during most of Mike's time in office) helped preserve that vital facility and its skilled workforce throughout the 1980s and 1990s, ensuring that it remains open today to make the armaments that our armed forces need to keep our nation safe.

I am grateful to my colleagues who have already spoken about some of Mike's many accomplishments. I want to share something perhaps lesser known about him: his longtime connection to Buckeye Boys State, a weeklong educational exercise for high school boys hosted by the American Legion Department of Ohio. Mike attended this program as a young man and always said that it helped prepare him for a career in public service. From 1986 through 2006, he was the keynote speaker at the annual Boys State graduation ceremony—an event that he often said was one of his favorites of the year. In these speeches, he encouraged Boys Staters to develop a clear vision, set high goals, work hard, and act with integrity at all times. These life lessons no doubt inspired the many thousands of young men who attended Boys State during that time.

Mike took great pride in being inducted into the Buckeye Boys State Hall of Fame—an honor shared by a select few, among them Neil Armstrong. Of course, the titles he held most dear were those of husband, father, and grandfather. Our continued prayers go out to Mike's wife, Pat; their son, Chadd; daughter-in-law, Jennifer; and grandson, Max. We offer them our sincerest condolences at this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, we remain grateful that decent men like Mike Oxley are willing to commit their lives to public service and to inspire others to do so.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of former Congressman Mike Oxley from Ohio.

I had the pleasure of serving with Congressman Oxley on the House Financial Services Committee. Under his leadership as Chairman, the Committee pursued a pro-growth economic agenda, protected American consumers, and conducted robust oversight of Washington's regulatory agencies.

Congressman Oxley was a true American patriot that dedicated his life to public service and helping his constituents in Ohio. His passion for America was profound. This legislative body and the institution of Congress became a better place because of his service and legacy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending our thoughts and prayers to the Oxley family. May God Bless the Oxley's and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in remembrance of former Representative Mike Oxley.

As a valued member of this Chamber, Representative Oxley represented Ohio's Fourth District for over twenty-five years and served as Chairman of the Financial Services Committee. As only a freshman Member of Congress on his committee, Chairman Oxley met with me and helped me pass the Life Insurance Fairness for Travelers (LIFT) Act, which prohibited discrimination by life insurance companies based on travel to Israel and other countries without an actuarial analysis of risk. It was one of the first bills I passed in Congress, and his respect and inclusion of the minority Members of our committee taught me that things could indeed get done across the aisle. It is a lesson I have not forgotten.

Many remember Representative Oxley for his tireless efforts in passing the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. This law was and continues to ensure our confidence in public corporations and financial reporting in the private sector.

However, more than his legislative accomplishments, I remember him for his involvement in the Congressional Baseball Game—an annual tradition that brings Members of both parties together for a good cause.

No matter what he was involved in, Chairman Oxley was a fair and decent man who ensured all Members felt respected. As a cancer survivor, his loss to cancer is even more heartbreaking and makes me more determined to fight to defeat this deadly disease. Mike Oxley's work, integrity and passion for public service bettered both the Congress and our nation.

It is with great pleasure that I honor Representative Oxley.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Congressman Mike Oxley, who dedicated his career to protecting average citizens from special interests.

During his 25 year tenure in the House of Representatives, and as Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, he tirelessly led investigations of major corporations like Enron. Congressman Oxley's 2002 Sarbanes-Oxley Act reformed corporate oversight in this country.

Congressman Oxley also worked on telecom issues in Congress; helping usher in policies that support our current mobile economy. He helped sponsor legislation to authorize the first ever spectrum auctions, an issue that continues to drive innovation today.

Congressman Oxley also dedicated his life to our country by serving as a FBI agent before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Most of all, Congressman Oxley was a wonderful colleague working hard with both parties to represent his constituents in the best way possible. He will be greatly missed.

On a personal note, Mike and Pat and Bob and I were personal friends. We got to know each other “back in the day” when members of Congress saw each other socially.

Even though we came from different parties, it didn’t make a difference when it came to friendship. At that time I was a Congressional spouse, so Pat and I got to know each other well and participated actively in Congressional spouse activities. Our sons also got to know each other when we took bipartisan trips to places like New York.

In fact, I remember one funny incident when the two families were together on a Congressional Arts Caucus trip to New York City. As we were riding around, touring on a bus, our sons Brian and Elvis, 10 years old at the time and dressed in their blue blazers, hopped off the bus and started walking down the street. Bob and Mike, alarmed, jumped off the bus and ran after them. They finally caught up with them and asked them what they were doing. The boys calmly replied and said that “they were all dressed up and ready to see the town!” We had such a laugh recalling those days in subsequent conversations.

When I think of Mike Oxley, I think of family and the joy he had with Pat and Elvis. We will all miss him.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I start, let me extend my condolences to those who are mourning the death of our former Congressman. That was 60 minutes’ worth of very, very nice tribute.

As I am sure all of my colleagues are aware, we are now in primary election season. This year the American people will elect a new President of the United States. Unfortunately, there is a great possibility that hundreds of thousands of Americans will be barred from casting their vote because of this body’s failure to act.

In 2012, I watched, horrified, as voters were forced to stand in outrageous lines at their polling places. Meanwhile, States across the country have set up new barriers to voting, cutting back on early voting hours, and adding difficult new identification hurdles that limit young people and communities of color more than anyone else—and this as we call ourselves the model

of democracy for the whole world to follow.

Instead of embracing every possible opportunity to improve and facilitate one of the cornerstones of our democracy, we are allowing it to crumble. There is quite a bit to fix, yet Congress isn’t willing to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, our States have wildly different voting systems. Early voting is allowed some places but not others, same-day registration is offered in one State but not in the next. I can think of few better tasks for Congress to take on than to set standards for Federal elections, at a minimum, and to provide the biggest possible opportunity for our constituents to pick the people that represent them.

We have Americans that have made mistakes in their pasts but have completed their sentences for nonviolent convictions. They have put in their effort to change and have come back to society as tax-paying, law-abiding citizens. Unfortunately, we ban millions of these Americans from the ballot box despite their rehabilitation. It seems to me that Congress should get involved in offering individuals like those one of the most fundamental rights that we have as Americans—but we are not.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a conversation for this body to have about technology. Smartphones and other mobile devices have fingerprint sensors. I can wave a key fob over a terminal and pay for lunch without swiping a credit card or even signing my name. I acknowledge that there are very real challenges we face in bringing technology to the ballot box, but we should be talking about how we can use digital advances to expand access instead of trying to manufacture excuses to limit access.

Right there alone, there are three steps we could take on voting rights in our Nation.

Unfortunately, we can’t even begin these discussions because we seem to have traveled back to a dark place in our Nation’s history when it was both legal and common to limit access to polling places. Despite so many opportunities to move forward, we are rolling backward.

Since 2010, 22 States have passed laws that make it more difficult for Americans to vote, most commonly in the form of voter ID laws that disproportionately impact communities of color, women, seniors, students, and low-income individuals.

Unfortunately, the Voting Rights Act, which had previously curtailed these dangerous restrictions, was gutted in 2013 by the Supreme Court. In the so-called first-in-the-nation primary held this week in New Hampshire, voters encountered new ID laws for the first time, a law that allowed poll workers to vouch for voters without approved IDs and gives them the leeway to discriminate against some voters while validating others. Laws like the one in New Hampshire were passed to protect elections from voting

fraud—a specter that Republicans have used time and again to scare Americans into thinking that some dark figure is hijacking their election, a notion that has been discredited and disproved time and again.

Between 2002 and 2005, the Department of Justice made prosecuting voter fraud a top priority. In that timeframe, hundreds of millions of votes were cast; yet only 38 cases were brought to trial, and then only one involved impersonation fraud, which is what photo ID laws protect against.

More recently, a professor at the Loyola University Law School has tracked every allegation of voter fraud since 2000 and has found just 31 cases—just 31 cases—of impersonation. That is 31 ballots out of more than 1 billion that have been cast. The fact of the matter is the kind of intentional shady voter fraud these laws were based on simply did not exist.

Mr. Speaker, of the many tasks this body has, protecting the right to vote, the foundation that built our democracy, the right for which countless Americans have fought over the course of a more than 200-year history, protecting, expanding, and strengthening that right seems like it should be one of our greatest priorities.

I hope that my colleagues can begin to see that also and to join me and many of my colleagues on the Democratic Caucus in taking action that will facilitate, expand, and provide opportunities for every eligible person who can vote to be able to vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am delighted to follow the gentlewoman from New Jersey, focusing on the Congressional Progressive Caucus’ commitment to ensuring every American can vote.

Might I add that we have worked together with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, we have worked together with the Congressional Black Caucus, and we have worked together with the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the entire House to be committed to the very values of this Nation. This should not be a Republican or Democratic issue, of which it has become. We stand here as Democrats arguing for the empowerment of voters all over the Nation, yet legislative initiatives have been introduced by members of the Judiciary Committee and others. I have joined a number of those legislative initiatives, and these initiatives cannot be heard and cannot be voted on.

The American people need to know that. There is no other reason than the Republican majority does not want to have empowered voters.

This is unlike what we did in years past. I have had the privilege of being on the House Judiciary Committee for a number of years, and the most powerful and moving experience was—and there have been many experiences on the House Judiciary Committee—when all of us came together to help write the restoration or reauthorization of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

□ 1815

It was a very emotional and tearful moment. It was a moment of great extensiveness—15,000 pages of testimony; many, many, many witnesses; individuals explaining how precious it is to vote; but, more importantly, how not having protection for the vote can, therefore, disallow them to vote.

I guess the most provocative experience was a Republican President being joined by Republican and Democratic Members on a joyful sunny day signing the legislation that reauthorized the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, that bill exhibits, if you will, the pain and suffering of so many who marched and marched and marched and marched. Not only did they march, they died, like Jimmie Lee Jackson. Or our own colleague from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, who reminds us every day of the fear and feeling of being beaten near to death in his march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama.

He also reminds us how precious the right to vote is. When Dr. Martin Luther King, who refused to give up or give out or give in, marched again, and they made it—with so many people from all backgrounds and all over the Nation—to Montgomery, Alabama, on that fateful trip back, everyone was celebrating that they had marched for the Voting Rights Act, that they had gotten through without violence—attributable, of course, to a Texas President by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

When a wonderful, wonderful lady—whose children I had the privilege of meeting—was driving back some foot soldiers, whom we will honor shortly at the leadership of TERRI SEWELL, when they were driving back and Viola Liuzzo was behind the wheel, lo and behold, somebody violently took a gun and killed her.

Voting has never been easy. Voting rights has never been easy. A lot of blood was shed.

It baffles me why we are faced with a situation where the United States Supreme Court eliminated section 5—not an illegal provision, but a provision that somebody disliked because, I believe, it empowered voters.

What the Congress was tasked to do by the Court, which I think incorrectly and wrongly ignored 15,000 pages of testimony, ignored tens upon tens of witnesses in a meticulous rewriting of the Voting Rights Act to prove that it was still necessary, in a skewed deliberation, the Supreme Court decided to reject it, indicating that it was long passe.

And, of course, some brilliant legislators used the example: because we have eliminated polio because of the vaccination, is it appropriate to get rid of the vaccination?

No, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

So with that skewed and, if I might use the term, weird reasoning, we are left holding the bag and the door is open to the kinds of laws, such as voter ID laws, that spread across America like a contagious disease because we did not have the protection of section 5, which the idea of section 5 was a preclearance for men and women of goodwill to look and determine whether or not a procedure was going to block individuals from voting.

Of course, the voter ID law from Texas sprung up. You will soon hear from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my dear friend and colleague, because he was, in fact, the leader on the lawsuit.

Let me say that that terrible law blocked a lot of people from voting.

I want to remind people that the day of August 6, 1965, in the presence of such luminaries as the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, Whitney Young of the National Urban League, James Forman of the Congress of Racial Equality, A. Philip Randolph, JOHN LEWIS, Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Everett Dirksen—mind you, a lady was missing, but, in the event, many women were foot soldiers.

The point was made on the Voting Rights Act:

The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men.

In this instance, I would modify it and say “women.”

When the voting ID law—because of the misgivings of the State of Texas and its legislature—was put in place, there were 80 counties at least in Texas that did not have a Department of Public Safety office for individuals to be able to register or to be able to get an ID. That is a tragedy. Each moment there is something coming out of Texas that wants to, in essence, put down the rights of individuals to vote.

One case that should be brought to our attention is a case before the Supreme Court that indicates a group of petitioners who don't like the fact that you represent a population of people. So they want to characterize and get a definition of what a person means, and they want to make that person be an eligible voter.

So, in essence, a sick person laying in a bed who needs health care and needs to be represented is not an eligible voter. Or a senior citizen that has gotten so old and feeble that they may not have been registered because of their illness and their feebleness, but they need to be represented. Or it may be a child—Hispanic, African American, Anglo, or Asian—who is not at the age of voting and they are not an eligible

voter. Or, as I know they are focusing on, is hardworking individuals who happen to be immigrants and they are not yet eligible to vote.

And this case is brought primarily to make sure that those people who need to be represented to the extent that they are taxpayers but are not yet status, they will not be counted.

This case is not anything to do with voter fraud. These people are not trying to vote. They are just trying to survive. But you are telling me that they are human beings, and this case is suggesting that they cannot be represented.

This is the devastating impact of not having voter protection in section 5.

So I rise today to ensure that it is heard throughout the land: We can pass voter restoration, voter advancement. We can pass fixing the Voting Rights Act and restoring section 5.

There are many people in this Congress who previously were here when we stood with President Bush, a Republican, and Republicans and Democrats 98-1, 98-2 in the Senate, massive support in the House, to restore the Voting Rights Act.

Let me ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Why now? Why are we struggling in this Presidential year not to allow people to vote?

Let me close my remarks because we could go on with—how should I say it—the irony and, as well, the wrongness of not passing legislation. But let me say this in closing:

Redistricting is a result of the Voting Rights Act. Those of us in Texas are still in litigation—for 20 years some of us—on the question of redistricting and making fair districts where all people are represented.

And the gerrymandering that has been done, that disallows and disenfranchises whole chunks of minorities, disallowing them from voting for the person of their choice, do you know what it brings about? It brings about this House in the majority—good friends of mine—having the sheer gall to deny the President's representative of the Office of Management and Budget to present the President's budget. In its 41-year history, that has never happened.

But because we have these districts that are drawn, not representing the vast numbers of people who should be able to hear the President's statement about his budget, by having his representative, the OMB Director, come before Congress and speak about what the President is trying to do: reducing the deficit, providing for education, protecting health care, job creation, economic security, universal access to child care, education for all, year-long Pell Grants, all of that, and a national security for peace—we can't hear from the OMB Director because of the skewed redistricting that allows for the majority to be so overwhelmingly in charge that they would deny the normal processes of government.

The Voting Rights Act and the empowerment of voters is crucial and a

fair redrawing of lines to let all of the people be heard and all of the voters be able to speak. That is why I am on the floor today.

I am looking forward to reasonable people coming together and fostering legislation that answers the constitutional call that we all are created equal with certain unalienable rights—the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—which is embodied in the vote of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in this important Special Order on voting rights protection and expansion for every American.

I would like to thank Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN for convening this evening's Special Order and for her dedicated leadership on critical issues impacting children and families, including this evening's topic of voting rights.

Fifty-one years ago, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and because of that law, I stand before you as Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the first African American woman Ranking Member of the U.S. House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

We are here today not just to commemorate the landmark achievement of 51 years ago but to redouble and rededicate our efforts to the work that remains to be done to protect the right of all Americans to vote free from discrimination and the injustices that prevent them from exercising this most fundamental right of citizenship.

On August 6, 1965, in the Rotunda of the Capitol and in the presence of such luminaries as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; James Foreman of the Congress of Racial Equality; A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; JOHN LEWIS of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Senators Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Everett Dirksen; President Johnson said before signing the Voting Rights Act, in: "The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men."

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was critical to preventing brazen voter discrimination violations that historically left millions of African Americans disenfranchised.

In 1940, for example, there were less than 30,000 African Americans registered to vote in Texas and only about 3% of African Americans living in the South were registered to vote.

Poll taxes, literacy tests, and threats of violence were the major causes of these racially discriminatory results.

After passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, which prohibited these discriminatory practices, registration and electoral participation steadily increased to the point that by 2012, more than 1.2 million African Americans living in Texas were registered to vote.

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

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

Because of the Voting Rights Act, as of 2013 there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

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

Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

The crown jewel of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is Section 5, which requires that states and localities with a chronic record of discrimination in voting practices secure federal approval before making any changes to voting processes.

Section 5 protects minority voting rights where voter discrimination has historically been the worst.

Since 1982, Section 5 has stopped more than 1,000 discriminatory voting changes in their tracks, including 107 discriminatory changes right here in Texas.

And it is a source of eternal pride to all of us in Houston, that in pursuit of extending the full measure of citizenship to all Americans that in 1975, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who also represented this historic 18th Congressional District of Texas, introduced, and the Congress adopted, what are now Sections 4(f)(3) and 4(f)(4) of the Voting Rights Act, which extended the protections of Section 4(a) and Section 5 to language minorities.

Barbara Jordan championed this reform because as she stated during the floor debate on the 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act: "There are Mexican-American people in the State of Texas who have been denied the right to vote; who have been impeded in their efforts to register and vote; who have not had encouragement from those election officials because they are brown people[.] "So, the state of Texas, if we approve [the Jordan language included in the bill], would be brought within the coverage of this Act for the first time."

We must remain ever vigilant and oppose all schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote.

And we are here today to remind the nation that the right to vote—that "powerful instrument that can break down the walls of injustice"—is facing grave threats.

The threat stems from the decision issued in June 2013 by the Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b) of the VRA, and paralyzed the application of the VRA's Section 5 preclearance requirements.

Earlier this week, the Maryland Senate voted to override Governor Larry Hogan's veto of a bill that allows formerly incarcerated individuals to register to vote after they are released from prison.

Also, the Iowa Supreme Court will also be considering amending laws to grant the right to vote those who have been incarcerated in the past.

Amending this legislation is important for the population because it will help in the reintegration of these individuals, and secure their right to vote.

In light of this, there is still progress in the fight to restore the right to vote.

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

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

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

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

The Voting Rights Act is needed as much today to prevent another epidemic of voting disenfranchisement as Dr. Salk's vaccine is still needed to prevent another polio epidemic.

However, officials in some states, notably Texas and North Carolina, seemed to regard the *Shelby* decision as a green light and rushed to implement election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

We all remember the Voter ID law passed in Texas in 2011, which required every registered voter to present a valid government-issued photo ID on the day of polling in order to vote.

The Justice Department blocked the law in March of 2012, and it was Section 5 that prohibited it from going into effect.

At least it did until the *Shelby* decision because on the very same day that *Shelby County v. Holder* was decided officials in Texas announced they would immediately implement the Photo ID law, and other election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

The Texas Photo ID law was challenged in federal court and thankfully, just yesterday, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos that Texas' strict voter identification law discriminated against blacks and Hispanics and violated the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

To take another example, last year, Councilwoman Pat Van Houte, who serves on the Pasadena, Texas City Council was forcibly ejected by armed officers at the direction of Pasadena Mayor Johnny Isbell at a council meeting to consider a controversial redistricting plan.

The Pasadena redistricting plan is one of the first to be implemented in the aftermath of the *Shelby v. Holder* decision.

Pushed through by Mayor Isbell and narrowly passed by the voters, the redistricting plan switches two of the city's eight council seats from single member district to at-large.

Thus, the effect of the plan is to dilute the voting power of the poorer, predominantly Hispanic residents of the Pasadena's north side who opposed the change, and to increase the voting power of residents in the wealthier, whiter south side who supported it.

This shameful episode is a reminder that the Voting Rights Act protected not only right to vote in federal elections but also applied to state and local jurisdictions as well.

For example, Section 5 subjected to preclearance and could have blocked the Texas Education Administration (TEA) from closing the North Forest Independent School District (NFISD) and disbanding its locally elected school board comprised of 7 African American members.

Once freed by the Shelby County decision from having to pass muster under Section 5, however, TEA directed the annexation of the NFISD by HISD and dissolved the school board, thus diluting the ability of the African American and Hispanic community residents served by NFISD to influence the decisions affecting the education opportunities of their children.

Protecting voting rights and combating voter suppression schemes are two of the critical challenges facing our great democracy.

Without safeguards to ensure that all citizens have equal access to the polls, more injustices are likely to occur and the voices of millions silenced.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Consider the demographic groups who lack a government issued ID: African Americans: 25%; Asian Americans: 20%; Hispanic Americans: 19%; Young people, aged 18–24: 18%; Persons with incomes less than \$35,000: 15%.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote. Others include:

1. Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting
2. Ending Same-Day Registration
3. Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day will not count.
4. Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration
5. Shortened Poll Hours
6. Lessening the standards governing voter challenges to vigilantes like the King Street Patriots to cause trouble at the polls.

Today, I call upon House Speaker RYAN to bring legislation intended to protect the right to vote of all Americans to the floor for debate and vote.

Specifically, I call for the passage of the bipartisan Voting Rights Amendments Act, (H.R. 3899 and H.R. 885) of which I am an original co-sponsor, which repairs the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court decision.

This legislation replaces the old 'static' coverage formula with a new dynamic coverage formula, or 'rolling trigger,' which effectively gives the legislation nationwide reach because any state and any jurisdiction in any state potentially is subject to being covered if the requisite number of violations are found to have been committed.

Alternatively, I call upon the Speaker to let the House debate and vote on the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 (H.R. 2867), a bill that provides even greater federal oversight of jurisdictions which have a history of voter suppression and protects vulnerable communities from discriminatory voting practices.

Second, I call for the passage of H.R. 12, the Voter Empower Act of 2015, legislation I have co-sponsored that protects voters from

suppression, deception, and other forms of disenfranchisement by modernizing voter registration, promoting access to voting for individuals with disabilities, and protecting the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for federal office.

Before concluding there is one other point I would like to stress.

In his address to the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, President Johnson said: "Presidents and Congresses, laws and lawsuits can open the doors to the polling places and open the doors to the wondrous rewards which await the wise use of the ballot.

"But only the individual Negro, and all others who have been denied the right to vote, can really walk through those doors, and can use that right, and can transform the vote into an instrument of justice and fulfillment."

In other words, political power—and the justice, opportunity, inclusion, and fulfillment it provides—comes not from the right to vote but in the exercise of that right.

And that means it is the civic obligation of every citizen to both register and vote in every election, state and local as well as federal.

Because if we can register and vote, but fail to do so, we are guilty of voluntary voter suppression, the most effective method of disenfranchisement ever devised.

And in recent years, we have not been doing a very good job of exercising our civic responsibility to register, vote, and make our voices heard.

In the last two mayoral elections in Houston, barely 10 percent of city residents bothered to cast ballots (12% in 2011 and 13% in 2013); in many district-level elections, turnout rates were less than 10 percent.

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

As we are approaching the 51st anniversary of that landmark law, let us rededicate ourselves to honoring those who won for us this precious right by remaining vigilant and fighting against both the efforts of others to abridge or suppress the right to vote and our own apathy in exercising this sacred right.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who represents the Houston and Harris County area, who does such a great job of speaking out on these issues.

Representative JACKSON LEE and really the entire delegation down there—Representatives GENE GREEN and AL GREEN, along with Representative JACKSON LEE—do a great job of keeping this on the forefront of Texans' minds and on the United States' mind.

Texas is such a large State that oftentimes, legislation that is passed out of Texas has an impact on the rest of

the Nation. It does seem that much of the discriminatory laws regarding redistricting and regarding voter suppression, like the voter ID bill, sadly, has emanated from our State.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you just how bad it is in our State. This is going to be really hard for some people to believe. But in the State of Texas, if a young person on a college campus were to find themselves their freshman year lost on the campus, or if they were to find themselves in a little bit of trouble on campus, they would be able to show their student ID to the proper law enforcement official, who is a police officer recognized by the State of Texas, on the campus to identify themselves. That ID works for them to be able to legally identify themselves.

In the State of Texas today, that same young person would not be able to show that same student ID at the voting place, at the voting booth, to be able to cast a vote. If you bring your concealed handgun license in, then you can cast a vote. The student will be given a provisional ballot that wouldn't count, and the person with a concealed handgun license would be able to cast a legal ballot.

Who is that really going to hurt? You have so many young people, particularly young people that don't come from wealthy families, whose parents really struggle to send them to college. They don't have cars in college, so they don't have their driver's license. They really rely on their student identification for everything that they do.

In the State of Texas, they absolutely cannot use that ID.

There are many things about the Texas voter ID law, to be honest with you, I really don't like. I became a plaintiff in the suit to try to scale back what I consider a very egregious act against voters in the State of Texas.

I was very delighted that back in July, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit actually upheld a lower court's decision that the Texas voter ID law had a discriminatory effect on minority voters and violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

I hope this means that the proper action will be taken to do something to scale back this law and the impact that it is having on people that simply want to exercise their suffrage, people that simply want to be able to vote. We take it for granted that you can simply vote. But this Texas voter ID law, and many laws from my time in the State legislature that were proposed—luckily, some of them advanced—would really roll back the clock on individuals that want to exercise their right to vote.

I will tell you what I have done in the meantime is joined as an original cosponsor of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 that restores the right and advances the voting rights that were provided to us in 1965 by providing a modern day coverage test which will protect our communities from these types of discriminatory practices.

I will tell you, I am very proud to join with TERRI SEWELL, with Representative JUDY CHU, with Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ, and, of course, with Representative JOHN LEWIS, who understands probably more than anyone in this body what discriminatory laws can do to affect a community.

□ 1830

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides coverage for 13 States upon enactment: Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Arkansas, Arizona, California, New York, and Virginia. I am a very proud Texan—I love everything about our State—but, unfortunately, we have been at the forefront of discrimination against voters, and Texas is included in this legislation as well. This new geographic formula is based on current conditions and on a 25-year look-back provision.

I hope that we will be able to work together in a bipartisan manner to protect not just some of our voters but to protect every single voter in the United States who would like to cast a ballot. It doesn't matter if a voter is poor and was not able to go and renew his driver's license so that his driver's license may be 61 days expired. It doesn't matter if it is a student whose parents are just putting every little bit of money that they have to get him through college, and, because of that, his only ID is his student identification card, and he would like to use that. We need to be able to make it easier for individuals to vote in our State.

Everybody wants people to be able to lawfully vote, too. We ought to be able to work together in order to pass strong voting rights laws that protect all of our citizens, because we certainly don't want to discourage anyone from voting, and we certainly don't want to look like we are going backwards from where we once were, back in the 1960s.

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

IN HONOR OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE ON ITS 107TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here tonight as a proud member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, known as the NAACP.

I am a member, and I am a life member, and I believe that the NAACP has had a profound impact upon my life. Hence, tonight, I am going to talk about the NAACP as I am also the person who is the sponsor of the original NAACP resolution for 2016. In doing this, I want to praise the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, on this, its 107th anniversary.

This resolution has 24 cosponsors. I thank all of them. I also thank the whip for allowing us this time to talk about the NAACP and to extoll many of its virtues. I thank all of the leadership for the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 11th time that we have introduced a resolution to honor the NAACP. It is the oldest civil rights organization in the United States of America. We introduced it first in 2006, and it was passed in the House by a voice vote and in the Senate by unanimous consent. When it passed in the House in 2006, it did not do so because of our help alone—"our help" meaning the Congressional Black Caucus. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, who was the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee at the time, was there to help us get this amendment passed. I have talked on the floor about the White side of Black history. Mr. SENSENBRENNER would be a part of that history because, if not for his presence, I assure you we would not have passed this resolution in 2006.

We went on to pass it in 2007, and it passed in the House with a vote of 410-0. In 2008, it passed in the House of Representatives by 403-0; in 2009, by 424-0; in 2010, by 421-0. In 2010, of course, and thereafter, we stopped passing resolutions on the floor of the House; although, we may still present them and talk about them on the floor of the House. So, tonight, this is what we will do.

I would like to mention the mission of the NAACP, which is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons—not just of Black people, not just of people of color, but of all people. The NAACP also desires to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination. These are lofty and noble goals because we understand that we have had much racial hatred and much racial discrimination in this country, and the NAACP took it upon itself to eliminate as much of it as possible. It has done a good job, I might add.

Let's look at a little bit of the history of the NAACP.

Back on February 12, 1909, a group of people decided that it was going to do something about the lynchings that were taking place in this country. Literally, in this country, between 1889 and 1918, thousands of African Americans were lynched—thousands. Lynching was done with mob violence. People were taken to trees, and they were lynched. It was done, a good many times, with impunity. No one was ever

prosecuted. It was a grave injustice, and there were people in this country who decided that they were going to do something about this injustice. Among the people who met initially were Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, William English Walling, and Ida Wells-Barnett. These persons met and issued a clarion call. Some 60 persons answered that call. Hence, the NAACP was born.

The NAACP did not have its first African American as an executive secretary until 1920. It is important for us to note that many of the Founders of the NAACP—in fact, most of them—were not of African ancestry. The first executive secretaries of the organization were all persons who were of European ancestry. In fact, the first five executive secretaries were White. They were not Black. In 1934, the NAACP had its first Black board chairperson—Louis T. Wright. Dr. Wright became chairperson after the NAACP had had a good number of White chairpersons. So the NAACP has never been and is not now an organization for Blacks only. The NAACP has always stood for an integrated society and has been an integrated organization since its inception.

In 1954, the NAACP, under the leadership and counsel of the Honorable Thurgood Marshall, who became a Justice of the Supreme Court, won the lawsuit of *Brown v. Board of Education*. This was a giant leap forward for us because this lawsuit integrated, to a certain extent, schools throughout the country. The word that was appropriately used at the time was "desegregated." These schools were ordered to be desegregated with all deliberate speed, and all deliberate speed can sometimes take a lot longer than one might expect. A good many years later, there are still those who would contend that we have not fully integrated our school systems across the length and breadth of the country.

In 1955, an NAACP member, the Honorable Rosa Parks, an African American lady, decided that she was going to take a stand, and she took that stand by taking a seat. She took a seat on a bus. In so doing, she ignited a spark that started a civil rights movement. By the way, there are many people who contend that she did this because she was tired. Well, she may have been tired, but she did it because she wanted to take a stand. She was tired of society's relegating her to the back of the bus, and she took a stand against it. Hence, we had the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which lasted more than a year. At the end of that boycott, the bus line—the transportation system—was integrated in Alabama and, of course, later on throughout the country.

An interesting note on this point about the integration and desegregation of bus lines. There was a three-judge panel that actually heard the litigation associated with this transportation issue. On that three-judge panel, there were judges who had a

great debate about this; but there was one Frank M. Johnson, a Federal district court judge, who took the position that we could apply the Brown decision to public transportation. This was the very first time it was done was under the leadership of that three-judge panel and by the Honorable Frank M. Johnson.

Again, I point these things out because it is important to note that there were others who were there with the NAACP to help us along the way. Frank M. Johnson, by the way, was a Republican appointee who was appointed by President Eisenhower, and he went on to help us to integrate schools throughout the South and integrate the Department of Public Safety. He went on to help us with the facilitation of voting rights acts and with the implementation of laws that prohibited persons from discriminating against persons in workplace environments. He really played a significant role as did many other persons who were associated with the NAACP in a vicarious way, because I don't have evidence of his having been a member.

I want to move forward, if I may next, to 2008. I move forward to 2008 because this is when the NAACP supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007. There are many unsolved cases in the history of this country with reference to things that happened to African Americans. The NAACP pushed for and supported legislation such that we can have the opportunity to bring some of the dastards to justice who have caused great harm to people who were doing no harm to anyone. The NAACP has fought for this.

In 2009, the NAACP celebrated its centennial anniversary, and the theme at that time was "Bold Dreams and Big Victories"—obviously, a good theme because the NAACP has won many big victories.

In 2012, the NAACP supported the Smart and Safe campaign, which brought attention to the overpopulated prisons and mass incarceration in this country. People who study these issues are well aware that, in this country, we have an overpopulation of persons who are incarcerated. Much of this has to do with mandatory sentencing laws. Much of it has to do with laws that allow persons who are convicted of one type of offense, with drugs, to receive a harsher penalty—cocaine, for example. Then, if you have crack cocaine, you will get a stiffer penalty as opposed to its being some other type of cocaine.

The point is that these harsh sentencing laws have caused a good many people to be incarcerated who, quite frankly, should not be incarcerated for as long as they are incarcerated. Some of these "three strikes and you are out" laws have also caused persons to go to prison for a minor offense because it happened to be the third offense; so the NAACP is fighting against this.

The NAACP wants a just society. The NAACP believes that people who com-

mit crimes ought to be punished, but that they ought to be punished in a fair and just way. Hence, the NAACP has supported trying to do what it can to help us with the overpopulation in prisons due to unjust laws.

The NAACP joined the lawsuit challenging the Texas strict voter ID law. In Texas—and you heard colleagues earlier tonight talk about this—we have one of the most draconian photo ID laws in the country. It is one that requires people who have been voting all of their lives—who have a history of voting, where a person at the polling place knows who you are if you show up to vote—to present a photo ID. The interesting thing about it is, if you vote by mail, you don't have to do this, and most of the fraud that takes place probably takes place by mail because you don't have the same identification process. I find it onerous that we, in Texas, would be subjected to this type of law, and, of course, we are doing what we can to get it properly disposed of. The NAACP is part of the effort to make sure this is done.

□ 1845

In 2014, the NAACP was a leader in the effort to strengthen the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act, as has been explained by colleagues prior to my taking the podium, has had section 4 eviscerated and, as a result, section 5 has been emasculated.

Section 4 was the section of the Voting Rights Act that brought certain places in the country under the purview of the Voting Rights Act. Section 5 is the section, then, that imposes the standards that have to be adhered to. Well, you can't have a strong section 5 if you don't have a section 4 to outline, to specify, to delineate the actual areas that are to be covered by the Voting Rights Act.

The NAACP is still working with us to help us get a strong Voting Rights Act so that people who have been disenfranchised, people who have been discriminated against will have the right to vote in this, the United States of America.

In 2015, the NAACP, after the death of Trayvon Martin, advocated for the arrest of his killer. The NAACP never said that he had to go to jail, but the belief was that, under the circumstances that existed at the time, the perpetrator should be prosecuted. There should, at least, be a trial. There should be an opportunity for the world to understand what happened to Trayvon Martin.

As a result, there was a trial. There was a finding. The NAACP was at the forefront, a part of the avant guard, if you will, to make sure that Trayvon Martin received justice. A trial is what ultimately occurred. I would daresay that, but for the NAACP and many other persons of goodwill, this would not have taken place.

Finally, I want to point out that the NAACP has also ventured into what is happening in Flint, Michigan. This is

some serious business that we have to take care of in Michigan. In Flint, Michigan, we have a circumstance wherein children, among others, but children have been poisoned. This was not at the hands of some major corporation that was doing something that was inappropriate. It was not at the hands of a civilian, some person who just decided he was going to do something ugly. It was not at the hands of some person associated with some sort of terrorist organization.

This was done by the government, at the hands of the government. Children have been poisoned at the hands of the government. That is an important point for us to digest because one does not expect that one would be poisoned by consuming the elixir of life, water, in this country. Especially, one would not assume this given that this country has some of the best technology and filtration systems in the world. In fact, there are none better than ours.

One would not expect that in a city wherein the water was fine before the hand of the government was imposed upon citizens, such that they couldn't make the choice themselves as to how they were going to regulate their water. A special person was put in charge at the hands of the State government, the Governor having the authority to appoint a person who literally took control of the city and, in so doing, caused great harm to befall young people, children, if you will.

When this happens, we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to take immediate action to not only bring people to justice who would do this, but also to impose a just system such that persons who had been harmed can be made whole to the extent that people can be made whole. I say this because, truth be told, you cannot make these persons completely whole. All of the intelligence that we are receiving indicates that once you receive lead poisoning, you don't recover totally and completely. There will be some residue, and this can go on for years and years and years.

So the NAACP went there immediately and made it clear that it expected action and had a 15-point plan. I will say more about the 15-point plan as time permits because I want to honor my colleague, the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, if he is available at this time. Given that he is on his way, I will continue.

The 15-point plan has 15 priorities that are listed, and I will go through these priorities rather quickly. They are, one, the emergency financial manager law must be repealed. This is the law that I spoke of earlier that allowed for the Governor to impose upon the citizens of Flint, Michigan, this emergency financial manager.

Much of this was done unfortunately under the auspices of saving money—some persons have said that we are talking about \$100 a day—saving some small amount of money so that some person who holds public office could

stand before the public and say: I saved you money. I saved you money. Look at what I have done.

Well, look at what you have done: You have changed the lives of innocent people forever in an effort to save a little bit of money and hold yourself out as a person who is cutting the budget, who is saving money for the taxpayers.

There are times when tax dollars are used effectively and efficaciously, and what they were doing with the water prior to this cut was a pretty good example of how things that are doing well can be corrected such that harm is placed upon people. I regret that it happened, but I am proud however that the NAACP is there to help us with this process of making people whole.

The second part of the plan would require water distribution that is currently being done by the National Guard to be done by local people. The National Guard does a good job, and I salute the National Guard for what they are doing. The truth is that local people need work, and this would provide them the opportunity to work and to be a part of the water distribution process. There is all of the good sense in the world in working out a system so that we can pay people who need work to help themselves by distributing water in their communities.

The third point is access to fresh fruits, vegetables, and other food items. Because to a certain extent, this is a food desert area in some parts of Flint, Michigan. As a result, there is a desire to make sure that all persons can have access to fresh fruits and fresh vegetables—good, clean, wholesome food.

Number four, all Flint citizens must be provided free home inspections. There are many homes that have not been properly inspected. The water source that leads into the home has to be inspected, the lines, and this should be done at no cost to all citizens. The NAACP stands for this. My belief is that this will happen, but I am proud that the NAACP voiced a concern that it should happen.

I mentioned the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH from Pennsylvania's Second Congressional District.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) with the notion that I will reclaim time that he may not utilize.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Lone Star State. He is a good friend, and I know that we have had an occasion to work together on water systems in Texas in my role as a member of the Appropriations Committee. We were able to work successfully on aiding communities that needed access to clean, safe water.

We had a hearing yesterday on the Hill on Flint in which we heard from the mayor and a host of other people. It is a circumstance in which, I think, we should have the utmost urgency and that the Army Corps should move aggressively. I would even hope that the President would take action, if nec-

essary, to nationalize the Guard to make sure that people in Flint get water.

I am rising today in honor of the birth of the NAACP. This is the most loved, most hated, the largest, the oldest, the boldest civil rights organization ever created. It has been at the forefront of efforts to have our Nation become the more perfect Union that the Founders had envisioned.

At every point, it has agitated, both in the streets and in the suites, to make changes. Here on the Hill, there is not an organization that has more consistently let their voice be heard on a whole range of issues. So I rise to thank those who have been a part thereof and who will continue to be.

The local NAACP in Philadelphia had an antiviolence march all the way across a major thoroughfare in our city, 52nd Street. It was great to see an organization that obviously has a lot of sophistication, but it also has the touch at the neighborhood level to reach out to people and to have people understand that individual responsibility to make communities safer is as important as public policy initiatives that might be generated in halls of the legislature like here.

So I want to thank the NAACP for all it has done. We hosted the National Convention in Philadelphia. I had a chance to open up the convention and to fly in with the President when he came to address our criminal justice reform.

We have so much to do in our country. And we have the understanding that in order to do complicated work, we need organizations to do it. It is difficult for individuals themselves to achieve a lot, but when working together, we can achieve almost anything.

We are in a range of dates here of import. Just the other day, we acknowledged the announcement date in which President Barack Obama announced he was going to run for President. Yesterday was the day that Nelson Mandela walked free from a prison cell in Robben Island for over two decades.

So February 12th is when people of different ethnic backgrounds, different racial backgrounds got together—people like Ida B. Wells and W.E.B. DuBois got together and said that there was going to be an effort to put together a membership-based organization, rooted in neighborhoods, rooted in individuals who would come together in their local communities and who would fight on a variety of levels—on the policy level, in the courts, and also work in neighborhoods at a neighborhood level to improve the lives of people of our country, particularly people who had been disproportionately ill-served by government institutions and people of color in our country who had to work for years, in fact, centuries without a paycheck and who were prohibited by law to do basic things like marry, or own a home, or own land, who had to bear the brunt of a criminal justice

system that, even to this day, is yet to be perfected.

So we have a history, but it is made better because of the NAACP. So I wanted to come and thank my colleague for holding this Special Order here on the House floor. I don't usually speak in Special Orders. I think, over my 20 years, it is a very unusual thing, but I came today because the NAACP has laid the foundation under which so much of the progress we have made as a country has been made possible.

I look forward to an opportunity to continue to work with him on issues of importance to his State, to our country, and to this world.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman especially for taking to the floor tonight and sharing his views on the NAACP. I also especially thank him for the good work that he has done in the Congress of the United States of America. He has served his constituents well, and he should be saluted.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that if we did not have the NAACP, we would have to create it. That is just how vital it is to the American system of justice. It is not an official arm of the American system of justice, but it is an aid to justice in this country such that people expect the NAACP to be there under certain circumstances and in certain places.

This gets us back to Flint. People expected the NAACP to be there, and the NAACP was there. As I continue, Mr. Speaker, permit me to ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in consuming this time, let me continue to point out some of the things that the NAACP has within its 15-point priority plan.

□ 1900

Number five is that all Flint residents must be provided federally funded replacements for their damaged systems and appliances. What they are saying and what the NAACP is saying is simply this: There are some appliances that have been so damaged that they cannot continue to use these appliances. As a result, they have to be replaced. These are people not of great means, and any help that they can get to maintain a good quality of life should be afforded them.

The NAACP has indicated that fairness and justice must be examined in rate hikes and in continued billing for poisonous water.

I heard Mr. CUMMINGS make this point at a hearing. He made the point that people are still paying water bills for water that they can't drink. That was at the hearing. I am not sure what the situation is now. My understanding is that persons are still getting water in bottles, but are they still paying their water bills?

The NAACP believes that fairness and justice must be examined in terms of the rate hikes that have taken place

and the continued billing of persons for water that they cannot use because the State made a mistake.

The NAACP believes that pro bono legal advice should be made available to all. With this, I think that we can expect and hope that the various bar associations would step up to the plate and help persons who are in need of legal advice. This is something that lawyers do eleemosynary quite often. I would hope that lawyers would move in and help persons, but if they don't move in and help persons, I think we have got a responsibility—we have done this in the past with funds that have gone to legal aid societies—to do something so that people who need some legal advice and some legal assistance can receive that advice and that assistance.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will just say this: Thank you for the time. I want to always celebrate the NAACP and all of its great victories.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 107th anniversary of the NAACP, an organization dedicated to eradicating racism and injustice in the United States. Since its founding in 1909, the NAACP has been a constant voice in the fight for civil rights. But, unlike other organizations, its original battlefield was the courtroom.

The founders of the NAACP were smart. They understood that in order to combat ignorance, you must first change the laws that foster it.

One of their first actions was to lobby against Jim Crow lynching laws. Though their

efforts were unsuccessful, they turned the nation's attention to the ongoing mistreatment of Blacks in the 1920s and '30s.

In 1954, the NAACP played a pivotal role in the historic landmark case, *Brown v. Board of Education*. A team of NAACP lawyers joined Thurgood Marshall in a series of legal battles that would lead to segregation in public education being ruled unconstitutional.

The organization was then instrumental in the passage of the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts of 1965.

Since its inception, the NAACP has been our champion, and its expertise is now needed more than ever.

We are at a critical point in our nation's history, where strategic, collaborative efforts are best to move our country forward. Like the NAACP, we must be catalysts for change, not the cause of division.

The anniversary of the NAACP's founding reminds us what can be done when we work together. We all must play a role in the advancement of our communities.

To quote NAACP member Ms. Rosa Parks, "Racism is still with us. But it is up to us to prepare our children for what they have to meet, and, hopefully, we shall overcome." As a nation, we must reject discrimination in any form and give all children a chance to succeed in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

To the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, my sincerest gratitude for all you have done to shape American history and ensure all of us have an opportunity to fully participate in the American dream. Thank you for being there in the streets, on college campuses, and at the courthouse. Our communities are indebted to you for the vision in 1909, and the 107 years dedicated to righting the wrongs of our nation's past. Thank you for persevering and changing the face of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of illness.

Ms. BONAMICI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 12 on account of official business in district.

Mr. PALLONE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 12 on account of responsibilities related to the passing of father.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 10, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3033. To require the President's annual budget request to Congress each year to include a line item for the Research in Disabilities Education program of the National Science Foundation and to require the National Science Foundation to conduct research on dyslexia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 12, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, Jan. 28, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert B. Aderholt	10/10	10/11	Spain		356.48		(3)				
	10/11	10/13	France		963.60		(3)				
	10/13	10/16	United Kingdom		1,488.72		(3)				
	10/16	10/17	Norway		197.56		(3)				
Jennifer Hing	10/13	10/15	Spain		756.73						
	10/15	10/17	Germany		611.29						
Commercial airfare								2,856.70			
Rental Cars								258.24			
Staffdel Costs									222.91		
Megan Millam	10/13	10/15	Spain		756.73						
	10/15	10/17	Germany		611.29						
Commercial airfare								2,457.40			
Taxi								94.16			
Rental Cars								258.24			
Staffdel Costs									222.91		

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cornell Teague	10/13	10/15	Spain		524.99						
	10/15	10/17	Germany		611.29						
Commercial airfare							2,379.40				
Taxi							62.17				
Rental Cars							258.24				
Staffdel Costs								222.91			
Collin Lee	10/13	10/15	Spain		756.73						
	10/15	10/17	Germany		611.29						
Commercial airfare							2,652.40				
Taxi							46.94				
Rental Cars							258.24				
Staffdel Costs								222.91			
Hon. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger	10/12	10/14	Europe		975.00						
	10/14	10/15	Europe		228.34						
	10/15	10/17	Europe		219.28						
Commercial airfare							10,461.00				
Delegation Costs								71.93			
Hon. Rodney P. Frelinghuysen	12/12	12/13	Jordan		355.41						
	12/13	12/14	Germany		255.58						
Commercial airfare							744.35				
BG Wright	12/12	12/13	Jordan		355.41						
	12/13	12/14	Germany		255.58						
Commercial airfare							744.35				
Hon. David G. Valadao	12/23	12/25	Kuwait		210.00						
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
Commercial airfare							14,205.20				
Hon. Kay Granger	12/29	12/30	Costa Rica		237.20						
Commercial airfare							1,549.82				
Hon. Henry Cuellar	12/29	12/30	Costa Rica		237.20						
Commercial airfare							781.42				
Clelia Alvarado	12/29	12/30	Costa Rica		477.00						
Commercial airfare							778.59				
Committee total					12,052.70		40,846.86		11,876.82		64,776.38

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
CODEL—Goodlatte											
Hon. Frederica Wilson	10/24	10/25	Haiti		261.00		394.10				655.10
Committee total					261.00		394.10				655.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Billy Long	10/10	10/11	Spain		380.50		(³)				380.50
	10/11	10/13	France		1,183.00						1,183.00
	10/13	10/16	England		1,377.60						1,377.60
	10/16	10/17	Norway		275.40						275.40
Hon. David McKinley	10/12	10/14	China		947.66		17,757.03		6,597.72		25,302.41
	10/15	10/18	India		738.36				2,423.23		3,161.59
Mary Neumayr	10/12	10/14	China		947.66		17,757.03				18,704.69
	10/15	10/18	India		738.36						738.36
David Redl	10/17	10/20	Ireland		791.20		2,223.40				3,014.60
Charlotte Savercool	10/17	10/20	Ireland		791.20		2,223.40				3,014.60
David Goldman	10/17	10/20	Ireland		791.20		2,223.40				3,014.60
Ben Lieberman	11/1	11/5	United Arab Emirates		2,459.80		7,718.20		5.60		10,183.60
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	11/5	11/7	Brazil		518.00		11,621.76		1,937.00		14,076.76
	11/8	11/9	Argentina		566.41				842.43		1,408.84
	11/10	11/11	Chile		295.36				1,965.04		2,260.40
Hon. Tony Cárdenas	11/5	11/7	Brazil		518.00		11,289.76				11,807.76
	11/8	11/9	Argentina		566.41						566.41
	11/10	11/11	Chile		295.36						295.36
Hon. Jerry McNeerney	11/5	11/7	Brazil		518.00		12,229.46				12,747.46
	11/8	11/9	Argentina		566.41						566.41
	11/10	11/11	Chile		295.36						295.36
Paul Nagle	11/5	11/7	Brazil		518.00		11,750.26				12,268.26
	11/8	11/9	Argentina		566.41						566.41
	11/10	11/11	Chile		295.36						295.36
Hon. Robert Latta	11/5	11/7	Brazil		361.00		12,539.76				12,900.76
	11/8	11/9	Argentina		324.41						324.41
	11/10	11/11	Chile		179.36						179.36
Hon. Bill Flores	11/19	11/20	Egypt		267.00		17,128.05				17,395.05
	11/21	11/22	Afghanistan		24.00		(³)				24.00
	11/23	11/25	Saudi Arabia		459.33						459.33
Tom Hassenboehler	12/5	12/14	France		2,684.00		1,157.90		2,973.00		6,814.90
Mary Neumayr	12/5	12/5	France		4,688.00		1,121.90				5,809.90
Peter Spencer	12/5	12/14	France		4,688.00		1,121.90				5,809.90
Tiffany Guarascio	12/3	12/13	France		3,221.00		1,121.70				4,342.70
Eric Kessler	12/5	12/13	France		4,151.00		1,121.70				5,272.70

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total					37,988.12		132,106.61		16,744.02		186,838.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jeb Hensarling	10/10	10/11	Germany		191.49		(3)		1,500.00		1,691.49
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,452.73		(3)		23,665.00		25,117.73
	10/14	10/17	England		1,885.11		(3)		29,084.00		30,969.11
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	10/10	10/11	Germany		191.48		(3)				191.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,272.73		(3)				1,272.73
	10/14	10/17	England		1,743.13		(3)				1,743.13
Hon. Blaine Luetkemeyer	10/10	10/11	Germany		191.49		(3)				191.49
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,322.73		(3)				1,322.73
	10/14	10/17	England		1,841.26		(3)				1,841.26
Hon. Bill Huizenga	10/10	10/11	Germany		217.00		(3)				217.00
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,442.00		(3)				1,442.00
	10/14	10/17	England		2,005.00		(3)				2,005.00
Hon. Sean Duffy	10/10	10/11	Germany		221.49		(3)				221.49
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,427.73		(3)				1,427.73
	10/14	10/17	England		2,035.07		(3)				2,035.07
Hon. Emanuel Cleaver	10/10	10/11	Germany		237.00		(3)				237.00
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,530.00		(3)				1,530.00
	10/14	10/17	England		2,085.00		(3)				2,085.00
Hon. John Delaney	10/13	10/14	Switzerland		452.35		(3)				452.35
	10/14	10/17	England		1,778.56		(3)				1,778.56
Kirsten Mork	10/10	10/11	Germany		201.48		(3)				201.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,521.00		(3)				1,521.00
	10/14	10/17	England		1,991.86		(3)				1,991.86
Kevin Edgar	10/10	10/11	Germany		156.48		(3)				156.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,417.72		(3)				1,417.72
	10/14	10/17	England		1,910.54		(3)				1,910.54
Brian Johnson	10/10	10/11	Germany		146.48		(3)				146.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,312.72		(3)				1,312.72
	10/14	10/17	England		1,820.40		(3)				1,820.40
David Popp	10/10	10/11	Germany		146.48		(3)				146.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,312.72		(3)				1,312.72
	10/14	10/17	England		1,789.13		(3)				1,789.13
Rosemary Keech	10/10	10/11	Germany		166.48		(3)				166.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,500.22		(3)				1,500.22
	10/14	10/17	England		1,929.07		(3)				1,929.07
Kristofer Erickson	10/10	10/11	Germany		161.48		(3)				161.48
	10/11	10/14	Switzerland		1,437.72		(3)				1,437.72
	10/14	10/17	England		1,918.93		(3)				1,918.93
Hon. Maxine Waters	10/19	10/19	Haiti				1,158.98				1,158.98
Hon. French Hill	11/6	11/7	UAE		332.00						332.00
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan								
	11/9	11/11	UAE		798.00		14,204.94				15,002.94
Joseph Pinder	11/8	11/10	Japan		659.00						659.00
	11/10	11/13	Korea		1,032.00		1,445.40				2,477.40
Hon. Robert Pittenger	11/20	11/21	Egypt		267.00						267.00
	11/21	11/23	Afghanistan		12.00						12.00
	11/23	11/24	Saudi Arabia		368.00		17,128.05				17,496.05
Committee total					47,832.26		33,937.37		54,249.00		136,018.63

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	11/20	11/21	France		473.36		20,763.80				21,237.16
	11/21	11/23	Egypt		534.00						534.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		500.48				310.39		810.87
	11/24	11/25	Japan		251.90						251.90
Hon. Tulsi Gabbard	11/20	11/21	France		473.36		10,372.50				10,845.86
	11/21	11/23	Egypt		534.00						534.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		500.48						500.48
	11/24	11/25	Japan		251.90						251.90
Paul Behrends	11/20	11/21	France		473.36		25,565.80				26,039.16
	11/21	11/23	Egypt		534.00						534.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		500.48						500.48
	11/24	11/25	Japan		251.90						251.90
Philip Bednarczyk	11/20	11/21	France		480.00		5,912.80				6,392.80
	11/21	11/23	Egypt		442.00						442.00
Hon. Eliot Engel	11/6	11/7	Bosnia-Herzegovina		169.28		12,633.10				12,802.38
	11/7	11/9	Germany		563.44						563.44
	11/9	11/10	Austria		332.65						332.65
Kyle Parker	11/6	11/7	Bosnia-Herzegovina		169.28		3,966.00				4,135.28
	11/7	11/9	Germany		563.44						563.44
	11/9	11/10	Austria		332.65						332.65
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	11/6	11/7	United Arab Emirates		400.00		8,694.20		2,167.00		11,261.20
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan								
	11/9	11/11	United Arab Emirates		706.00						706.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Theodore Yoho	11/6	11/7	United Arab Emirates		402.00		13,085.20				13,487.20
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan								
	11/9	11/11	United Arab Emirates		754.00						754.00
Edward Acevedo	11/6	11/7	United Arab Emirates		424.00		8,694.20				9,118.20
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan								
	11/9	11/11	United Arab Emirates		782.00						782.00
Casey Kustin	11/6	11/7	United Arab Emirates		452.00		8,694.20				9,146.20
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan								
	11/9	11/11	United Arab Emirates		854.00						854.00
Kristen Marquardt	10/10	10/12	Saudi Arabia		943.50		4,167.90				5,111.40
	10/12	10/13	Jordan		360.00						360.00
	10/13	10/16	Lebanon		213.00						213.00
Mark Iozzi	10/10	10/12	Saudi Arabia		945.00		4,541.60				5,486.00
	10/12	10/13	Jordan		350.00						350.00
	10/13	10/16	Lebanon		215.00						215.00
	10/11	10/13	Jordan		610.82		3,717.20				4,328.02
	10/13	10/16	Lebanon		75.00						75.00
Joan Condon	10/11	10/13	Jordan		610.82		3,632.90				4,243.72
	10/13	10/16	Lebanon		225.00						225.00
Matthew Zweig	11/8	11/10	Japan		657.93		1,298.50				1,956.43
	11/10	11/13	South Korea		1,032.26						1,032.26
Edmund Rice	11/8	11/10	Japan		657.93		1,445.50				2,103.43
	11/10	11/13	South Korea		1,032.26						1,032.26
Hunter Strupp	11/8	11/10	Japan		647.90		1,298.50				1,946.40
	11/10	11/13	South Korea		1,022.26						1,022.26
Scott Cullinane	10/12	10/14	Austria		656.18		2,225.00				2,881.18
	10/14	10/17	Germany		844.21						844.21
Philip Bednarczyk	10/12	10/14	Austria		676.18		2,498.10				3,174.28
	10/14	10/17	Germany		859.21						859.21
Kristen Marquardt	10/30	11/1	Bahrain		792.00		10,542.26				11,334.26
Hon. Reid Ribble	10/30	10/31	Guatemala		302.79		(³)				302.79
	10/31	11/1	Honduras		180.86		(³)				180.86
Edward Acevedo	10/11	10/14	Israel		2,025.00		4,598.26				6,623.26
	10/15	10/17	Switzerland		906.00						906.00
Golan Rodgers	10/11	10/14	Israel		2,072.00		3,378.26				5,450.26
	10/15	10/17	Switzerland		934.00						934.00
Piero Tozzi	10/11	10/14	Israel		2,022.29		4,598.26				6,620.55
	10/15	10/17	Switzerland		924.00						924.00
Sadaf Khan	10/11	10/14	Israel		2,065.00		4,598.46				6,663.46
	10/15	10/17	Switzerland		926.00						926.00
Amy Chang	11/7	11/9	Burma		683.00		8,059.10				8,742.10
Nilmini Rubin	11/8	11/13	Brazil		967.48		4,842.52				5,810.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	11/6	11/8	Turkey		1,155.85		11,466.00				12,621.85
	11/8	11/10	Germany		401.86				1,063.24		1,465.10
	11/7	11/7	Iraq				(³)				
Paul Behrends	11/6	11/8	Turkey		1,155.85		10,910.00				12,065.85
	11/8	11/10	Germany		401.86						401.86
	11/7	11/7	Iraq				(³)				
Worku Gachou	11/9	11/10	Germany		219.00		7,513.72				7,732.72
	11/11	11/13	Djibouti		534.95						534.95
Lesley Warner	11/9	11/10	Germany		229.00		7,478.72				7,708.51
	11/11	11/13	Djibouti		559.27						559.27
Amy Porter	11/7	11/10	Malaysia		704.48		11,517.18				12,221.66
	11/10	11/12	Burma		666.00						666.00
Janice Kaguyutan	11/6	11/9	Burma		999.00		13,869.70				14,868.70
	11/9	11/10	Malaysia		227.00						227.00
	11/10	11/12	Burma		671.00						671.00
Peter Freeman	11/7	11/10	Malaysia		684.48		11,517.18				12,201.66
	11/10	11/12	Burma		651.00						651.00
Douglas Anderson	11/7	11/10	Malaysia		693.73		11,517.18				12,210.91
	11/10	11/12	Burma		648.00						648.00
Brian Skretny	12/6	12/13	France		3,632.40		1,529.80				5,162.20
Hon. Lee Zeldin	12/23	12/25	Kuwait		724.47		14,176.20				14,900.67
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
Hon. David Cicilline	12/23	12/25	Kuwait								
	12/25	12/25	Iraq		724.47		14,176.20				14,900.67
Committee total					56,225.10		299,496.00		3,540.63		359,261.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
B. Shields	11/9	11/10	Croatia		279.00		9,339.50*				9,618.50
	11/10	11/12	Serbia		567.00						567.00
	11/12	11/14	Germany		561.00						561.00
M. Taylor	11/8	11/9	Bulgaria		252.42		12,597.90*				12,850.32
	11/9	11/10	Croatia		279.00						279.00
	11/10	11/12	Serbia		527.00						527.00
	11/12	11/14	Germany		561.00						561.00
A. Northrop	11/8	11/9	Bulgaria		252.42		12,597.90*				12,850.32
	11/9	11/10	Croatia		279.00						279.00
	11/10	11/12	Serbia		527.00						527.00
	11/12	11/14	Germany		561.00						561.00
Committee total					4,645.84		34,535.30				39,181.14

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Airfare inclusive of multiple legs of trip.

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Chairman, Jan. 20, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	11/12	11/12	South America		350.50		1,029.09				1,379.59
	11/12	11/13	North America		242.00				472.00		714.00
Jeffrey Shockey	11/10	11/11	Europe		131.00		4,622.59				4,622.59
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/13	Asia		710.82						131.00
	11/11	11/13									710.82
Chelsey Campbell	11/10	11/11	Europe		131.00		13,800.40				13,800.40
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/13	Asia		710.82						131.00
	11/11	11/13									710.82
Damon Nelson	11/10	11/11	Europe		131.00		13,800.40				13,800.40
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/13	Asia		710.82						131.00
	11/11	11/13									710.82
Jacob Crisp	11/10	11/11	Europe		131.00		13,800.40				13,800.40
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/13	Asia		710.82						131.00
	11/11	11/13									710.82
Timothy Bergreen	11/10	11/11	Europe		131.00		13,800.40				13,800.40
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/13	Asia		710.82						131.00
	11/11	11/13									710.82
Hon. Devin Nunes	12/12	12/13	Asia		355.41		744.35				1,099.76
Commercial airfare	12/12	12/14	Europe		255.58						255.58
	12/13	12/14									
Douglas Presley	12/12	12/13	Asia		355.41		744.35				1,099.76
	12/13	12/14	Europe		255.58						255.58
Wells Bennett	12/20	12/21	Asia		476.00				32.76		508.76
	12/21	12/23	Asia		610.00				513.66		1,123.66
Commercial airfare							15,358.10				15,358.10
Committee total					23,738.24		337,540.50		32,444.88		393,723.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lynn A. Westmoreland	11/20	11/22	Germany		653.76		12,680.10				13,333.86
	11/23	11/24	Italy		977.28				290.63		1,267.91
J. Mac Tolar	11/20	11/22	Germany		653.76		12,057.30				12,711.06
	11/23	11/24	Italy		977.28						977.28
Committee total					3,262.08		24,737.40		290.63		28,290.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, Jan. 28, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Erika Schlager	9/20	10/4	Poland	Zloty	4,036.00		2,484.00				6,520.00
			Austria	Euro							
Mischa Thompson	9/27	10/3	Poland	Zloty	1,719.00		3,749.00				5,468.00
			Brussels	Euro							
Paul Massaro	11/15	11/20	Austria	Euro	2,256.00		1,360.90				3,616.90
	10/16	10/24	Israel	Shekel	2,086.00		2,731.96				4,817.96
Orest Deychakiwsky	10/7	10/13	Jordan	Dinar							
			Belarus	Ruble	855.00		3,681.90				4,536.90
Shelly Han	10/27	11/4	Azerbaijan	Manat	2,052.00		3,917.40				5,969.40
	10/1	12/31	Austria	Euro	29,484.00		7,886.70				37,370.70
Janice Helwig	10/29	11/2	Turkey	Lira	1,552.00		1,249.20				2,801.20
	11/30	12/4	Serbia	Dinar	1,740.00		997.80				2,737.80
Nathaniel Hurd	12/4	12/13	Italy	Euro	931.79		1,816.30				2,748.09
	11/30	12/4	Serbia	Dinar	1,020.00		3,100.00				4,120.00
Committee total					47,731.79		32,975.16				80,706.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4309. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3140; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-063-AD; Amendment 39-18385; AD 2016-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4310. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited [Docket No.: FAA-2016-2068; Directorate

Identifier 2016-SW-002-AD; Amendment 39-18387; AD 2016-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4311. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-2069; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-070-AD; Amendment 39-18386; AD 2015-22-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4312. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1998; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-18379; AD 2016-01-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4313. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0669; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-038-AD; Amendment 39-18373; AD 2016-01-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4314. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1935; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-18374; AD 2016-01-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4315. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) (Airbus Helicopters) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0577; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-042-AD; Amendment 39-18375; AD 2015-12-09 RI] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4316. 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-2015-1987; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-240-AD; Amendment 39-18377; AD 2016-01-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4317. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6823; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-38-AD; Amendment

39-18360; AD 2015-27-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4318. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0824; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-18378; AD 2016-01-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4319. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1281; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-18346; AD 2015-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4320. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Denver, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6753; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-29] received February 8, 2016, 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.

4321. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q-35, Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2013-6001; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4322. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Boise, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3674; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-18] received February 8, 2016, 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.

4323. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; El Paso, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1074; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASW-10] received February 8, 2016, 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.

4324. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Revocation of Class E Airspace; Chico, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3899; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-14] February 8, 2016, 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.

4325. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following New York Towns; Elmira, NY; Ithaca, NY; Poughkeepsie, NY

[Docket No.: FAA-2015-4514; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-9] received February 8, 2016, 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.

4326. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bowman, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1834; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-8] received February 8, 2016, 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.

4327. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-443; North Central United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7611; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2016, 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.

4328. A letter from the Management and Program 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.: 31056; Amdt. No.: 3678] received February 8, 2016, 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.

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. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 4532. A bill to provide for a safe harbor for reports to potential employers by current or former employers of violent behavior or threats thereof by employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

H.R. 4533. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 4534. A bill to recognize the importance of the land forces of the United States Armed Forces and to revise the fiscal year 2016 end-strength levels for these Land Forces and specify new permanent active duty end strength minimum levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms.

NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GRIMALVA):

H.R. 4535. A bill to prohibit drilling in the outer Continental Shelf, to prohibit coal leases on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4536. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unlawful disposal of fetal remains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. BOST, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COLE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4537. A bill to prohibit the use of military installations to house aliens who do not have a lawful immigration status or are undergoing removal proceedings in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4538. A bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4539. A bill to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4540. A bill to provide clarity regarding States' ability to manage the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP) and to provide States with funding to treat drug addiction in the SNAP population; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals providing adult education the same above-the-line deduction as is allowed for expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a low-income sewer and water assistance pilot program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4543. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4544. A bill to repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4545. A bill to expand the Big Laurel Branch Wilderness and Sampson Mountain Wilderness in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 4546. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to issue uniform standards for the method for truncation of Social Security account numbers in order to protect such numbers from being used in the perpetration of fraud or identity theft and to provide for a prohibition on the display to the general public on the Internet of Social Security account numbers by State and local governments and private entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to complete the required 700-mile southwest border fencing by December 31, 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4548. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to clarify that employees of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China are to be treated as covered employees for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4549. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to conduct security screening at certain airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 4550. A bill to permit qualified law enforcement officers, qualified retired law enforcement officers, and persons not prohibited by State law from carrying a concealed firearm to carry a firearm, and to discharge a firearm in defense of self or others, in a school zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIMALVA, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 612. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2016 as "National No One Eats Alone Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BARR, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HILL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 613. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the restoration of authority of the American people and the separation of powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H. Res. 614. A resolution honoring the Denver Broncos on their victory in Super Bowl 50; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. GOODLATTE:
H.R. 4532.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to provide for uniform laws that remove barriers to trade and facilitate commerce nationwide; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 9;

Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 4533.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4534.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4535.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4536.

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

the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 4537.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 "provide for the common Defense"

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 4538.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 4539.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4540.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4541.

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

Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4542.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4543.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4544.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4545.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4546.

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

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4547.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4548.

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

Article 1, Section 8, particularly Clause 18.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 4549.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 4550.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the Second Amendment of the 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."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 27: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 169: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 244: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 267: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 430: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 472: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 581: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 664: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 699: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 711: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 799: Mr. GIBSON and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 836: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 865: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 911: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 953: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 969: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1089: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. FARR, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1215: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1221: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1258: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1399: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1538: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1545: Mr. VELA, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1559: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1632: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1666: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1671: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1854: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 2058: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2367: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2403: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2404: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2515: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2646: Mr. POLQUIN.

H.R. 2858: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2957: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2962: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3071: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 3084: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3209: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3223: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3225: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3235: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3299: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 3326: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3515: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 3516: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 3520: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3565: Mr. COSTA and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3619: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3652: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3706: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3742: Mr. BRAT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3765: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3779: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3861: Mr. HURT of Virginia and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3886: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3915: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 3919: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3926: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4007: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4019: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4057: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4087: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 4177: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 4213: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 4219: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4220: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4230: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4247: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 4248: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 4262: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 4264: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4335: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 4371: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 4376: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4377: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 4381: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4390: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4399: Mr. FARR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4400: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHN-SON of Texas, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 4405: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4415: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 4420: Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 4428: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4431: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 4434: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 4436: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 4454: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 4456: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 4469: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4477: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 4479: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 4480: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4481: Ms. MOORE and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 4486: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4490: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4498: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 4505: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 4513: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 4521: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HANNA.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. KIND.
 H.J. Res. 55: Mr. MARINO, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BUCK, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BLUM, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H. Con. Res. 75: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H. Res. 148: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H. Res. 445: Mr. RIGELL.

H. Res. 469: Mr. KLINE.
 H. Res. 564: Mr. BOST.
 H. Res. 571: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H. Res. 591: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H. Res. 600: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Miss RICE of New York.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H. Res. 571: Ms. Granger.