United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2016 No. 43

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

Merciful God, thank You for giving us another day.

Your care and wisdom are shown to us by the way You extend Your kingdom into our world down to the present day. Your word reveals every aspect of Your saving plan. You accomplish Your designed purpose in and through the hearts of the faithful who respond to You.

Today convert our minds and hearts that we may become the great Nation You hope us to be.

Help the Members of this people's House to seek Your presence in the midst of their busy lives. Animate them with Your holy spirit, and help them to perform their appointed tasks to come to solutions that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

May all that is done this day 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.

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VEASEY 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GUNNERY SERGEANT MICHAEL D. STANTON II

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the Congressional Explosive Ordnance Disposal Caucus, today I rise to honor the life and service of Gunnery Sergeant Michael D. Stanton II, United States Marine Corps, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Retired.

A native of St. Louis, Missouri, Gunny Stanton was born on January 27, 1963, and passed on February 6, 2016, in Dunedin, Florida.

At the start of his career, Gunny Stanton was a telephone technician, but he soon took those technical skills and put them to work as an explosive ordnance disposal technician. When Gunny Stanton first began his training, he attended the basic EOD course at Eglin Air Force Base. While in training, his block tests and final examination scores were so high that his records remain intact to this day.

In the course of his 18 years in the Marine Corps, Stanton earned many awards too numerous to list in this space. He is preceded in death by his father, Michael Dale Stanton Sr.; and a brother, Brian Stanton. Gunny Stanton is survived by his loving family: his wife, Terri Stanton; his mother, Gloria Mueller; and a brother, Timothy Stanton.

While I know that his family and friends will remember him in their own personal way, I would like all of us here in the House of Representatives to remember him as a courageous leader and a fine marine who each day bravely faced the challenges inherent in the life of an explosive ordnance disposal technician.

IMMIGRANTS ARE PART OF AMERICA'S BACKBONE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, later today House Republicans will forward a resolution authorizing the Speaker to file an anti-immigrant amicus brief with the Supreme Court.

While Speaker RYAN has called for a vote, House Republicans refuse to reveal what the plan may say; but then again, given House Republicans' extensive record on anti-immigrant actions, little is left to the imagination.

Time and time again, GOP leadership has failed to bring a comprehensive immigration reform vote to the floor. Instead, they have favored deporting DREAMers. They have done all they can to undermine President Obama's executive actions on immigration.

Later this week, this gimmick that they are proposing will do nothing to

Printed on recycled paper.

fix our broken immigration system. Instead, it sends a message that the GOP intends to continue confining hard-working immigrants and their families to the shadows. Families who currently live in fear of deportation should be afforded the opportunity to fully contribute to the only country they call home.

As 5 million DACA/DAPA-eligible immigrants anxiously await the Court's final decision, I remind my House Republican colleagues that immigrants are part of America's backbone, and their contributions should not be discounted.

FRIVOLOUS ADA LAWSUITS ARE FLOODING OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a wave of frivolous lawsuits flooding my district. These lawsuits use the Americans with Disabilities Act, a law that has done tremendous good in our Nation, as legal cover to sue small mom-and-pop businesses for often unnoticed and easily correctible ADA violations.

Businesses that have passed local inspections are often unaware that any ADA violation exists until a lawsuit arrives in their mailbox. Instead of demanding the violation be fixed, these lawsuits try to make a quick buck by settling out of court. The businesses have little choice: pay the settlement or pay expensive business-ending attorney fees to fight the charge.

Often these attorneys, as in my district, don't even live in the State. Some use Google Earth to find violations and then file these lawsuits remotely. This is wrong. It takes advantage of the ADA, those with disabilities, and small businesses that thought they were in compliance.

That is why I have cosponsored the ADA Education and Reform Act, which we believe will fix this problem. I will work to get this bill passed so west Texans won't be abused by predatory attorneys who care more about money than helping those with disabilities.

FREE SPEECH IS UNDER ASSAULT IN TURKEY

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, free speech and the freedom of the press are under assault in Turkey.

No longer can the United States turn a blind eye as an increasingly authoritarian regime continues to crack down on virtually all critical voices. The harassment, intimidation, and prosecution of dissenting journalists and citizens as well as the government takeover of critical media outlets represents the antithesis of free speech and a free press. These are not the actions of a nation that respects democratic values.

Beyond the obvious consequences, by continuing on this path, the regime risks destabilization and pushing the persecuted into the arms of Islamist extremism. Right now, today, Turkey's leadership should embrace the marketplace of ideas that is a part of any vibrant, real, and sincere democracy.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL FORAN, GRAND MARSHAL OF SAVANNAH'S 2016 ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Savannah's St. Patrick's Day parade as well as Mr. Michael Foran, the 2016 grand marshal of the St. Patrick's Day parade.

The St. Patrick's Day parade is a family tradition for all Savannahians and many tourists alike. After 190 years of the St. Patrick's celebration, the Savannah parade has grown into the third largest in the world.

I would like to congratulate the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee on 192 years of festivities. I know this year's committee will present an excellent parade.

I would also like to congratulate Mr. Foran as the 2016 grand marshal. Holding all the characteristics of a great grand marshal, he fits the bill of a true Savannahian. As a member of a proud Irish family, Mr. Foran is the perfect person to receive this distinction.

I want to thank Mr. Foran and his family for their continued service to the entire Savannah community.

REMEMBERING HOWARD COBLE

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend, mentor, and former colleague, Congressman Howard Coble. Howard was a proud son of Greensboro, who for 30 years served the people of North Carolina's Sixth District with honor, integrity, and kindness.

While he is no longer with us, we will always remember Howard fondly. We miss his unique style, including madras jackets, colorful suspenders, and distinctive hats, his humble sense of humor and his personality that drew people to him.

As a matter of fact, Howard never met a stranger, and he set a standard for legendary constituent service. His constituents knew they had a friend in Congressman Coble. I work every day to live up to that example.

Howard's 85th birthday would have been tomorrow. I want to ask my colleagues and my fellow North Carolinians to join me in celebrating his remarkable life. It was a privilege to get to know Howard Coble, to call him a friend, and to continue his legacy of service to the people of North Carolina.

I know there will be no shortage of celebration in Heaven tonight.

Happy birthday, Congressman Coble.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 639, AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE ON BEHALF OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 649 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 649

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 639) authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15-674. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, which will provide for consideration of House Resolution 639. I believe the underlying resolution is imperative to protecting the balance of power that our Founders so carefully enshrined in the United States Constitution.

I would also like to point out that the House Committee on Rules held an original jurisdiction hearing and markup yesterday in which we received testimony and consideration of an amendment from the minority.

Mr. Speaker, over 25 States or State officials have filed suit challenging the Obama administration's expansion of DACA and the creation of DACA-like programs for aliens who are parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents.

On February 16, 2015, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas entered and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed a preliminary injunction prohibiting further implementation of these programs on the ground that States are likely to prevail in their argument for the programs that have run afoul of the law.

The Supreme Court indicated that they will begin hearing oral arguments on United States v. Texas in April of 2016 and that it will consider the plaintiffs' claims under the Take Care Clause. Because of this timely consideration by the highest court in the land, it is imperative that the House consider this underlying resolution.

I want to make it very clear that this resolution is not about policy. If you spoke with every single Member of this body, you would find a wide spectrum of opinions regarding how to handle the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants currently residing in the United States unlawfully. This resolution is not about those viewpoints. It is about the fundamental separation of power ingrained in our founding document, the Constitution.

Article I, section 8 gives Congress, not the President, the authority ''to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.'' The administration simply cannot ignore certain statutes and selectively enforce others or bypass the legislative process to create laws for executive fiat.

This administration has failed in its duty under Article II, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and the Supreme Court has specifically indicated that it will consider the plaintiffs' claims under the Take Care Clause. Clearly, the Court views this case as an important review of Article I and Article II issues and the balance of power between the branches.

□ 0915

For that reason, and that reason alone, the United States House of Representatives is uniquely suited to speak to this underlying question that has been raised by the court.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House can't agree on a budget. They take futile vote after futile vote to kill ObamaCare. They waste millions of dollars and thousands of hours on the futility. Children are drinking lead-tainted water from aging pipes criss-crossing the country. Young people are saddled with crushing student loan debt. Bridges are crumbling. Our schools are falling apart. Obviously, the Metro system in Washington is in serious condition. Our airports are struggling to function, and we have no high-speed rail.

But what do we do here? We vote 64 times to take health care away from people. We have Benghazi hearings, which come to nothing. We have had eight in the House. Many chairs of those committees have said there is nothing there, so we set up a Select Committee to look at it again and spend millions of dollars to see what they can find.

We go after Planned Parenthood, investigate them, set up a Select Committee to do that—despite the fact that a case in Texas against Planned Parenthood found in favor of Planned Parenthood and indicted the people who made the film which created such a sensation in this House. We waste congressional time with duplicative, baseless investigations. Today, the crusade against President Obama reaches new heights.

This resolution surrounding United States v. Texas adds to the already overwhelming list of baseless political tactics that the House majority has used to discredit, undermine, and disrespect President Obama.

This resolution makes a political statement, one that represents the House majority—not the entire House of Representatives or even the entire Congress, since a major part of it has been left out of this altogether.

This resolution seeks to put this whole Chamber on record when there is significant, vocal, and strong opposition. In fact, 186 House Democrats, along with 39 Senate Democrats, have joined together for our own amicus brief in support of the President's executive actions.

Not only were the President's actions constitutional, they are in line with decades of bipartisan action by Presidents on immigration itself, including action by President Ronald Reagan and President George H.W. Bush.

This is a rarely seen ploy, seeking to file an amicus brief as the whole House, leaving out completely the voice of the minority. I hope the American people will see it for what it is: purely political. This shows us, once again, that the Republicans are willing to prioritize their party over their country.

Adding insult to injury, Speaker RYAN has said:

''The president is not permitted to write law—only Congress is.''

How true, indeed. So why don't we, the Congress, do what we were sent here to do: write laws.

Republicans have reached for a tool that is not in their constitutional tool box: running to the courthouse. Rather than allowing Congress to do its job, the Republicans insist on telling other branches of government how to do theirs.

It is quickly becoming clear that this is a dangerous moment in our country and in our political system. The Presidential primary field on the Republican side is resorting to demagoguery and nativism, fanning the flames of dangerous anti-immigrant anger and anger in general.

What the President rightly called ''vulgar and divisive rhetoric'' in the Republican contest is a logical and foreseeable consequence of the anger and fear carefully and deliberately cultivated by decades of Republican campaign strategy, as Republicans went beyond principled advocacy for smaller government to the outright encouragement of people to think of government as the problem and their an enemy to be hated.

This debate would not have even been an issue if, last Congress, the House had taken up the bipartisan Senate immigration bill, which they were asked time and time again to do but it never saw the light of day here. That was an opportunity for our country to come together in a bipartisan way, instead of further dividing us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the argument we are making today is that this President has a repeated history of needing to have his actions resolved through the court system.

The Supreme Court has acted over 13 times to rule against the Obama administration. This President is an activist President that works around the legislature. As a matter of fact, even Members of this body have implicated that they don't even know who their White House contacts are.

We have repeatedly tried to work with the President. We hold hearings. They ignore and rebuff the things that we do. They disallow what are considered to be normal rules of law.

So this is an action that has been brought by the States, not by the United States Congress. We were simply asked to give an opinion, and that is what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) one of our bright, new members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolution.

I disagree with the gentlewoman from New York. This is not about politics. This is about the Constitution of the United States. And it is very clear. It says the President ''shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.''

Now, some people may argue about what that may mean. But in 1792, President Washington, who was the chair of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, wrote this:

''It is my duty to see the Laws executed—to permit them to be trampled upon with impunity would be repugnant to'' my duty.

Fast forward to 2010. In response to those arguing for executive amnesty at that time, President Obama himself stated:

> I am President. I am not king. There's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I'm obliged to execute the law. I can't just make the laws up myself.

Six months later, the President went further. He said this:

There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Unfortunately, in 2012, President Obama reversed course and unilaterally imposed a massive program of executive amnesty in violation of this country's immigration laws. In 2014, he doubled down with a second, more expansive executive amnesty program.

According to an analysis by the Migration Policy Institute, 87 percent of all illegal aliens will be exempted from immigration enforcement actions under this President's amnesty policies. Thus, immigration laws, as actually written by Congress, will apply to a mere 13 percent of violators.

In the upcoming case of the United States v. Texas, the Court will consider whether the President's executive amnesty violated the Constitution. Consequently, that case has the potential to be one of the most important constitutional decisions on executive power ever decided.

This resolution authorizes the filing of an amicus brief on behalf of this House in legal opposition to the President's unconstitutional actions.

As a lawyer, I can tell you amicus filings are important. They allow the court to obtain information and arguments from nonparties who have an important bearing on this case.

This resolution will allow this body to be heard before the Supreme Court.

This is not about immigration policy. This is about ensuring that this President and future Presidents, regardless of their political party, do not have the authority to ignore or change the laws through executive fiat. Ultimately, this is about the Constitution and protecting the rule of law.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this important resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative LOFGREN's resolution expressing the position of the House in support of the Obama administration in United States v. Texas.

If the House is going to take a vote on weighing in on an anti-immigrant lawsuit filed against the President, we should at least have the option of voting to support the President's executive actions, which are a worthwhile and temporary first step toward reforming our broken immigration system.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth reflecting why we are here.

When we had the bipartisan bill passed by the Senate last Congress, the Congressional Budget Office calculated that it would mean almost a trillion dollars to the positive for the American economy, not to mention the human toll that our current broken system inflicts on people.

Now, we failed to act. And when we did, the President went to the Office of Legal Counsel, an independent group, and asked them what he could do, if anything. I thought they were rather conservative, but one of the things they said he could do was to give temporary reprieve to children who had been brought here without their concurrence and to the parents of American citizens. So he did that.

How could he do that? Because the Congress has delegated to the executive the authority to act. In 1952, we did so—it can be found at 8 U.S.C. 1103(a)(3)—and again in 2002. When we created the Department of Homeland Security, we told the Department Secretary that he should establish immigration policies and priorities for removal.

Now, why would that happen? We have only appropriated 4 percent of the funds necessary to remove everyone who is here without their proper papers. So clearly, there needs to be some prioritization. We recognize that. We told the Secretary to do it, and that is exactly what he did. We delegated the authority.

On work authorization, again, we delegated that authority. In 1981, President Reagan went to rulemaking and established that authority, which is actually in practice; it has been in place. And Congress, in 1986, explicitly recognized the authority to give work authorization to those who are in deferred action status.

But even without that delegation, the President has long had the authority to take the action that the President has in this case. It is called prosecutorial discretion and foreign policy.

In United States v. Arizona, Justices Roberts and Kennedy noted that when the executive has broad discretion, a principal feature of the removal system is that it extends, and it extends to whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all.

This isn't new with President Obama. When President Reagan held that office, he sponsored a bill that gave relief—amnesty, if you will—to several million people; but the Congress—and it is reflected in the Judiciary Committee report—specifically excluded the spouses and children of those who had relief. What did Reagan do? He gave deferred action to the spouses and the children who had been specifically excluded from relief by the Congress because he didn't want to break up families. That was about 40 person of the undocumented people at the time—about the same amount that President Obama has dealt with.

Not only is this resolution wrong, it is the wrong process. Democrats went to the Ethics Committee. We got approval to get a volunteer to write a brief, which I will later include in the RECORD. We read it before we signed it.

In contrast, what are you asking Members to do? You have no idea what you are signing onto, just that you are against it.

Now, does this mean that you are saying that the Administrative Procedure Act applies whenever the President takes a discretionary action? Well, good luck fighting ISIS then. Good luck getting disaster relief if there is a flood.

It is defective for process, too. There is a group called the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. I have been involved with that in the past. That group is consulted when there is an issue that relates to the prerogatives of the House. For example, is there a speech or debate issue before the court?

□ 0930

This did not come before the BLAG because this is political. This is not about the prerogatives of the House.

Now, all Members of the House had an opportunity to file a brief, and Republican Members still can if they can meet the time deadlines. But using this process, I think there is a reason why CRS was unable to tell us any other instance where a process like this was used about the prerogatives of the House.

So this is a radical procedure and a radical act because it says the House cannot delegate to the executive, as we have done, because it could cripple the President by requiring the Administrative Procedure Act whenever he takes a discretionary act, because it violates the procedures the House has always used.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. But finally, the net result could be this: if the Republicans prevail, we could end up with a roundup of a million kids who did nothing wrong, who were brought here as infants, who don't even remember the country of their birth.

When all is said and done, that is what this is about.

I would urge that our colleagues vote ''no'' on this radical resolution. We will attempt to offer a resolution that, instead, is something you know what you are buying into, not a pig in a poke, but a thoughtful, reasoned brief that outlines what the House has done to delegate to the executive, outlines what the executive's authority has been since Eisenhower.

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

Mr. Speaker, if you listen to our colleagues, they make wild accusations. They are swinging widely rather than understanding the essence of the case. The essence of the case is more than 25 States have gone to Federal Court in Texas, at the heart of the border, and argued the laws of the United States of America.

The process that comes about and that we agree with is we do not believe that the President of the United States, not any President, has the authority, the responsibility, or the legal standing to do what this President has done.

The President repeated that, evidently, some 21 times, that he did not have that standing either to do what he eventually did, which was purely political, and that is what we are being accused of today.

We believe that rule of law is the most important attribute, and we simply in the House of Representatives are supporting what the Supreme Court has asked at the time the oral arguments will be done here before the Supreme Court, probably in the next month or so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), an esteemed district attorney in Colorado and currently a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution lays out a very clear picture of how our government works. In Article I, section 8, the Founding Fathers gave Congress the duty to create laws. More importantly, Article I gave Congress the authority to ''establish a uniform rule of naturalization.''

Rather than enforcing the laws Congress created, the President has failed to execute them. Through his executive actions, he has even bypassed this building, rewriting the laws on immigration to his liking.

Sadly, this is not the only time our President has bypassed Congress and, by extension, the will of the people. On energy regulations, health care, war powers, gun rights, and even judicial nominations, all have faced Presidential work-arounds. Through executive actions, failure to enforce laws, and administrative regulations, the executive branch is slowly becoming a monarchy.

I founded the Article I Caucus last year to fight executive overreach and reassert the power of Congress. Today we have an incredible opportunity to speak to not just one, but two of the other branches of government.

Speaker RYAN has a duty to stand up for Congress and the people of this Nation by filing a friend of the court brief in this case. I urge my colleagues to vote today to give him that prerogative.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in April, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in the United States v. Texas, a case that has been repeatedly litigated by our colleagues in the halls of Congress. And this resolution is absolutely about immigration policy. Let's be clear.

Numerous hearings have been held in our committee challenging the constitutionality of Deferred Actions for Parents of Americans. Our colleagues, instead of moving forward on comprehensive immigration reform and fixing our broken immigration system, have instead insisted on putting forth a resolution, a resolution that has no substantive findings, makes no legal arguments against the executive action, and exists only in the hopes of securing time before the Court during oral arguments.

If our colleagues do find themselves before the Court in this case, it would be helpful if they remember the settled Constitutional law on this subject.

DAPA is a lawful exercise of executive discretion well within the bounds of the Constitution. It is based on laws enacted by Congress that grant broad discretion to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Since 1952, Congress has authorized the executive branch to establish such regulations, issue such instructions, and perform such other acts as it deems necessary for carrying out its authority. And within that authority, it is a reasonable exercise of the discretion delegated by Congress to do what it is doing.

The executive action focuses the limited resources of the Department of Homeland Security on public safety priorities, ensuring that we are deporting felons, not families.

It is important to recognize that Congress appropriates enough to remove less than 4 percent of the unauthorized immigrants now in our country. The Secretary of Homeland Security has the statutory responsibility to set enforcement priorities and to adopt policies necessary for meeting these priorities.

It is consistent with the actions of Presidents of both parties for the last decades, including President Eisenhower, President Reagan, and President George Herbert Walker Bush. In fact, the strongest historical precedent for DAPA was the Family Fairness program implemented by President Reagan and President Bush.

These executive actions will strengthen our communities, keep families together, and grow our economy.

This resolution is not about limiting executive authority. It is about attempting to reverse immigration policy set by the executive branch.

I understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to admit that, or they want to frame it in the context of a Constitutional question, but it is really about changing policies that are keeping families together, that are making sure that we properly allocate resources to the most serious individuals who should be deported, those who have committed crimes, and keep families together while we work to fix our broken immigration system.

This is about a fundamental change in immigration policy that will rip families apart, that will undermine our values as a country. We ought to call it what it is.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and vote against this resolution.

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

I would remind this body, Mr. Speaker, that over 13 times the highest court in this land, the Supreme Court, has ruled against this activist President for exceeding his constitutional authority.

This President, in his own concoction of the way the country ought to be run, does not follow the rules, not the rule of law, not the rule of providing enough information for people by properly delineating the way rules and laws should be executed.

That is why we are here today. It has everything to do with our belief that the President of the United States has not well and faithfully properly executed the laws of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this important situation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 639.

Mr. Speaker, we are here again discussing the President and his executive actions. Back in November of 2014, President Obama announced a series of executive actions that would have provided amnesty to approximately 5 million additional illegal immigrants.

Amnesty for these 5 million illegal immigrants would have been in addition to the millions who were provided amnesty under the administration's 2012 actions.

The President continues to degrade the rights of American citizens and ignores the U.S. Constitution which this country was founded on.

The checks and balances that our Founding Fathers established made it specifically clear that they wanted Congress to enact laws that shape our country, not the President. That is why I am supporting House Resolution 639.

House Resolution 639 will allow the Speaker of the House to submit to the U.S. Supreme Court its opinion, arguing that the President's executive action on amnesty for illegal immigration is unconstitutional. Congress must be able to express its arguments that the President's executive order on amnesty is unconstitutional so we can continue to maintain the balance of power between Congress and the President.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 639 so we can continue to deny the President's overreach of power and uphold the rights and responsibilities given to this body by the Constitution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think context is important in this debate we are having today. I can't get it out of

my head, as we look at House Resolution 639, that our Senate has just announced that it is going to shut down the Supreme Court nomination process.

Only a few years ago, the House shut down the government for 16 days.

We have had 62 ACA repeals.

MITCH MCCONNELL once said, famously, that his goal was to make Obama a one-term President. He failed at that.

The fact is that here we are again with Republican efforts to undermine, thwart, and shut down President Obama. This is outrageous, in my opinion.

House Resolution 639 is nothing but a continuation of the politics of obstruction, just one more way to say you are not really the President, you are not legitimate. That is what this represents today. That is the exercise we are taking on this floor.

President Obama's action will bring relief to millions of families who live in fear. Families shouldn't be torn apart because House Republicans refuse to work together with Democrats to pass an immigration bill which would make executive action unnecessary.

While the Republicans held up progress, President Obama worked within his authority and took courageous steps needed to address the problems of millions of Americans.

The Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and the expanded Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program is an important step toward fixing an immigration system that is inhumane and cruel, and it is within the right of the President to prioritize removal proceedings for certain people. We have to prioritize them. We cannot remove everybody at the same time.

Furthermore, it is consistent with the action of past Presidents, dating back to President Eisenhower, including George H.W. Bush and Ronald Reagan, who both took executive action to keep immigrant families together.

The Republicans offer no substantive findings and no legal arguments in their resolution. This is a delay tactic. This is a political tactic. This does not serve the interests of the American people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ELLISON. The fact that executive action is right for American families, and right for our economy, and right for our society, is what should guide our actions today, not political delay tactics.

Republicans won't acknowledge that immigration and immigrants are an important part of the society that we live in. I stand with the families that President Obama is trying to keep together within his authority.

Vote ''no'' on House Resolution 639.

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

There is a lot of good debate here today. The facts of the case are real simple. The Supreme Court of the United States will be deciding this.

□ 0945

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Federal District Court of the Southern District of Texas have let their answer be known, and that is they believe that the President is wrong. But we have a process to follow, and the good part is it is not whether something House Republicans are doing is trying to delay or to stop something that might be a decision-making that has been made by someone else. We are simply trying to support an action that was asked as a result by the Supreme Court: Do we have an opinion about this issue? And it is thus that we are asking the House of Representatives to come together today to hear the facts of this issue and to then render a decision.

That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is normal and regular, and our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, is most meticulous in looking at this issue. His advice and judgment comes from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Virginia, BOB GOODLATTE. Both of these gentlemen are not only well balanced, but really doing what is being asked of them by the third branch of government, which is the judiciary. The judiciary has asked the House of Representatives and parties to this suit if they would please discuss this issue.

We believe our ideas are material to the question at hand, and that is why the United States House of Representatives, through the Rules Committee, is here for this rule today and the underlying legislation in just a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), an exciting young member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of Speaker RYAN's House Resolution 639.

Like many of my colleagues, I continue to oppose President Obama's illegal amnesty program, and I have long believed that the proper venue to challenging the President's overreaching actions is primarily in the courts of this country. To this end, I was 1 of 68 Members of Congress—and the only member from the New Jersey delegation—to sign an amicus brief in support of a lawsuit brought by a coalition of 26 States against the President's executive order on immigration.

As a lawyer who has practiced constitutional law in my home State of New Jersey, I have tried to study these issues closely. There is no gray area: Congress writes the laws, and the executive branch enforces them.

The executive overreach consistently taken by this administration demonstrates not only contempt for law, but a disregard for the critical balance of powers central to our Constitution. The American system of self-governance would not be as strong as it is if it were not for these bedrock principles.

Today, we have unelected officials in Federal agencies writing our laws. The executive branch is appropriating taxpayer funds without authorization from Congress, and departments are selectively deciding which laws to enforce. Prosecutorial discretion cannot be expanded to break the rule of law, as I am confident the Supreme Court of the United States will rule.

I applaud Speaker RYAN for pursuing an amicus brief to defend our Article I powers under the Constitution. Given the President's gross executive overreach, it is essential for this institution to respond as a whole. This action today is not only prudent, but an important and necessary step in defense of the Constitution and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 639.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this is a political act because this action only comes with President Obama. We never did this with Republican Presidents.

Let me give you an example. After Tiananmen Square, the House of Representatives passed a bill to preclude the deportation of Chinese students. President Bush vetoed that bill. Do you know what he did then? He deferred the deportation of the Chinese students because he had the executive authority.

In 1999, a letter was sent to Janet Reno. It was signed by Henry Hyde, LAMAR SMITH, SAM JOHNSON, and many others asking her to use her prosecutorial discretion and citing the fact that the prosecutorial discretion is clear in removal proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I will include that letter in the RECORD.

I was shocked to hear Mr. SESSIONS say that the Court had solicited a brief—maybe I misunderstood him—had asked the House for a brief. If that is the case, I would respectfully request to see a copy of the document soliciting a brief from the House of Representatives. That is a procedure that would be an extraordinary one, and it is certainly news to me.

Finally, I would like to add that the fact that Mr. GOODLATTE doesn't agree with the President has nothing to do with the fact that the procedures were not followed in this case. The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group is the process established in the House to be used when the House takes a step in Court to defend its prerogatives, which is what the majority is suggesting is at play in this case.

This is clearly a political act, and if it succeeds, who will be punished? One million children who did nothing wrong, who will be rounded up and taken from their homes.

I don't know what Republicans think they are doing if they sign on to this resolution because it doesn't give any findings nor does it say what, in fact, they are signing on to.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my dear friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman from Texas for yielding and for leading on this issue.

As I sit and listen to this debate, a number of things come to mind, and they start with this: I am hearing a lot of policy discussion over on the other side of the aisle, but this is about a constitutional question.

We have just said good-bye to one of the great, great Justices in the United States Supreme Court, Justice Scalia, who often said that, when he made a decision based on the Constitution and he was uncomfortable with the policy that resulted from that constitutional decision, he was most comfortable that he had made the right constitutional decision when he disagreed with a policy result of that decision.

That is also how we should view this case. Every one of us that has the privilege to speak and address you on the floor of this House has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. This is about the President's oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, except his says take care to ''preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States,'' and it is referenced in the Take Care Clause in the Constitution that requires him to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Now, I don't know that there is a schoolchild in this land that is going to get that wrong. They don't think that the President should execute the law itself and then conduct himself in the fashion that he sees fit. I think they understand that the President, multiple times, has lectured the country in his adjunct constitutional law professorship that he didn't have the constitutional authority to do what he did.

So this issue is about the Take Care Clause, the President keeping his oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, and it is about prosecutorial discretion, as the gentlewoman from California said; except that, it was a clear understanding, when they wrote the Morton Memos, that they were creating groups of people, classes of people, and categories of people, and the Morton Memos were the beginning of this. They created four different categories of people, and as far as I know, anyone who fit into those categories was essentially maybe individually dealt with because they processed their paperwork, but they were automatically exempted from the application of the law. That is when this began.

We should not think, Mr. Speaker, that the House hasn't weighed in on this. It goes back to this. March 2, 2011, was the introduction of the Morton Memos. That was the first executive overreach on immigration that is starkly on paper. The first opportunity to push back on that was a hearing in which Janet Napolitano asserted that it was on an individual basis only and repeated herself. And Morton Memos themselves have several references to an individual basis only, except that they create four categories of people. So the words don't mean what the rules do. They abuse prosecutorial discretion by granting it to vast groups of people that were defined first in the Morton Memos.

So I brought an amendment June 7, 2012, that cut off all the funding to the Morton Memos. That passed 238–175 on a bipartisan vote. The next opportunity was the Morton Memos in DACA, another King amendment, June 6, 2013, that passed 224–201, another bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

So we addressed the Morton Memos in this House and voted to defund them in 2012. That was the first opportunity.

The next opportunity was 2013. We addressed the Morton Memos in DACA and defunded them in this House of Representatives. That was also a bipartisan vote.

Then August 1, 2014, we addressed DACA alone, defunded it, a vote of 216–192, another bipartisan vote, Mr. Speaker.

Not to be completing it there, January 14, 2015, the House addressed, separately, DAPA and Morton Memos in an amendment to defund. That passed 237–190. And we picked up the DACA in a separate amendment, same day, and that passed 218–209.

The House has voted time and time again. And if that was not enough for the voice of the House to weigh in on this, we came back again on June 3, 2015, another King amendment, and defunded the DOJ lawsuit we are talking about here now because we said: Step back, Mr. President; keep your oath of office. We stood up, and we defended ours.

I will say this. Despite all of these votes, the government and Democrat Members claim Congress has acquiesced to the unconstitutional actions when the House has a clear voting history of opposing each step in the President's path to amnesty.

So the House has now exhausted our remedies, with the exception of the omnibus spending bills, where everything gets packaged up in one vote. Except for that, the House has done all it can, Mr. Speaker, except for this opportunity to introduce an amicus brief that will be the voice of the House keeping our oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Is it the gentleman's proposition that a vote in this House that does not become law voids an action of the House that does become law, to wit, the 2002 Department of Homeland Security Act that directed the Secretary to establish priorities for removal?

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

Mr. SESSION. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am asserting that the House needs to do all it can to keep our oath to support and defend the Constitution, and we are doing this today with this endorsement of the Speaker's amicus brief so that the House can weigh in in defending our constitutional obligation.

I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman from New York for her courtesies.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to take note, in light of the previous debate and comments that were made, that this is a House divided. This amicus brief more than likely will be supported by a number of Members, but it will not be supported by the entirety of the House. So whether or not it is a majority, which is the other party, it is not going to be the voice of the entirety of the House.

As far as I am concerned, and as the Constitution has made clear, that responsibility that the President has exercised is a constitutional authority. So I oppose the resolution because it is nothing more than our Republican majority's latest partisan attacks on the President and a diversionary tactic to avoid addressing some of the more important issues such as the broken immigration system.

Just a few years ago, the Senate Republicans and Democrats came together to produce and pass a very thorough assessment of the immigration system, and they actually passed laws, the intent of the Nation, represented by Senators, and that came to the House and never saw the light of day to be able to be voted on. But yet the Homeland Security Committee, in an extensive series of hearings and then, of course, legislation, then wrote legislation that passed by voice vote in a bipartisan manner to protect the border, everything that the Republican side is asking for.

But lying at the heart of the plaintiff's misguided and wholly partisan

complaint is a specious claim that President Obama lacked the constitutional authority and statutory authority to take executive action. This frivolous and partisan lawsuit seeks to have DACA and DAPA declared to be invalid and to permanently enjoin the Obama administration from implementing those salutary policies.

Let me briefly speak about these actions by the President. They are reasonable. The reason they are reasonable is because, in addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the Take Care Clause as ensuring Presidential control over those who execute and enforce the laws and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws.

□ 1000

Arizona v. United States, Bowsher v. Synar, Buckley v. Valeo, Printz v. United States, Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.

Let me also say to you that this is a Texas case that they are submitting the amicus on. These are Texas DREAMers. Many of us have worked with them. They are in our institutions of higher learning. They are going to be contributing to society. This is what this amicus brief is, to turn them back and to turn their families.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. How would DACA and DAPA impact domestic violence? DACA provided a sense of peace, knowing that this woman would not be deported.

I would argue to my friends that whatever the vote is today, it is not the sense of the House. It is a divided House, and we are not supporting an amicus to turn back the President's constitutional authority.

With that, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the rule governing debate of H. Res. 639, and the underlying resolution, which authorizes the Speaker to appear as Amicus Curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674.

I oppose the resolution because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 639, if adopted, would vest in the Speaker alone the power to file on behalf of the full House an amicus brief with the Supreme Court supporting the constitutionally untenable position of 26 Republican-controlled states in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674.

Lying at the heart of the plaintiffs' misguided and wholly partisan complaint is the specious claim that President Obama lacked the constitutional and statutory authority to take executive actions to implement Administration policy with regard to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens and Lawful Permanent Residents, the creation of (DAPA).

This frivolous and partisan lawsuit seeks to have DACA and DAPA declared invalid and to permanently enjoin the Obama Administration from implementing these salutary policies, both of which are intended to keep law-abiding and peace loving immigrant families together.

The purely partisan nature of the resolution before us is revealed by its text, which authorizes the Speaker to waste precious taxpayer funds and file on behalf of every Member of the House an amicus brief that no Member has seen in support of a position opposed by virtually every member of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Pursuant to Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, ''shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the ''Take Care'' Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., Arizona v. United States; Bowsher v. Synar; Buckley v. Valeo; Printz v. United States; Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has ''prosecutorial discretion''—the inherent power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Thus, enforcement agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), properly may exercise their discretion to devise and implement policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize our nation's resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Mr. Speaker, to see the utter lack of merit in the legal position to be supported by the amicus brief permitted by H. Res. 639, one need take note of the fact that deferred action has been utilized in our nation for decades by Administrations headed by presidents of both parties without controversy or challenge.

In fact, as far back as 1976, INS and DHS leaders have issued at least 11 different memoranda providing guidance on the use of similar forms of prosecutorial discretion.

Executive authority to take action is thus ''fairly wide,'' and the federal government's discretion is extremely ''broad'' as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of Arizona v. United States, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written by Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

''Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A rincipal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal.'' (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in Arizona v. United States, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as ''[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families'' or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

''Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities.''

Exercising thoughtful discretion in the enforcement of the nation's immigration law saves scarce taxpayer funds, optimizes limited resources, and produces results that are more humane and consistent with America's reputation as the most compassionate nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, a DREAMER (an undocumented student) seeking to earn her college degree and aspiring to attend medical school to better herself and her new community is not a threat to the nation's security.

Law abiding but unauthorized immigrants doing honest work to support their families pose far less danger to society than human traffickers, drug smugglers, or those who have committed a serious crime.

The President was correct in concluding that exercising his discretion regarding the implementation of DACA and DAPA policies enhances the safety of all members of the public, serves national security interests, and furthers the public interest in keeping families together.

Mr. Speaker, according to numerous studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office, Social Security Administration, and Council of Economic Advisors, the President's DACA and DAPA directives generate substantial economic benefits to our nation.

For example, unfreezing DAPA and expanded DACA is estimated to increase GDP by $230 billion and create an average of 28,814 jobs per year over the next 10 years.

That is a lot of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Let me cite a just a few examples of executive action taken by American presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

2. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 ''Mariel Cubans'' were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

3. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

4. In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

5. In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

6. In 2010, the Obama Administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of the President's leadership and visionary executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a $338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me note that the President's laudable executive actions are a welcome development but not a substitute for undertaking the comprehensive reform and modernization of the nation's immigration laws supported by the American people.

Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges.

Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

Comprehensive immigration reform is desperately needed to ensure that Lady Liberty's lamp remains the symbol of a land that welcomes immigrants to a community of immigrants and does so in a manner that secures our borders and protects our homeland.

Instead of wasting time debating divisive and mean spirited measures like H. Res. 639, we should instead seize the opportunity to pass legislation that secures our borders, preserves America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world, and will yield hundreds of billions of dollars in economic growth.

I urge all Members to join me in voting against H. Res. 639.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), who serves on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. BOST. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, whenever we take these offices—and understand, I have raised my hand and took an oath of office many times in my life, whether it was in the United States Marine Corps., local government, or here in Congress. When I take that oath and mention the fact that I am swearing allegiance to the Constitution to do my duty and do it correctly, I make that promise, and I make that promise to the American people. This document that we take an oath to, the President himself has to take that same oath.

When the President steps away from that oath, this House has no other thing that they can do but to act.

Any grade school civics student knows that Congress makes the law and the President executes them. It is called the separation of powers, checks and balances. But the President's executive amnesty proves once again that he wants to do both—both. That is not in the Constitution. It doesn't work that way.

Immigration law clearly state that individuals who are here illegally must be removed. The President does not have the power to pick and choose. That is not what the law says. He doesn't get to ignore the laws.

The outcome of this case will be determined in the Court. But I want my constituents—and I want to be on the record—to know that I will uphold the Constitution; I will stand for the Constitution; and I take my oath of office very, very seriously.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and the underlying resolution so we can stop this unconstitutional move.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation. And I call on the Speaker to stop this political game and allow the vote on comprehensive immigration reform that we should have taken 2 years ago.

Everyone agrees that our immigration system is broken, but instead of voting on a solution, Congress is again wasting time on a political gimmick that does not address a single real problem.

The President took lawful action to help families being torn apart by our current system. If Republicans take issue with what current law allows, they should stop obstructing meaningful debate and get serious about comprehensive immigration reform.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I helped lead efforts last Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform by introducing the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, H.R. 15. I believe that bill would have passed if we had been given a chance to vote on it on the floor. We had 200 cosponsors and a chance to fix this problem then.

I won't blame the current Speaker for mistakes of the past, but he has a chance to lead now.

For too long, Congress has failed to take meaningful action to address our broken immigration system. As a result, we have a deeply flawed system that is not working for our communities, our businesses, immigrants, or families.

It will take Congressional action to truly repair our broken immigration system, so I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and demand that Congress act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the arguments that are on the floor today evolve and revolve around the issues that we believe are very important; that is, we believe that the President of the United States has exceeded his executive authority, and the Supreme Court is going to hear the case.

But, in fact, today the question that lies before the House is about an action that will be taken by this House to support, in an amicus brief, the positions that will be needed.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I rise today to urge Members to support this measure, House Resolution 639. Let me explain why, and why everyone should support this.

This resolution authorizes me, on behalf of the House, to file an amicus brief to defend our Article I powers under the Constitution. Normally this question would be considered by what is known as the House's Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, but I am asking the whole House to go on the record, as an institution.

I recognize that this is a very extraordinary step. I feel it is very necessary, though. In fact, I believe this is vital.

This is not a question of whether or not we are for or against any certain policy. Members who are making immigration policy arguments are missing the entire point here. This comes down to a much more fundamental question. It is about the integrity of our Constitution.

Article I. Article I states that all legislative powers are vested in Congress.

Article II. Article II states that the President ''shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.''

Those lines, that separation of powers, could not be clearer. Article I: Congress writes laws. Article II: Presidents faithfully execute those laws.

In recent years, the executive branch has been blurring these boundaries to the point of absolutely overstepping them altogether. As a result, bureaucrats responsible for executing the laws, as written, are now writing the laws at their whim.

This just doesn't throw our checks and balances off-balance, it creates a fourth branch of government. This creates a fourth branch of government

that operates with little or no accountability whatsoever. Most profoundly, this means that we the people, through our elected representatives, are not drafting the laws that we live under. This is the profound difference that is occurring here. This fourth branch of government is a danger to self-government itself.

The Supreme Court has recognized the severity of this threat. In United States v. Texas, the Court has asked whether the President's overreach violates his duty to faithfully execute the laws. This House is uniquely qualified and, I would argue, obligated to respond.

Colleagues, we are the body closest to the people. We are the ones who are directly elected by the American people every other year. And if we are going to maintain the principle of self-government, if we are going to maintain this critical founding principle of government by consent of the governed, then the legislative branch needs to be writing our laws, not the executive branch, and certainly not a branch of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats. This is what is happening. And it is not just this administration, although this administration has taken it to whole new levels.

As Speaker, I believe the authority of the office that I have been entrusted by each and every one of you is to protect the authority of this body. I am prepared to make our case.

We must defend the principle of self-determination, of self-government, of government by consent of the governed.

This Constitution protects our rights, as people. It makes sure that the government works for us and not the other way around. It makes sure that we, as citizens, if we don't like the direction our government is going, if we don't like the laws that we are being forced to live under, that we can change that through the ballot box. And this is being undermined every day.

I am prepared to submit this defense of our Article I powers, and I ask the whole House for its support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, obviously, we all like and honor the Speaker of the House. I was pleased to hear his recognition that this should have gone through the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group because that is how the House organizes itself before asserting a privilege of the House in court.

What he didn't say is why, since cert was granted on January 19—and today is March 17—he didn't call together the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. Certainly, we have met in a much shorter time frame. I know because I have been a participant in that process.

The failure to follow the procedures in this instance can only lead observers to conclude that this is a more politicized action than is traditional in terms of intervening in the court.

Now, the Speaker said: ''All legislative powers are vested in Congress.'' No one can disagree with that. And that the President must ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'' No one can disagree with that.

Is the Speaker saying that we did not, in 2002, delegate to the Secretary of Homeland Security the responsibility to establish priorities and policies, the priorities for removal, that we did not fail to provide most of the money that would be necessary to actually remove every single undocumented person in here? I think not. In fact, the President has done exactly what we said he should do in 2002.

To approve this resolution, which says that he has acted inconsistent with his duties, is a mystery. It is a pig in a poke for the Republicans.

The District Court made a finding that in order to take a discretionary action, one would need to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act. That is a very bulky procedure—90 days posting.

Are the Members of the House being asked to say that whenever the President takes a discretionary action, he must post a rule for 90 days? We don't know because this resolution only says we are against it.

If we are saying that a rule must be adopted whenever a discretionary action is taken, that would be an extraordinary departure from the President's power to act, and it is certainly something that Members ought to know they are doing before they vote on this resolution.

Much has been said about the States that filed the lawsuit. They were all States with Republican Governors. But there are States who disagree, including my State of California.

□ 1015

There is a brief filed by the Californians which reads that the discretionary action the President took would generate 130,000 jobs in California and that it would provide $3.8 billion in taxes to California.

So if we are going to use as an excuse the fact that Republican Governors filed a lawsuit to stop it, let's think about the States that have been enjoined unfairly and that are experiencing extreme economic damage because of the Fifth Circuit's misguided opinion.

I hate to say it, because I do appreciate the Speaker of the House, but there is only one way to look at this resolution—as a highly politicized effort. This is not the way the House has traditionally proceeded when adopting a court proceeding, a court intervention, that deals with the privileges of the House.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I advise my colleague that I have come to the end of my speakers and would wait for her to offer her final comments, and I will close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am prepared to close.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative LOFGREN's resolution expressing a position of the House in support of the Obama administration in United States v. Texas.

If the House is going to vote on weighing in on the anti-immigration lawsuit that was filed against the President, we should at least have the option of voting to support the President's executive actions, which are a worthwhile, if temporary, first step toward reforming our broken immigration system.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is broken, as evidenced by the fact that there are 11 million undocumented persons who are living in the United States.

Instead of engaging in a bipartisan legislative process to reform the system, the House majority has decided to focus on discrediting the President rather than forming policies that benefit our country. There is ample evidence of Presidents long before this one having exercised the same executive order privilege without there having been any great rush by the House of Representatives to go to court to try to stop him. House Democrats would welcome the chance to work on a bipartisan solution to the Nation's broken immigration system, but we can't because we simply are not allowed to participate—only to show up to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. If we have a ''no'' vote on this closed rule, we then will be able to present our own resolution in support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her engagement on this important issue and for her leadership on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, most of all, what we are doing here is acknowledging that the Supreme Court of the United States will make this decision; but in seeking input on this important question, we feel like the House is uniquely qualified to begin answering that question, literally, with a vote. That is how we do things around here.

I do recognize and respect that the minority leader has gathered a group of those who might be Democrats—from the Democrat Party, House and Senate sides—for their own opinion, and they did file that. This is an action that will be taken today that is by the

House of Representatives, and I think the Speaker outlined why we are here and the importance of it.

Mr. Speaker, in July of 2011, President Obama stated: ''I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting, I promise you, not just on immigration reform, but that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.''

I quote the President of the United States on addressing the same issue exactly that is before us today.

Article I, section 8 gives Congress, not the President, the authority to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. It is directly out of the Constitution. The President had it right at least 21 times.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States requires the President take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today, before this body, is not about policy. It is not about how we should handle the 11 million undocumented, illegal immigrants who are currently residing in this country. It is about our Nation's Constitution. It is about the checks and balances that our Founders labored over so intensely to ensure a government will always be by and for the people. It has even been noted that it has been taught and is taught today in elementary school that the legislature—the Congress—writes the laws. That is why we are here today. It is even taught in our elementary schools.

Mr. Speaker, this administration, as well as future administrations from either party—whoever serves—must not be allowed to ignore the Constitution and circumvent those who write the laws, and it is imperative that the House speaks as an institution on this matter.

I am pleased with the arguments that have been made today. I believe they were right and just, and I believe that our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, in his own wisdom and experience and temperament, is attempting to approach this as an important constitutional issue and as the prerogative and the right and the responsibility of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following amici curiae brief:

No. 15–674

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF TEXAS, et al., Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF OF 186 MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND 39 MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS

KENNETH L. SALAZAR.
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, LLP.
SETH P. WAXMAN, COUNSEL OF RECORD.
JAMIE S. GORELICK.
PAUL R.Q. WOLFSON.
DAVID M. LEHN.
SAURABH H. SANGHVI.
RYAN MCCARL.
JOHN B. SPRANGERS.
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, LLP.

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici are 186 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and 39 Members of the U.S. Senate. A complete list of amici is set forth in the Appendix. Among them are:

U.S. House of Representatives:
Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader.
Steny H. Hoyer, Democratic Whip.
James E. Clyburn, Assistant Democratic Leader.
Xavier Becerra, Democratic Caucus Chair.
Joseph Crowley, Democratic Caucus Vice-Chair.
John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary.
Zoe Lofgren, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security of the Committee on the Judiciary.
U.S. Senate:
Harry Reid, Democratic Leader.
Richard J. Durbin, Democratic Whip.
Charles E. Schumer, Democratic Conference Committee Vice Chair and Policy Committee Chair, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest, Committee on the Judiciary.
Patty Murray, Secretary, Democratic Conference.
Patrick J. Leahy, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary.
Robert Menendez, Democratic Hispanic Task Force Chair.

As Members of Congress responsible, under Article I of the Constitution, for enacting legislation that will then be enforced by the Executive Branch pursuant to its authority and responsibility under Article II, amici have an obvious and distinct interest in ensuring that the Executive enforces the laws in a manner that is rational, effective, and faithful to Congress's intent. Given their institutional responsibility, amici would not support executive efforts at odds with duly enacted federal statutes. But where Congress has chosen to vest in the Executive discretionary authority to determine how a law should be enforced and the Executive has acted pursuant to that authority—as is the case here—amici have a strong interest in ensuring that federal courts honor Congress's deliberate choice by sustaining the Executive's action.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Congress understands that the Executive is often better positioned to determine how to adjust quickly to changing circumstances in complex fields, particularly ones involving law-enforcement and national-security concerns. Congress therefore regularly gives the Executive broad discretion to determine how to enforce such statutes. Rarely has it done so more clearly than in the Nation's immigration laws.

Recognizing the Executive's institutional advantages in the immigration context, Congress has for more than sixty years granted the Executive broad discretionary authority to ''establish such regulations; . . . issue such instructions; and perform such other acts as [the Secretary] deems necessary for carrying out his authority'' under the Immigration and Nationality Act (''INA''). 8 U.S.C. 1103(a)(3). And in 2002, in the face of a yawning gap between the size of the unauthorized immigrant population and the amount of resources reasonably available for enforcement, Congress charged the Secretary of Homeland Security with ''[e]stablishing national immigration enforcement policies and priorities.'' 6 U.S.C. 202(5). Congress thereby encouraged the Executive to focus its resources in a rational and effective manner on cases in which the Nation's interest in removal is strongest, to provide the maximum return on Congress's sizeable but necessarily finite investment in immigration enforcement.

As representatives of diverse communities across the United States, amici have witnessed how an approach to enforcement of the immigration laws that does not focus on appropriate priorities undermines confidence in those laws, wastes resources, and needlessly divides families, thereby exacting a severe human toll. Amici thus regard the DAPA Guidance as exactly the kind of ''enforcement polic[y]'' that Congress charged the Secretary with establishing. Building on the Secretary's decision to prioritize for enforcement threats to national security, border security, and public safety, the DAPA Guidance establishes a ''polic[y]'' that certain nonpriority immigrants may be considered for ''deferred action,'' i.e., memorialized temporary forbearance from removal, which triggers eligibility for work authorization upon a showing of economic need.

This Court has observed that deferred action is a ''commendable exercise in administrative discretion.'' Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm., 525 U.S. 471, 484 (1999) (''ADC''). Deferred action is not just a humanitarian exercise. Like other uses of deferred action, the DAPA Guidance facilitates the implementation of the Secretary's priorities and promotes the efficient and effective execution of the immigration laws consistent with the limited enforcement resources available. The Guidance does this by encouraging eligible persons to submit to a background check so they can be identified and classified according to removal priority, and by enabling those with an economic need to support themselves lawfully.

That the Secretary's guidance is within his statutory authority should not be open to doubt. For half a century, the Executive has used deferred action and other forms of discretionary relief in a variety of circumstances, even when not specifically authorized by statute. Congress has approved of those practices, repeatedly amending the immigration laws without foreclosing the Executive's broad discretion to use them—and even enacting provisions that presume the Executive will continue its discretionary practice of deferred action. Similarly, Congress has explicitly recognized the Executive's broad discretion to determine which removable individuals qualify for work authorization and has never disturbed the Executive's decades-long practice of providing work authorization to those granted deferred action.

The court of appeals' holding that the DAPA Guidance is ''manifestly contrary to the INA'' reflects a misreading of the INA

and a faulty approach to interpreting complex regulatory statutes like the immigration laws. The court reasoned that the immigration laws' specific references to discretionary relief from removal and work authorization under certain circumstances implicitly foreclosed discretionary relief and work authorization under others. But deferred action is not a substitute for specific statutory statuses and forms of discretionary relief, as it grants none of the legal rights that lawful status provides. Moreover, the court's expressio unius analysis disregards the broad grants of discretion that are explicit in the immigration laws and the long history of undisturbed executive exercise of that discretion. The court's approach would make it virtually impossible for Congress to grant the Executive the broad authority and discretion required to tackle urgent and unforeseen immigration challenges, while retaining the ability to direct specific enforcement action it deems appropriate. More generally, it would hamper Congress's ability to allocate to the Executive the combination of broad discretion and specific responsibilities so often needed to administer sprawling statutory schemes effectively.

Finally, even if a claim under the Take Care Clause is justiciable, and even if such a claim may be asserted against an Executive officer other than the President, the claim must fail here. The States' challenge rises and falls on the proper interpretation of the immigration laws, and thus should be viewed as presenting only a statutory claim. In any event, the Take Care Clause surely does not prevent an agency faced with the task of removing hundreds of thousands of individuals each year from pursuing such removals in a rational rather than haphazard manner in light of its limited enforcement resources.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 4, 1999.

Embargoed for release Monday, November 8, 1999.

Contact: Allen Kay, Rep. Lamar Smith.

Re Guidelines for use of prosecutorial discretion in removal proceedings.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

Hon. DORIS M. MEISSNER,
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO AND COMMISSIONER MEISSNER: Congress and the Administration have devoted substantial attention and resources to the difficult yet essential task of removing criminal aliens from the United States. Legislative reforms enacted in 1996, accompanied by increased funding, enabled the Immigration and Naturalization Service to remove increasing numbers of criminal aliens, greatly benefitting public safety in the United States.

However, cases of apparent extent hardship have caused concerns Some cases may involve removal proceedings against legal permanent residents who came to the United States when they were very young, and many years ago committed a single crime at the lower end of the ''aggravated felony'' spectrum, but have been law-abiding ever since, obtained and held jobs and remained self-sufficient, and started families in the United States. Although they did not become United States citizens, immediate family members are citizens.

There has been widespead agreement that some deportations were unfair and resulted in unjustifiable hardship. If the facts substantiate the presentations that have been made to us, we must ask why the INS pursued removal in such cases when so many other more serious cases existed.

We write to you because many people believe that you have the discretion to alleviate some of the hardships, and we wish to solicit your views as to why you have been unwilling to exercise such authority in some of the cases that have occurred. In addition, we ask whether your view is that the 1996 amendments somehow eliminated that discretion. The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established. Indeed, INS General and Regional Counsel have taken the position, apparently well-grounded in case law, that INS has prosecutorial discretion in the initiation or termination of removal proceedings (see attached memorandum). Furthermore, a number of press reports indicate that the INS has already employed this discretion in some cases.

True hardship cases call for the exercise of such discretion, and over the past year many Members of Congress have urged the INS to develop guidelines for the use of its prosecutorial discretion. Optimally, removal proceedings should be initiated or terminated only upon specific instructions from authorized INS officials, issued in accordance with agency guidelines. However, the INS apparently has not yet promulgated such guidelines.

The undersigned Members of Congress believe that just as the Justice Department's United States Attorneys rely on detailed guidelines governing the exercise of their prosecutorial discretion, INS District Directors also require written guidelines, both to legitimate in their eyes the exercise of discretion and to ensure that their decisions to initiate or terminate removal proceedings are not made in an inconsistent manner. We look forward to working with you to resolve this matter and hope that you will develop and implement guildelines for INS prosecutorial discretion in an expeditious and fair manner.

Sincerely,

Henry J. Hyde; Lamar Smith; Bill McCollum; Bill Barrett; Barney Frank; Sheila Jackson Lee; Martin Frost; Howard L. Berman; Brian P. Billbray; Charles T. Canady; Nathan Deal; David Dreier; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Patrick J. Kennedy.

James P. McGovern; F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.; Henry A. Waxman; Gene Green; Corrine Brown; Barbara Cubin; Lincoln Diaz-Balart; Bob Filner; Sam Johnson; Matthew G. Martinez; Martin T. Meehan; Christopher Shays; Kay Granger; Ciro D. Rodriguez.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 649 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 646) expressing the position of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 646.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—234

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)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
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
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
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
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Buchanan
Comstock
DeSantis
Fincher
Frankel (FL)
Graves (MO)
Himes
Jordan
Kirkpatrick
Lieu, Ted
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 1043

Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Messrs. RUIZ, COHEN, TONKO, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. COFFMAN and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—234

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)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
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
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
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)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—180

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
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
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Buchanan
Comstock
DeSantis
Fincher
Frankel (FL)
Graves (MO)
Jordan
Kirkpatrick
Lieu, Ted
Quigley
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Stutzman
Westmoreland
Young (IN)

□ 1050

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1831. An act to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 719. An act to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE ON BEHALF OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 649, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 639) authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15674, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is the Speaker not already authorized by way of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group to offer an amicus brief with current authority without the need to pass the resolution under consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may consult clause 8 of rule II for the role of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will please state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Is it in order to offer an amendment to amend section 2 of the resolution to make the text of any amicus brief to be filed available for all Members to review for 3 days previous to its filing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 649, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion, except for a motion to recommit.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it in order to amend section 2 of the resolution to formally include the amicus brief prepared by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and signed by more than 200 Democrats?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair just stated, the previous question is ordered without intervening motion, except on a motion to recommit.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. So it is not in order?

Mr. POLIS. Is or isn't?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No intervening motions are in order except as provided in House Resolution 649.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Okay. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Is it in order to offer an amendment to section 3 that would make available all names of outside counsel that will be providing services to the Office of General Counsel; that way the American public can know who all the outside counsel is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's response remains the same.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it in order to offer an amendment to include a CBO report on the costs of the Office of General Counsel that would occur under this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's response must remain the same.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that every President since President Eisenhower and up through President Obama has used powers granted to them by Congress to set aside the deportation of certain immigrants?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated an inquiry related to the pending proceedings.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. I thought I was.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is it true that Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush protected in excess of 1 million undocumented immigrants by executive action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry related to the pending proceedings.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we are seeing here are some dilatory moves on behalf of the minority. While I respect every bit of that, we have decorum that is established in this House, and I believe the Speaker has adequately responded to the questions thereon by the gentlemen, and I ask that we move on forward.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. All Members will suspend.

Pursuant to House Resolution 649, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 639

Resolved, That the Speaker is authorized to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the Supreme Court in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674, and to file a brief in support of the position that the petitioners have acted in a manner that is not consistent with their duties under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Speaker shall notify the House of Representatives of a decision to file one or

more briefs as amicus curiae pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 3. The Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives, at the direction of the Speaker, shall represent the House in connection with the filing of any brief as amicus curiae pursuant to this resolution, including supervision of any outside counsel providing services to the Speaker on a pro bono basis for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes, once again, the gentleman from Texas.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will please state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Under the rules of the House, in order to accept volunteer efforts, one must be cleared by the Committee on Ethics. The resolution purports to seek pro bono assistance, but the inquiry is whether this comports with the rules of the House requiring the Committee on Ethics to preclear the acceptance of such assistance to avoid unseemly or potentially illegal assistance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret a pending measure. That is a matter for debate.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 639, authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al.

Mr. Speaker, as we have earlier stated, as we were debating and discussing the rule, over 25 States or State officials have filed suits challenging the Obama administration's expansion of DACA and the creation of DACA-like programs for aliens who are parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents.

The States allege that these administrative actions run afoul of the Take Care Clause of the Constitution. Article II, section 3 declares that the President ''shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' which requires any President to enforce all constitutional valid acts of Congress, regardless of the administration's views of the wisdom or the policy.

The States in this case that brought the case in southern Texas allege that these actions run afoul of the separation of powers set forth in the Constitution Article I, section 8, which gives Congress—not the President—the authority to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. That is directly from the Constitution.

Congress passed the Immigration and Nationality Act, which clearly specifies the limited cases in which the executive branch can suspend the removal of unlawful aliens.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has sought review on this case from the Supreme Court, which granted its petition, and that is because this administration lost in the Federal District Court in the Southern District of Texas and lost its case in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

In doing so, the Court indicated that it would also consider the plaintiffs' claims under the Take Care Clause.

I include in the RECORD the official document from the Supreme Court.

UNITED STATES, ET AL. V. TEXAS, ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. In addition to the questions presented by the petition, the parties are directed to brief and argue the following question: ''Whether the Guidance violates the Take Care Clause of the Constitution, Art. II, §3.''

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the questions presented in the case are really extraordinarily significant to the House of Representatives. In particular, this case raises issues related to the limits on executive discretion not to enforce laws enacted by Congress as well as the point at which the exercise of such discretion turns into lawmaking, thereby infringing on Congress' Article I legislative powers.

□ 1100

It is precisely because of these constitutional questions pending before the highest court in our land, the United States Supreme Court, that the U.S. House of Representatives—which, I believe, will present a side which we believe is important from a constitutional perspective—will consider this resolution. The House, I believe, will and must protect its Article I legislative powers on behalf of the American people and on behalf of Representatives who believe in self-governance.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today there are a lot of legal arguments and talk. I want to make sure the American people listening at home and watching at home know exactly what we are talking about here today.

I want to talk about somebody whose life is on pause, waiting for the DAPA program to clear the courts. The brief that the Republicans are seeking to file is the exact opposite. It is saying that DAPA cannot occur. And this gentleman and his family, Colorado constituents of mine—just to put a human face on it—show what DAPA means for so many families across our country.

Mr. Edin Ramos of Colorado—he is pictured there next to his three lovely kids and his wife—is a native of Honduras. He has been in the United States for over 13 years. His kids are American citizens, were born here, don't know any other country. He fled his home country to avoid persecution and extortion at the hands of local, corrupt officials and gangs.

He is married to a U.S. citizen. They have three young children together. He is a very successful business owner in my district. He and his wife employ 12 people. They make investments in our local community. We rely on them for jobs, for the services they provide. Yet the lack of any peace of mind prevents families like Edin Ramos' from reaching their full potential.

Every day his kids come home from school, and his wife worries over something as minor as a taillight being out or a speeding ticket, that Mr. Ramos could find himself in detention for an indefinite period of time, removed from his family, or even deported to another country which he doesn't have any ties to.

I would also like to talk about the case of Ms. Mercedes Garcia. Mercedes is a long-time resident of my hometown, Boulder, Colorado. Her life has been greatly affected by the arbitrariness of an immigration system that is immoral and has lacked meaningful priorities.

She has been in the United States for close to 20 years. She is the mother of three American children, U.S. citizen children. But you know what happened? Her husband was removed from the United States in 2011 over a traffic citation, forcing her to be the sole provider for her three children.

Now, Mercedes is undocumented herself, and she fears contact by immigration authorities on a daily basis. DAPA was a ray of hope for her. What DAPA would do is provide Mercedes with a meaningful level of certainty, the ability to legally seek employment, the ability to provide her family with expanded opportunities here in the U.S., and would help make her American citizen children as successful as they are able to be.

Her children are just as American as you or me, Mr. Speaker, as is anyone born in the United States. Don't they deserve to have their mother help them succeed with all the great promises that this country offers? Why can't we give that certainty to their mother?

DAPA is a legal, commonsense, lawful exercise of discretion. It is consistent with the actions of Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, for decades. It directs, very simply, with the limited amount of enforcement resources we have in the Department of Homeland Security, that we want to focus on removing undocumented immigrants who pose a threat to public safety or national security—not Mr.

Ramos, not Ms. Garcia. We want to remove those who represent a danger or a threat to our country.

To somehow misfocus those limited resources on tearing apart families instead of going after criminals would put the American people at risk. The President has acted to make the American people safer by ensuring that our limited law enforcement resources are focused where they will have the biggest impact.

These policies are very simple. They create a process for low-priority enforcement immigrants who come forward, submit to a background check, register, be able to get a provisional work permit, and work legally. It enhances our public safety and national security.

Yet we hear people from the other side saying: Well, this is something Congress should have done. I agree. This is something Congress should have done. You know what? It is not my fault Congress didn't do it.

I have talked about immigration every week and every month here on the floor of the House. I cosponsored a comprehensive bill. I signed a discharge petition last Congress to try to bring it forward. Yes, I agree.

You know what? Congress didn't do it, Mr. Speaker. And that is on the Republican majority that Congress failed to act.

So the President moved forward with the legal authority he has and that Republican and Democratic Presidents in the past have used to say that Ms. Garcia is not the same risk to this country as a dangerous criminal.

It is common sense, and it is about time that we move forward with DAPA and DACA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time you will see that our Republican Members that will come and speak are men and women not only with extensive legal experience, grounded in the law and the Constitution of the United States but will make their arguments from a professional nature that are directly related to the law.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who served as a judge in Texas, and is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is whether the U.S. Constitution will be followed by the President or not. That is the issue. That is why we have this unusual situation, where the House of Representatives, by this resolution, is joining in on a legal action to let that be resolved by the judiciary branch of government.

It all started in November of 2014, when the Department of Homeland Security wrote out a memo and sent it out to the fruited plain and said that the Department of Homeland Security would no longer enforce U.S. immigration law.

The Department of Homeland Security is a branch, a portion of the administration.

This unprecedented, unilateral action by the executive branch was a nullification of immigration law of the United States. And it was not done by Congress. It was done by administrative edict that came from the White House.

Article I, section 8, clause 4 states that Congress—that is us—has the power ''to establish an uniform rule of naturalization'' in the United States.

So what value is the law or the Constitution if the executive, who is supposed to enforce the law—not make it, as we all learned in ninth grade civics—sends out a memo saying it will no longer enforce the law?

The law of the land is repealed by the administrative pen because the President doesn't like the law, as written.

Repealing a law is supposed to be a legislative action—that is Congress—and is not supposed to be an executive action; that is, if the Constitution is followed, which it is not under these circumstances.

This illegal executive action will place a burden on the States that the action is taking place against, such as my home State of Texas, where the amnesty proclamation by the executive branch, through its memo, has been in effect.

The Federal Government is not going to pay for the benefits of these 5 million-plus folks. The States will be forced, required, and obligated to pay for that.

So the States will pay for the driver's licenses, government benefits, and health care benefits for these newly legalized individuals. All of the money the State spends will be taken away from the ability to provide services for U.S. citizens and residents who are already legally in the U.S.

This action is in direct contravention of U.S. law. Texas, my State, will be one of the hardest-hit. That is why the Governor of the State of Texas was the first to file a lawsuit—this lawsuit—against the unconstitutional action by the executive branch of government. And that occurred in 2014.

The Constitution, to me, is very simple. It lays out an outline for democracy. Congress makes the laws; the executive branch faithfully executes the laws; and the judiciary resolves disputes between government, other entities, and between the branches of government.

So, if U.S. immigration law is going to be changed, the Constitution states that it should be changed by the U.S. Congress. That is us.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. POE of Texas. Even if the Congress doesn't act, that doesn't give the executive branch Burger King authority.

The Burger King philosophy is: the President wants it his way. He can't have it his way. He has got to follow the Constitution. He is a former constitutional law professor. He ought to know better.

That is what this lawsuit is about. That is why it is a constitutional issue. And that is why we should join in with those other Governors in filing this lawsuit with an amicus brief to support the Constitution of the United States against executive memos from the executive branch.

The executive branch should take care of the Constitution, not tear up the Constitution.

That is just the way it is.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), a great leader on the issue of uniting families.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, we shouldn't even be here today. This is partisan politics at its worst. And using the resources of the Federal Government and the legislative branch of government to promote a political agenda is just an affront to all Americans.

Why don't you just say it clearly? This is your: I want to deport 4 to 5 million people. I wish the majority would stop talking about the Constitution and really talk about what it is they mean to achieve here.

If you want to see people deported, why don't you all stand up and say it? Be men and women of integrity and of your word and say: I want 4 to 5 million unprotected, and amend this to say, ''this is a mass deportation for 4 to 5 million people.''

You keep saying that the candidates out there on the Presidential trail do not represent your values, do not represent who you are politically, and then you come back here and stoke the fire even more.

What you are demonstrating here is that you should be doing immigration reform. What you are demonstrating here is your impotence at being able to get it done. Why don't you just say that this is what it is all about?

Because out on the campaign trail, on immigration, we get lots of demagoguery from the majority. The debate has sunk to a level where people are actually throwing punches, and worse.

Two refugees from Southeast Asia and a gentleman from Puerto Rico were shot and murdered in front of their children in Milwaukee because they didn't have the right accent in their voice.

□ 1115

Two students, a Muslim and a Latino, were attacked by a man when they encountered him beating a Black man in Kansas this week, and he turned to them and shouted racist threats and said they should just go and leave the country.

We have Go Back to Africa and Hitler salutes, and all of this is becoming more and more what we expect, the reality we see in 2016.

And now the Republicans in the House are stoking the same anti-immigrant fears and mass deportation fantasies some more. No, they are not

leading. They are not calling for calmer rhetoric, let alone more rational policies. They are playing politics with immigrants, plain and simple. Shame on them.

If Republicans are so secure in the validity of their arguments, they should write a brief and submit it, just like the 259 Democrats did last week, without politicizing and using this august body to bring about your partisan political hatred against immigrants.

The vote is a political stunt disguised as a legal brief. This is not a legal brief. This is a political stunt. The Republican majority sees a crass political opportunity to stand with the anti-immigrant wing of their party.

I guess the Speaker thinks, hey, why play it straight when you can force a purely political vote on immigration, designed to deepen the partisan line and validate the very angry people who go around showing their hatred, their bigotry, and their prejudice in the political process in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I recognize that there are people in this body who are frustrated, and I have engaged a number of those people very thoughtfully, and they have tried to engage me, I think, thoughtfully.

But the essence of what today's argument is about is actually a legal exercise because, in fact, the Federal District Court in southern Texas, Judge Andy Hanen, looked at the law, and he, in a judicial sense, heard evidence that would be presented from all of the some 25 States, as well as the Federal Government; and findings of facts and conclusions of law, not upon hyper-political accusations or bombastic comments that are made to attack another side, is what actually prevailed in the case.

I am well aware that a number of our colleagues want to talk about politics, politics, politics, and make accusations. This is about the foundation of law, and it actually goes to direct words out of the Constitution of the United States.

A Federal District Court is particularly in tune with those arguments as they handle constitutional issues and questions, and the Court clearly found in favor of these States. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, in reviewing that case, came to that same conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will see that the Supreme Court will also rule on the law, not upon political sound bites that come back and forth from this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentleman who, I believe, represents not only thought and balance, but who is trying to work within the constitutional confines and the laws of this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, without enforcement of the law, there cannot be accountability under law, and political accountability is essential to a functioning democracy. We in the House of Representatives who face re-election every 2 years, under the Constitution, are perhaps reminded of that more than others. And while there is at least one political branch willing to enforce the law, we will not fail to act through whatever means by which we can successfully avail ourselves.

When the President fails to perform his constitutional duty that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed, the Congress has appropriations and other powers over the President. But none of those powers can be exercised if a sizable Senate minority controlled by the President's own political party refuses to exercise them, or in the absence of veto-proof majorities in both Houses. Nor would the exercise of those powers solve the problem at hand because they would not actually require the President to faithfully execute the laws.

Of course, the most powerful and always available means of solving the problem at hand is to vote out of office a President who abuses his power. In the meantime, however, the need to pursue the establishment of clear principles of political accountability is of the essence.

So today we consider a resolution to authorize the Speaker to file on behalf of the House in litigation brought by a majority of the States challenging the constitutionality of the President's unilateral immigration amnesty program.

Earlier this year, the Supreme Court agreed to hear that constitutional challenge to the President's immigration plan, which the people's legislative representatives never approved.

So far, a Federal judge in Texas has issued a preliminary injunction in the case blocking the enforcement of the President's unilateral immigration amnesty. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld that injunction.

Importantly, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in the case and, rather than limiting the issue the way President Obama requested, it took the State's suggestion and requested briefing on the following question: ''whether the President's action violates the Take Care Clause of the Constitution, Article II, section 3.''

That clause of the Constitution requires the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

The Founders would have expected Members of the House of Representatives, known as the people's House for its most direct connection to the will of the people, to aggressively guard their role in the constitutional legislative process. The resolution before us today will provide another means of doing just that.

The stakes of inaction are high. The lawsuit challenges the President's failure to enforce key provisions of the immigration laws.

We should all support this resolution today as it aims to help deliver a simple message: Congress writes the laws, under Article I, section 1, the very first sentence of the United States Constitution.

We should all support this resolution today. Our own constitutionally required oath to support the Constitution of the United States requires no less.

What is required of the President of the United States is found in Article II, section 3, which says, ''he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'' That is the issue before us.

For the Court to pay attention to this institution's concern, the Court requires that the Congress take a vote, and that is what we should do today in order to let the Court know that this brief is not just a collection of a group of Members; this is an actual vote of the United States House of Representatives to ask the Court to consider our very well-founded concerns and protect the people's House, protect the people's rights under the Constitution, protect the Constitution itself, and Article I, section 1, which said very simply, ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.''

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of Latin used on the other side. But the plain English is this vote is about ripping apart the families of my constituents, Mr. Ramos, Ms. Garcia, countless others, millions across the country. And this vote would weigh in from the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives, those who vote for this, want those families ripped apart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So last week, 186 Members of this House and 39 Senators from the Senate filed an amicus brief. We filed it before the Supreme Court in this very case that is being discussed, United States v. Texas. But we filed it without using taxpayer dollars. We filed it individually, separately from our official duties.

The brief that we submitted supports the actions which President Obama took because he is our Nation's chief executive and he has the right to try to make our laws work as best as possible.

In the case of our immigration laws, everyone agrees that they are broken, they are fractured, and it is a system that does not work coherently. There are more than 4 million people who will be impacted by the decision that the Supreme Court reaches in the case of United States v. Texas. President

Obama took his actions exercising his authority under the Constitution to execute and implement the laws of the land.

So here we are today. Speaker RYAN and my colleagues on the House side, on the Republican side, will force this House to vote on a resolution authorizing the House to file a similar type of amicus brief, albeit in this case opposing the President's position in the case of United States v. Texas.

But there is a big difference between the amicus brief that was filed by 186 Members of this House and 39 Members in the Senate and what the Republican majority in the House is intending to do today—a big difference. They are looking to use taxpayer money to push forward their political partisan agenda and their position in this case of United States v. Texas; so they are injecting every American who pays taxes into this fight, even though most Americans support a comprehensive fix to our immigration system.

Why would we want to use taxpayer dollars to go litigate? These days it seems that my Republican colleagues in Congress spend more time and taxpayer money filing partisan lawsuits and legal briefs than working to pass the country's must-do legislation. We have got a budget to do. We should be passing jobs legislation, and, yes, we should be fixing a broken immigration system by passing comprehensive immigration reform.

Congress doesn't need to file a legal brief lobbying the Supreme Court to fix our broken laws. Most Americans know from their high school civics classes that the Constitution vests the Congress with the power to make or change any law without having to hope or wait for the Supreme Court to bail out Congress for not doing its work.

In fact, today, Speaker RYAN said: ''The legislative branch of government needs to be the branch making our laws, not the executive.'' He is absolutely right. So rather than doing legislation to file a lawsuit, let's do our job, which is to make the laws.

This Republican Congress, unfortunately, is completely out of step with the interests and expectations of the American people. It is time to legislate, not to litigate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the Republican message today, one of our other senior Members who is a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee now serves as the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. He is a gentleman who has devoted himself and his life to the rule of law, a gentleman who is in the thick of the understanding of the immigration issue, being from San Antonio, Texas. He has seen for a long time the need and the desire for not just Congress to work with the executive branch, but the rule of law. He has believed in that in his years of service to the Judiciary Committee. He stands as a testament to his belief in constitutional law—including Federal court and Supreme Court decisions—and how important they are. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that this gentleman has, for a long time, spoken with balance and credibility on the issue, not just to rule of law, but also about this Nation and how we do treat those who come to this country with dignity and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the young chairman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee and my Texas colleague for yielding me time and also for his very generous comments.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution authorizing the Speaker to submit an amicus brief to the Supreme Court in support of the Texas-led lawsuit challenging the President's amnesty policies.

It is critical that the House of Representatives defend the Constitution, which specifically gives Congress, not the President, the power to enact immigration laws.

Regrettably, the President's policies have ignored laws, undermined laws, and changed immigration laws. The President's policies have led to a surge of tens of thousands of illegal immigrants across our borders, allowed unlawful immigrants to compete with unemployed Americans for scarce jobs, and established sanctuary cities that release dangerous criminal immigrants into our neighborhoods where many go on to commit other crimes.

The House of Representatives must reinforce the rule of law and protect the lives and livelihoods of the American people. Mr. Speaker, that is why I support this resolution.

□ 1130

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, happy St. Patrick's Day to you. What a way House Republicans have chosen to celebrate St. Patrick's Day.

Today we pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Irish immigrants and their descendants to the fabric of America. Today we are reminded that ours is truly a nation of immigrants—that immigrants have truly made America more American with their optimism, their hope, and their courage to come to America, and to make a future better for their families. That is what America is all about, and that is what immigrants have strengthened.

We have spent this entire week with our Irish friends celebrating the heritage of immigrants in America. The Taoiseach—that would be the Prime Minister of Ireland—was here in the Capitol earlier in the week. He spoke about immigration last night at the dinner. In the letter that was read by the Irish Ambassador from the Taoiseach, he talked about immigration. Here on the floor of the House, we are talking about immigration in a totally negative way.

Why would House Republicans want to spend St. Patrick's Day in this insulting manner to Irish immigrants?

House Republicans have brought forward a resolution authorizing the Speaker to file an anti-immigrant amicus brief with the Supreme Court, but they won't tell the House or the American people what they are planning to say in it. Given Republicans' past positions and rhetoric, that raises serious questions:

Will the Republicans yet again call for tearing apart families?

Will they call for deporting DREAMers?

Will they yet again suggest a religious test for prospective immigrants?

Will they ask the Court to explore ending birthright American citizenship, as they did in their Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee hearing?

Sadly, there is not much difference between the rhetoric of the Republican candidate for President and House Republicans when it comes to a record of appalling anti-immigrant statements—an agenda of discrimination.

Furthermore, Republicans have denied House Democrats the opportunity to have a meaningful vote on our alternative amicus brief in support of the President's immigration executive actions, which we filed with the Court last week, 225 House and Senate Democrats.

The fact is the President's immigration actions fall within the legal and constitutional precedent established by every administration, Republican and Democrat, since President Eisenhower.

The fact is the President has the right to take these administrative actions under the law, and he also is following in the precedents of former Presidents to do so.

I don't know if the Republicans were silent or didn't know what was going on when President Reagan went further in his administrative actions on immigration in terms of affecting a higher percentage of immigrants than President Obama's actions have affected.

The President is acting because Congress has refused to act to pass comprehensive immigration reform. Even when the Republicans in the Senate had a bipartisan bill, it did not get the chance to have a vote in this House. So the President has acted.

President Reagan, to his credit, acted even after Congress acted, and he signed their bill into law, and then he said back to Congress that you didn't go far enough to protect families. So he initiated, by executive action, Family Fairness. That was carried on by President George Herbert Walker Bush, and the spirit of all of that was carried on by President George W. Bush, all of those, including President Clinton in between and President Obama, were

strong, strong advocates for comprehensive immigration reform and respecting the role that immigrants play as a consistent reinvigoration of America.

So, by law, legal authority and by precedent, legal authority, the President has the right to do this. If it was okay when President Reagan did it and President George Herbert Walker Bush did it, why isn't it okay when President Obama takes these same administration acts and, as I said, affecting a smaller percentage of people than President Reagan did?

So here we go. It is long past time for us to have comprehensive immigration reform that honors our heritage and our history. Immigration has always been the reinvigoration of America. Each wave of immigrants brings their hopes, their aspirations, their faith, their work ethic, and their determination to succeed to our shores.

Let us not tear families apart and deport young DREAMers and their parents. Let us oppose this radical, narrow-minded, anti-immigrant resolution. This St. Patrick's Day, let us recognize the immense contributions that immigrants of all cultures and all creeds have made to the past, to the present, and to the greatness of America.

Happy St. Patrick's Day.

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

Mr. Speaker, consistent with what we have seen for the last 8 years by a White House and administration, so we see here on the floor of the House of Representatives a denial of trying to follow the law but, rather, to blame people, including using the word ''discriminatory'' and trying to attach that to a party.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, this issue is far different. This is based upon rule of law. In the Federal District Court in the Southern District of Texas, during the trial, there was a determination that was being pushed about whether DACA would be characterized as an exercise of prosecutorial discretion. In fact, when challenged, because this was a claim that the administration made, that Federal district court examined the operation of the DACA process, and despite the claim or the reason why the President had this authority, that DACA was applied on a case-by-case basis, the administration could not provide one piece of evidence in the Federal district court, no examples of DACA applicants who would meet the program's criteria.

Mr. Speaker, it does matter why you do something, how you do something, and, if you are going to be a professional, how you sustain that which you have done, in a Federal district court, when asked directly to sustain what the assertions are, could not even sustain their answers.

This is why we are talking about rule of law, Mr. Speaker, and to come here and ascribe insults to a party, to a Presidential process, or to a rule, a body that operates under rule of law, I believe misses the point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) in order to further this example of why Republicans are on the floor at this time, and he will so adequately explain our case.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the issue in this case actually implicates the very existence of the House. The law is the reason we exist. We do not exist to pass ideas or to pass suggestions. We make law with the corresponding expectation that that law will be enforced, respected, and executed.

We do so because the law is the thread that holds the tapestry of this country together. It is the most unifying, equalizing force that we have. It makes the rich respect the poor, and it allows the powerless to challenge the powerful. Attempts to undermine the law, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the motivation, are detrimental to the social order.

In 2014, President Obama declared unilaterally that almost 5 million unlawful immigrants would receive deferred action under some tortured definition of ''prosecutorial discretion.''

I can't help but note the word ''discretion'' means sometimes you say yes, and sometimes you say no. But, of course, the administration has never said no. The Court found not a single time has the administration said no. So that is not prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker. That is lawlessness.

You may like what the President did. I take it from some of the speakers that they do, and you may actually wish what the President did was actually law. You may wish—Mr. Speaker, you may wish that when Democrats controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House for 2 years that they had lifted a finger to do a single, solitary thing about what they are talking about this morning. You may wish that. You may wish that all these grandiose policies that we are talking about this morning on the other side, that they cared enough about them to actually make law when they had a chance, but they did not.

They know now that one person doesn't make the law in a republic. You may want to live in a country where one person makes the law, but that would not be this country. You would have to look for another one.

The President knows this because, more than 20 times, Mr. Speaker, he said he could not do the very thing that he eventually did. His power didn't change. The law didn't change. The politics is all that changed.

We should have seen this coming, Mr. Speaker. He warned us. On this very floor, he warned us that he didn't need the people's House. He said he would do it with or without Congress. Many of you cheered when he said that. Many of you cheered because you benefit from the nonenforcement of the law today.

But tomorrow will be different. Tomorrow is coming, and tomorrow will be different. Tomorrow you will cry out for the enforcement of the law. Tomorrow you will want others to follow the law.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, because this administration violated one law in its haste to allow others to violate yet another law. The administration lost, and then they appealed. So here we are before the Supreme Court.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, Congress has let the executive branch engage in constitutional adverse possession. Today it is immigration. Tomorrow it will be some other law. One day, I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, one day your party may not control the gears of enforcement. One day a Republican President might decide that he or she doesn't like a law and is going to ignore it and fail to enforce it.

For more than two centuries, Mr. Speaker, the law has been more important than any political issue. It has been more important than any election, and it has been more important, frankly, than any one of us. It binds us together, and it embodies the virtues that we cherish like fairness, equality, justice, and mercy.

We symbolize our devotion to the law with this blindfolded woman holding a set of scales and a sword. That blindfold keeps her focus on the law. But I want you to understand this, Mr. Speaker: once that blindfold slips off, it is gone forever. You can want to put it back on, but it is gone forever, because once you weaken the law, good luck putting it back together.

So once you decide that some laws are worth enforcing and some are not, once you decide that some laws are worth following and others are not, then you have weakened this thing we call the law, and you have weakened it forever.

Let me just say this. I will say this, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't take any courage to follow a law you like. That doesn't take any courage, following a law you like? What takes courage, which makes us different, is we follow laws even that we don't like, and then we strive to change them—legally. That is the power and the fragility of the law. But once it is abandoned, it is weakened in the eyes of those we expect to follow it.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes

Mr. GOWDY. I will say this, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, in the oath of citizenship that we require new citizens to take—and I am sure the Speaker already knows this, and perhaps some of my colleagues on the other side may know this as well—but in that oath, it references the law five separate times, five separate references to this thing we call the law—in the very oath that we want new citizens to take, five times in a single paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, good luck explaining why new citizens should follow the law when those in power do not have to.

Good luck explaining the difference between anarchy and the wholesale failure to enforce the law simply because you do not like it. Good luck stopping the next President from ignoring a law that he or she does not like.

If the President can pick and choose which laws he likes, then so can the rest of us, and you have undermined the very thing that binds us together. So be careful what you do today. Tomorrow is coming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

□ 1145

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, even 100 years ago, if you asked somebody who was living in Asia or Latin America or Europe where on Earth they would want to go if they were going to leave their home country, the answer was very clearly the United States of America.

We proudly say, as Americans, that we are a Nation of immigrants, yet throughout the generations, immigrants from different corners of the world have encountered resentment and scapegoating here in our land.

Today we celebrate St. Patrick's Day for the Irish. When the Irish came in the 1800s, they were greeted by signs that said ''No Irish need apply'' in cities like New York and Boston. The Chinese, for many decades, were excluded from admission into the United States. The Japanese and Germans were interned through World War II.

There was an operation called ''Operation Wetback'' in the Eisenhower administration that rounded up and deported thousands, if not over a million, Mexicans and Mexican Americans back to Mexico.

The latest iteration of those politics, the latest attempt to relive our worst mistakes started when a man—who may become President—called Mexican immigrants rapists and murderers.

There are times in our Nation's history when our politics become a race to the bottom, and it takes people of good faith, of different political stripes and beliefs, to stand up and put the brakes on it. Sometimes we have, and sometimes we have fail to do that. But make no mistake that we are in one of those eras now, and this resolution represents just the beginning.

My colleague from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), about 45 minutes ago referenced talk of mass deportations. That is not just talk. That is coming from the leading Republican frontrunners for President.

Do you know what that means? That means that you are going to go pull 2- and 3- and 4-year-old kids out of homes, from their parents forcibly, and send them out of here. It means that you are going to take parents and drag them away from their kids, leaving them alone.

I know that there are people of very good faith who disagree with Democrats on this issue. In fact, many have spoken today, and I respect their opinions. But I would ask all of us, as Americans, to ask ourselves whether this represents the very best of our Nation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. The fact is we are a Nation of immigrants, we have always been a Nation of immigrants, and we will always be a Nation of immigrants. It is what has made us strong, it is what has made us powerful around the world, it is what has earned us friends, and it is what has made us the envy of the world.

All of us have to make sure, in governing, that 50 years from now, when somebody in Europe or Latin America or Asia is asked where on Earth they would want to move, if they were going to leaving their home country, that the answer is still the United States of America.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

And to my fellow Texan who is managing on the other side, the chairman of the Rules Committee, it is a moment in history that we are speaking of, and it is powerful to follow my fellow Texan on the moment in history that we have.

Earlier today, I said that as my friends on the other side were debating about the will of the House, I indicated that it is a divided House, and that is not the will of the American people. It is evidenced in the rules.

So to go and suggest that any brief that would wish to overcome, if you will, the President's constitutional authority is bogus; it is not true. If this was a consensus, the brief would be prepared, and all Members would sign onto the brief. That is not the case.

As I come from Texas, let me say that much of what is being done is out of fear. You don't understand it. You don't understand DREAMers.

We do in Texas. We have a State law that allows our DREAMers to go to college, and they are making good. I see them in my office. And I know their parents, of whom we are speaking about, because some of their parents' children are, obviously, children who are citizens and who are able then at a point in time to be able to be under the DACA and the DAPA.

So let me reinforce the fact that the President has acted under executive orders that squarely fall under the Take Care Clause, as ensuring Presidential control over those who execute and enforce the laws. You can rely on Arizona v. United States, Bowsher v. Synar, Buckley v. Valeo, Printz v. United States, and Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB.

The enforcement agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, properly may exercise their discretion to devise and implement policies specific to laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize our Nation's resources.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Are we to kick out children who are on their way to success and then their parents?

And the reason why I want to dispel this myth of fear: These parents are working. Maybe they are working in positions that others would not have; maybe they are working alongside of fellow Americans. I don't adhere to in any way to think of people displacing Americans looking for jobs. That is not this issue.

A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter—we have prioritized criminals and those who would do us harm.

But we are operating out of fear, just as was earlier said. When someone who—the world does not know whether he is a Presidential candidate or whether he is a spokesman for America—blocks and puts his hand up to stop all Muslims from coming in. Who will be next? Would it have been the Irish in the 1800s? Would it have been the Italians in the 1900s?

America has to get back to reasonable lawmaking, pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, and make a difference.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying I don't want the next victim of domestic violence to be thrown out.

Vote against this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the rule (governing debate of H. Res. 639, and the underlying resolution, which authorizes the Speaker to appear as Amicus Curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674.

I oppose the resolution because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 639, if adopted, would vest in the Speaker alone the power to file on behalf of the full House an amicus brief with the Supreme Court supporting the constitutionally untenable position of 26 Republican-controlled states in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No.15–674.

Lying at the heart of the plaintiffs' misguided and wholly partisan complaint is the specious claim that President Obama lacked the constitutional and statutory authority to take executive actions to implement Administration policy regard to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Deferred Action for Parents

of American Citizens and Lawful Permanent Residents, the creation of (DAPA).

This frivolous and partisan lawsuit seeks to have DACA and DAPA declared invalid and to permanently enjoin the Obama Administration from implementing these salutary policies, both of which are intended to keep law-abiding and peace loving immigrant families together.

The purely partisan nature of the resolution before is revealed by its text, which authorizes the Speaker to waste precious taxpayer funds and file on behalf of every Member of the House an amicus brief that no Member has seen in support of a position opposed by virtually every member of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Pursuant to Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, ''shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the ''Take Care'' Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., Arizona v. United States; Bowsher v. Synar; Buckley v. Valeo; Printz v. United States; Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has ''prosecutorial discretion,'' the inherent power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Thus, enforcement agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), properly may exercise their discretion to devise and implement policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize our nation's resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Mr. Speaker, to see the utter lack of merit in the legal position to be supported by the amicus brief permitted by H. Res. 639, one need take note of the fact that deferred action has been utilized in our nation for decades by Administrations headed by presidents of both parties without controversy or challenge.

In fact, as far back as 1976, INS and DHS leaders have issued at least 11 different memoranda providing guidance on the use of similar forms of prosecutorial discretion.

Executive authority to take action is thus ''fairly wide,'' and the federal government's discretion is extremely ''broad'' as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of Arizona v. United States, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

''Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal.'' (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in Arizona v. United States, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as ''[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families'' or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

''Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities.''

Exercising thoughtful discretion in the enforcement of the nation's immigration law saves scarce taxpayer funds, optimizes limited resources, and produces results that are more humane and consistent with America's reputation as the most compassionate nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, a DREAMER (an undocumented student) seeking to earn her college degree and aspiring to attend medical school to better herself and her new community is not a threat to the nation's security.

Law abiding but unauthorized immigrants doing honest work to support their families pose far less danger to society than human traffickers, drug smugglers, or those who have committed a serious crime.

The President was correct in concluding that exercising his discretion regarding the implementation of DACA and DAPA policies enhances the safety of all members of the public, serves national security interests, and furthers the public interest in keeping families together.

Mr. Speaker, according to numerous studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office, Social Security Administration, and Council of Economic Advisors, the President's DACA and DAPA directives generate substantial economic benefits to our nation.

For example, unfreezing DAPA and expanded DACA is estimated to increase GDP by $230 billion and create an average of 28,814 jobs per year over the next 10 years.

That is a lot of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Let me cite a just a few examples of executive action taken by American presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

2. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 ''Mariel Cubans'' were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

3. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

4. In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

5. In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

6. In 2010, the Obama Administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of the President's leadership and visionary executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a $338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me note that the President's laudable executive actions are a welcome development but not a substitute for undertaking the comprehensive reform and modernization of the nation's immigration laws supported by the American people.

Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges.

Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

Comprehensive immigration reform is desperately needed to ensure that Lady Liberty's lamp remains the symbol of a land that welcomes immigrants to a community of immigrants and does so in a manner that secures our borders and protects our homeland.

Instead of wasting time debating divisive and mean spirited measures like H. Res. 639, we should instead seize the opportunity to pass legislation that secures our borders, preserves America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world, and will yield hundreds of billions of dollars in economic growth.

I urge all Members to join me in voting against H. Res. 639.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very eloquent comments

today. I was particularly taken by my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), the chairman of the committee, his passionate speech about the rule of law. In fact, we all do agree about the importance of the rule of law in American life and in the vitality of our country.

Unfortunately, the facts of this case have nothing to do with the speech given by Mr. GOWDY.

On November 20, 2014, a number of memoranda were issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security. One of them is titled: ''Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants.'' That was pursuant to the 2002 action of this Congress, creating the Department of Homeland Security and directing the Secretary to establish priorities for removal. And it is worth pointing out that this memorandum has not been enjoined. Nobody sued to stop it. It is in effect. Nobody has challenged its legality. It is what is happening right now.

In fact, the only things that have been enjoined temporarily are the DAPA, the relief for parents, and the expansion of relief for children.

My colleague, who I respect and like, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), did mention that the deferred action provides benefits, health care, and education. In fact, the deferred action provides no such benefits. It is not a legal status. It is a deferral of deportation. It is revocable at any time.

Here is what the memorandum establishing this said:

''This memorandum confers no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to citizenship. Only an act of Congress can confer these rights. It remains within the authority of the executive branch, however, to set forth policy for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion and deferred action within the framework of existing law. This memoranda is an exercise of that authority.''

In fact, the exercise of that authority is nothing new. We have mentioned earlier that President Reagan deferred action on the deportation of the wives and children of those who got relief through the 1986 IRCA Act that Congress passed, despite the fact that Congress told him not to do it, because he had the authority to do it.

We have also had instances where wives of American soldiers were going to be deported. Do you know what? The President gave them deferral from deportation because it was unconscionable to us that a soldier fighting in Iraq or Afghanistan would have his wife deported while he is over in the battlefield.

We have private bills that we take up, egregious cases. Do you know what? If we ask for a report from the Department about that bill, the Department defers action on it. They defer deportation for the person who is the subject of that bill.

We, on the committee, thank them for doing that. We know that they do that, and we agree and like that they do that.

I mentioned earlier that the Congress, after Tiananmen Square, passed a bill to prevent the deportation of Chinese students who had been murdered, some of them, in Tiananmen Square. President Bush vetoed that bill. Why did he veto it? He vetoed it so he could give deferred deportation to the students because it was his position—and no one challenged that—it was the President's authority to do that.

I want to raise another issue. My friend, the Chairman of the Rules Committee, mentioned earlier this morning that the House had received a request to brief this issue. I was very surprised by that. It was the first I had heard of it. It is my understanding from the paper submitted that what he was referring to was the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, which was granted. This is what it says:

''In addition to the questions presented by the petition, the parties are directed to brief and argue the following question—''

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LOFGREN. I know that Mr. SESSIONS is not a lawyer and I would not suggest he intended to mislead this House. But the comment was, in fact, misleading because that is not a requirement for the House to brief that point. It is simply directed to the parties in the litigation, which we are not.

This is about whether we deport kids or not, but it is also about whether we engage in rhetoric that is injurious to the public because it distorts the actual facts of this case.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has repeatedly and explicitly passed laws delegating enforcement authority to the executive branch in the immigration context.

Through DAPA and the expansion of DACA, the Secretary of Homeland Security is simply enforcing these existing laws that have previously been passed.

□ 1200

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Words matter.

In talking about the families, like Ms. Garcia's from my district, we really know that, especially during a campaign season or when there is rhetoric on the floor, the words that those of us in elected office say matter. I found that out firsthand as I talked to some of the families in my district who have mixed status children who turn on to VTV and see some of our national politicians rail against them.

I asked permission to use stories from some of our families here today. In the past, it has always been very customary that they have said, ''Yes. If it will help to share my story, please share it with the American people. The American people will understand that I want to be with my child. What is more family oriented than that?''

Those are the values of the people. Yet, when I asked over the last few days and when my staff asked, there were many families who said no to having their stories told on the House floor.

Why? Because major, national political figures, like Donald Trump, are running for higher office and are trying to win votes by promising that they will do everything in their power to break up families like Ms. Garcia's. They promise to do everything in their power to rip apart our communities at the core, to separate American children from one or both parents. By any means necessary, they say, we will deport mothers and fathers of American children.

We are better than that, Mr. Speaker. We are better than that. DAPA and DACA are an enormous step forward.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

I find it so annoying that they argue this is Congress' job; yet the very people arguing that it is Congress' job are the people who are preventing Congress from doing its job. Thank goodness the President used his executive authority, which already exists, to move forward in prioritizing immigration cases just as President Reagan did, just as President Bush did.

If those on the other side believe that Congress should solve this, let them stop standing in the way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, four really quick points.

I would say to my friend from Colorado, through the Speaker, that one reason Congress may not enact new laws is that we have absolutely zero confidence they will actually be enforced. Maybe if this President enforced current law, we would be more willing to embark on new ones.

Secondly, I think Judge POE was right. I do think part of the opinion deals with the conferring of benefits, but I would invite people to read it for themselves.

Thirdly, on this issue of prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker, all law enforcement agencies have limited resources, but they don't hold press conferences ahead of time and announce ''you are not going to be prosecuted or investigated if you just steal 'this' amount of money. You are not going to be prosecuted or investigated if you just possess 'this' amount of controlled substances.'' This is not prosecutorial discretion. This is a political decision to not enforce the law.

Lastly, I want to say—and she is my friend—I have great respect for Ms.

LOFGREN, and I am actually not including her in what I am getting ready to say because I will bet you, in 2008, she was ready, Mr. Speaker, to move on comprehensive immigration reform when nobody else was. From 2008 to 2010, when they had all the gears of government, they didn't lift a finger Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, they did not lift a finger. So with all of the ideas I hear my friends talking about, it just makes me wonder: Where were you when you had the House? Where were you when you had the Senate? Where were you when you had the White House? You had all three of them, and you didn't do any of the things you are talking about doing this morning.

In conclusion, yes, you are right. It is Congress' job to pass the law. As soon as you show us that you are willing to enforce it, maybe we will be willing to pass some new ones; but asking us to trust an administration, Mr. Speaker, that is deciding, wholesale, certain categories not to enforce, we may not be smart, but we are smarter than that.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue about the constitutional equilibrium. The House needs to speak up for itself, and I applaud Speaker RYAN for doing exactly that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members, once again, to please direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Where we were was doing a lot of business unlike we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

I say to my friends across the aisle, who are so passionate about Congress having a role in this case: where was that enthusiasm when Congress had ample opportunity to prevent this case by doing its job and enacting real, bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform?

The only reason this case exists is that Congress did not do its job, and then President Obama had no choice but to act in the limited capacity that he could under the law. He acted within his legal authority—something I am confident the Court will affirm. He acted because it would have been inhumane not to do anything while families were being torn apart by our broken immigration policies and this Congress' failure to act.

The Democratic-controlled Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill in June of 2013, and House Republicans did nothing for more than 500 days before President Obama resorted to the power of his pen. Now to authorize the Speaker to file an amicus brief opposing the President's actions rather than acting through the office known as the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group is a break from the usual procedure by which the House weighs in on a matter before the courts in which it may have an interest.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. In other words, this is not regular order, as is so often the cry of my Republican colleagues. This is regular disorder. I am a member of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. It was never brought to us. We never considered it.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

I say to my friends across the aisle, who are so passionate about Congress having a role in this case—where was that enthusiasm when Congress had ample opportunity to prevent this case by doing its job and enacting real, bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform?

The only reason this case exists is Congress did not do its job.

And then President Obama had no choice but to act in the limited capacity that he could under the law.

He acted within his legal authority—something I am confident the court will affirm.

And he acted because it would have been inhumane not to do anything while families were being torn apart by our broken immigration policies and this congress failure to fix them.

The Democratic-controlled Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill in June 2013, and House Republicans did nothing for more than 500 days before President Obama resorted to the Power of his pen.

Now, to authorize the Speaker to file an amicus brief opposing the President's actions, rather than acting through the office known as the "Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group," is a break from the usual procedure by which the House weighs in on a matter before the courts in which it may have an interest.

This amicus brief, which no one has even yet seen, reflects this majority's policy of opposing the administration's legal, policy determinations to help immigrant families after having earlier abandoned its reponsibility to do so through statute.

I was proud to be one of 225 Democratic members of the House and Senate to sign our own amicus brief last week supporting the administration's position.

I'm also among the Democratic members of the House proud to cosponsor a reslution today in support of the President's executive actions and offering our amicus brief as an alternative to the one Republicans are putting forward to represent the views of the House.

And I will continue to work toward the goal of comprehensive immigration reform legislation that offers an earned pathway to citizenship, keeps families together, and makes it easier to recruit and retain talented innovators and entrepreneurs from abroad to contribute to our economy and create jobs here in America.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

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

This discussion is about my constituents, Mr. Ramos and his family. It is about keeping them together. As Mr. GOWDY says, it is about Congress not doing its job, Democrats and Republicans. In the absence of Congress doing its job, thank goodness this President or any President has used his executive authority that exists under the law, most recently in the form of DAPA and DACA, to provide some certainty to Mr. Ramos and his family so that his American kids come home from school to a loving family and so that those 12 jobs Mr. Ramos and his wife have created in our community are protected and preserved and their business is given every ability to expand.

Rather than doing the right thing by debating how to fix our broken immigration system, this Chamber is working, once again, to undermine the only significant progress that has been achieved in recent years.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, to support the families of Ms. Garcia, of Mr. Ramos, and of so many others who are scared to be named, and to reject this approach we see today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I believe what happened up in the Rules Committee was going through regular order—regular order to hear the original jurisdiction and regular order as we were discussing, debating, and voting on the rule. Going through regular order here on the floor of the House of Representatives is important, and I appreciate the American people and the Speaker in understanding what we are attempting to accomplish.

I also reiterate that this resolution is not about policy. It is about the law. It is about the Constitution of the United States. It is about the fabric of our democracy and the checks and balances which are demanded by every single Member of not only this House of Representatives, but also by the American people. It is about our American Constitution.

The House, I believe, must speak, will speak, and will defend its Article I legislative powers on behalf of the American people. Today you have watched Republicans argue thoughtfully and carefully on behalf of this, and I urge my colleagues to join me and the Speaker in support of this important resolution.

While we have consulted with the Committee on Ethics and been advised that this

resolution complies with its guidance in the House Ethics Manual, section 3 of the resolution provides further authorization for the Speaker to accept pro bono assistance so there is no question as to its propriety.

Mr. Speaker, the relevant portion of the House Ethics Manual states:

''[A]s detailed below, Members and staff may accept pro bono legal assistance for certain purposes without Committee permission.

''As to pro bono legal assistance, a Member, officer, or employee may accept such assistance without limit for the following purposes:

''To file an amicus brief in his or her capacity as a Member of Congress;''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for the President's executive actions on immigration to expand the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program and the creation of the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) program.

Soon, the Supreme Court will consider U.S. v. Texas, the case concerning President Obama's executive actions on immigration to extend temporary relief from deportation for undocumented immigrants who arrived in the U.S. when they were children and eligible parents of American citizens or legal permanent residents. These crucial programs have been halted as this litigation continues and our families, our businesses, and our economy hang in the balance.

Today, the House Republicans brought a polarizing resolution to the floor authorizing the Speaker to file an anti-immigrant amicus brief with the Supreme Court opposing these executive actions. I am disappointed that House Republicans are attempting to block the President's executive actions on immigration from taking effect.

The President acted to keep hard-working immigrant families together and to ensure that DREAMERS can continue to live in the only country they've ever known. As co-chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus' Immigration Task Force, I'm hopeful that the Supreme Court will recognize the legality and importance of President Obama's executive actions for our immigrant families. We compromise our nation's family values when we tear apart families and instill fear and mistrust among communities.

With so much at stake, we can't rely on the courts to correct this injustice. America deserves a fair and just immigration system, and our hard-working immigrant families have waited long enough. It's time for Congress to do its job and pass comprehensive immigration reform immediately.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 639, a misguided resolution forced on all Members of the House of Representatives in an attempt to block President Obama's execution action on immigration. This is yet another partisan effort by House Republicans to tear families apart and separate children from their parents.

This amicus brief that Speaker RYAN will file on behalf of the entire House of Representatives not only goes against well-established Constitutional precedents but also against our economic interest. The Congressional Budget Office and numerous other researchers have found that immigration raises average wages for U.S. born workers and grows our economy by billions of dollars. In my State of California alone, the President's Executive action will generate 130,000 jobs and lift 40,000 Californian children out of poverty.

The actions taken by the President on the subject of immigration are within authority of the executive branch. I am proud to join 186 of my House colleagues in support of the President's immigration executive actions.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 639, which would allow the Speaker to file an amicus brief on behalf of the entire House of Representatives in United States v. Texas.

This case deals with critical executive actions implementing immigration initiatives that will strengthen our communities, protect the dignity of families, enhance public safety and national security, raise average wages for U.S.-born workers, and grow our economy by tens of billions of dollars.

Unfortunately, the majority opposes these initiatives and now seeks to influence this pending appeal before the Supreme Court.

I oppose this resolution for several reasons.

First, it is entirely unnecessary. Earlier this month, 185 of my colleagues and I filed an amicus brief in this case with the Supreme Court.

And other individual Members of this body are already free to file their own amicus briefs as well.

The Speaker, however, has chosen to expend legislative time on this measure instead of focusing on what Americans truly care about. Americans are worried about jobs, about overwhelming student loan debt, and in my State, the safety of the drinking water.

Another problem with this resolution is that it authorizes the filing of an amicus brief on behalf of the entire House of Representatives in United States v. Texas when in fact it would not reflect the views of the entire legislative body.

The amicus brief authorized pursuant to House Resolution 639 would represent the views of only the Republican majority.

The majority should not be able to bind the minority to this ill-conceived and misleading undertaking.

Finally, we have already thoroughly debated the constitutionality of the President's executive actions and it is clear that the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and expanded Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals immigration programs are lawful exercises of executive discretion.

Presidents from both parties, including George H.W. Bush and Ronald Regan, have routinely used similar deferred deportation policies to promote family unity in our immigration system.

These programs are commonsense solutions to our broken immigration system that has divided families for decades.

The Supreme Court is the proper venue to resolve this issue, and I am confident the Court will find these actions consistent with the law and the Constitution.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill conceived and wasteful resolution.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. H. Res. 639 is an unprecedented measure by the House Majority to make its opposition to deferred action the official policy of the United States House of Representatives.

A resolution offering the full House to file an amicus has never been done before. Last week, I proudly joined 222 congressional colleagues in sending a amicus brief to the Supreme Court in support of immigrant communities and deferred action. House Republicans are welcome to do the very same. However, to send a brief in the name of the full House and the American people is unprecedented and unwarranted.

DAPA, Deferred Action for Parental Accountability, and expanded DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, created by the President's 2014 Executive Order, would give over 5 million immigrants living in our country today—including an estimated 182,000 immigrants living in Harris County, Texas—the opportunity to no longer live in fear and a shot at the American Dream.

The President's Executive Order that created DAPA and expands DACA is entirely within the Department of Homeland Security's legal authority to grant or deny applications for deferred action. Congress has explicitly passed laws delegating broad immigration enforcement authority to the Executive Branch.

There is a strong historical precedent for DAPA: During the administrations of President Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, deferred action was granted to hundreds of thousands of immigrants in the 1980's and early 1990's.

All of this would be completely unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, if the House Majority had stood with the American people in the last Congress and passed comprehensive immigration reform. Instead, we will be voting on an unprecedented resolution that has little, if anything, to do with fixing our nation's broken immigration system and everything to do with the political season.

I sincerely hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of whom I have worked with for years and consider good friends, will not allow the People's House, or their party, to adopt the anti-immigrant views of Donald Trump. Mr. Trump's demagoguery and fearmongering against immigrants who came to this country for a better life—just like our forefathers and foremothers before us—must not be allowed to become the sanctioned policy of Congress.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with me and vote against this needless and unprecedented resolution.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 639. This bill would allow Speaker RYAN, on behalf of the House, to file an amicus brief in the Supreme Court case on expanded Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA). An amicus brief submitted by the House of Representatives should convey the sentiments of the entire House and not just those of the Republican party—a party whose frontrunner in the presidential campaign has maligned our immigrant communities with hateful and demeaning rhetoric. The Speaker and his party do not speak for the whole House on this matter, and they certainly do not speak for me.

I support the president's executive actions to expand DACA and implement DAPA. Every president for more than fifty years, regardless of party, has taken executive action on immigration, including Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. President Obama's

actions are a step forward in allowing more people to come out of the shadows to participate more fully in our communities.

If Speaker RYAN and House Republicans are serious about reforming our broken immigration system, they should not waste time and taxpayer money on partisan political stunts. Instead, I call on the Speaker to bring his caucus to the table to help negotiate a sensible, bipartisan immigration reform package that will enhance our national security, protect the dignity of families, grow our economy, and put millions of immigrants on a path to citizenship.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express frustration and disappointment in my Republican colleagues' obstinate and insulting discussion about President Obama's Executive Action on Immigration. We are a nation built on the shoulders of immigrants. For most of us, our family trees will reflect a history with roots in other nations—making us the sons and daughters of immigrants ourselves. It has become profoundly clear, however, that many of us today have forgotten this.

The arguments being made on the House floor today not only disrespect the legacy of the immigrants who helped shape this nation, but it undermines the authorities we entrust to our nations President. Simply put, the Executive Action taken to address the immigration crisis in this country fall wholly and legally into his executive authority. DACA and DAPA are necessary in approaching our immigration policy in a compassionate and humane way. We are not prepared to rip babies from the arms of their mothers and deport them. We do not support destroying the families of hardworking men and women who came here looking for a better life. We are better than that. America is better than that.

We all recognize that the President is responsible for upholding and executing the laws passed by this Congress. The actions taken on immigration policy are not only legal but necessary, yet my friends on the other side of the aisle appear to ignorantly and vehemently disagree. So to them I ask, if this approach to immigration reform does not sit well with you, why don't you instead do your job and bring forward legislation on comprehensive immigration reform and let us vote on it in this House? You've made it clear in this discussion today that you understand that it is Congress' job to create immigration law and yet, all I see is a Party content to sit on its hands and scream at the administration for taking the action that they refuse to take themselves. This nation is ready for comprehensive immigration reform. Our constituents deserve answers, our hardworking immigrant families deserve relief and our undocumented guests, who work tirelessly to contribute to the economy of this country, deserve a clear and fair pathway to citizenship.

I support comprehensive immigration reform. I do not support this ill conceived resolution. I urge a no vote.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is taking up H. Res. 639, authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States v. Texas concerning the creation of the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) program and the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. I adamantly oppose H. Res. 639. Congress needs to prioritize and pass comprehensive immigration reform instead of wasting precious time with partisan, backwards legislation like H. Res. 639.

For over a decade, Democrats and Republicans in both houses have been trying to pass immigration reform. My colleagues and I have voted repeatedly against Republican attempts to defund DACA and have signed a discharge petition requesting a vote on comprehensive immigration reform. Because Arizona is a border state, we have suffered from years of federal inaction to fix our broken system. It's time for leadership to stop trying to obstruct programs like DAPA and DACA, which are keeping Arizona families together, and pass comprehensive immigration reform to address border security in our state, offer a fair but tough pathway to citizenship and provide an effective system to meet Arizona's and the country's labor needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 649, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—234

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)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
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
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
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
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
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	Walz	Welch
Veasey	Wasserman Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Vela	Waters, Maxine	Yarmuth
Velázquez	Watson Coleman	
Visclosky		

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Frankel (FL)	Rush
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chaffetz	Jordan	Scalise
Comstock	Kirkpatrick	Smith (WA)
Fincher	Lieu, Ted	

□ 1233

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. WALORSKI changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14; Tuesday, March 15; Wednesday, March 16; and Thursday, March 17, 2016, I was on medical leave while recovering from hip replacement surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 111 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 2426).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 112 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Con. Res. 75, as amended).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 113 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Con Res. 121, as amended).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 114 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 640).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 115 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 640).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 116 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2081).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 117 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3447, as amended).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 118 (on agreeing to the Pallone Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 3797).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 119 (on agreeing to the Pallone Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 3797).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 120 (on agreeing to the Bera Amendment to H.R. 3797).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 121 (on agreeing to the Veasey Amendment to H.R. 3797).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 122 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 3797, with instructions).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 123 (on passage of H.R. 3797).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 124 (on passage of H.R. 4596).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 125 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4416).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 126 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4434).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 127 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 649).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 128 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 649).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 129 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 639).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127, 128, 129, I was unable to vote, as I was attending a funeral service for a close family friend. Roll No. 127 was ordering the previous question; Roll No. 128 was H. Res. 649, providing for consideration of the resolution H. Res. 639, which authorizes the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of U.S., et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15–674; and Roll No. 129 was agreeing to that resolution, H. Res. 639. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on all three rollcall votes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

EVIDENCE-BASED POLICYMAKING COMMISSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1831) to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Evidence-Based Policymaking Commission Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established in the executive branch a commission to be known as the ''Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking'' (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

SEC. 3. MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be comprised of 15 members as follows:

(1) Three shall be appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) one shall be an academic researcher, data expert, or have experience in administering programs;

(B) one shall be an expert in protecting personally-identifiable information and data minimization; and

(C) one shall be the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or the Director's designee).

(2) Three shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) two shall be academic researchers, data experts, or have experience in administering programs; and

(B) one shall be an expert in protecting personally-identifiable information and data minimization.

(3) Three shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) two shall be academic researchers, data experts, or have experience in administering programs; and

(B) one shall be an expert in protecting personally-identifiable information and data minimization.

(4) Three shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) two shall be academic researchers, data experts, or have experience in administering programs; and

(B) one shall be an expert in protecting personally-identifiable information and data minimization.

(5) Three shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) two shall be academic researchers, data experts, or have experience in administering programs; and

(B) one shall be an expert in protecting personally-identifiable information and data minimization.

(b) EXPERTISE.—In making appointments under this section, consideration should be given to individuals with expertise in economics, statistics, program evaluation, data security, confidentiality, or database management.

(c) CHAIRPERSON AND CO-CHAIRPERSON.—The President shall select the chairperson of the Commission and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall select the co-chairperson.

(d) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS.—Appointments to the Commission shall be made not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) TERMS; VACANCIES.—Each member shall be appointed for the duration of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without pay.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY OF DATA.—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of the data inventory, data infrastructure, database security, and statistical protocols related to Federal policymaking and the agencies responsible for maintaining that data to—

(1) determine the optimal arrangement for which administrative data on Federal programs and tax expenditures, survey data, and related statistical data series may be integrated and made available to facilitate program evaluation, continuous improvement, policy-relevant research, and cost-benefit analyses by qualified researchers and institutions while weighing how integration might lead to the intentional or unintentional access, breach, or release of personally-identifiable information or records;

(2) make recommendations on how data infrastructure, database security, and statistical protocols should be modified to best fulfill the objectives identified in paragraph (1); and

(3) make recommendations on how best to incorporate outcomes measurement, institutionalize randomized controlled trials, and rigorous impact analysis into program design.

(b) CLEARINGHOUSE.—In undertaking the study required by subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) consider whether a clearinghouse for program and survey data should be established and how to create such a clearinghouse; and

(2) evaluate—

(A) what administrative data and survey data are relevant for program evaluation and Federal policy-making and should be included in a potential clearinghouse;

(B) which survey data the administrative data identified in subparagraph (A) may be linked to, in addition to linkages across administrative data series, including the effect such linkages may have on the security of those data;

(C) what are the legal and administrative barriers to including or linking these data series;

(D) what data-sharing infrastructure should be used to facilitate data merging and access for research purposes;

(E) how a clearinghouse could be self-funded;

(F) which types of researchers, officials, and institutions should have access to data and what the qualifications of the researchers, officials, and institutions should be;

(G) what limitations should be placed on the use of data provided;

(H) how to protect information and ensure individual privacy and confidentiality;

(I) how data and results of research can be used to inform program administrators and policymakers to improve program design;

(J) what incentives may facilitate interagency sharing of information to improve programmatic effectiveness and enhance data accuracy and comprehensiveness; and

(K) how individuals whose data are used should be notified of its usages.

(c) REPORT.—Upon the affirmative vote of at least three-quarters of the members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a detailed statement of its findings and conclusions as a result of the activities required by subsections (a) and (b), together with its recommendations for such legislation or administrative actions as the Commission considers appropriate in light of the results of the study.

(d) DEADLINE.—The report under subsection (c) shall be submitted not later than the date that is 15 months after the date a majority of the members of the Commission are appointed pursuant to section 3.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''administrative data'' means data—

(1) held by an agency or a contractor or grantee of an agency (including a State or unit of local government); and

(2) collected for other than statistical purposes.

SEC. 5. OPERATION AND POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) EXECUTIVE BRANCH ASSISTANCE.—The heads of the following agencies shall advise and consult with the Commission on matters within their respective areas of responsibility:

(1) The Bureau of the Census.

(2) The Internal Revenue Service.

(3) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(4) The Department of Agriculture.

(5) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(6) The Social Security Administration.

(7) The Department of Education.

(8) The Department of Justice.

(9) The Office of Management and Budget.

(10) The Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(11) The Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(12) Any other agency, as determined by the Commission.

(b) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet not later than 30 days after the date upon which a majority of its members have been appointed and at such times thereafter as the chairperson or co-chairperson shall determine.

(c) RULES OF PROCEDURE.—The chairperson and co-chairperson shall, with the approval of a majority of the members of the Commission, establish written rules of procedure for the Commission, which shall include a quorum requirement to conduct the business of the Commission.

(d) HEARINGS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate.

(e) CONTRACTS.—The Commission may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for any purpose necessary to enable it to carry out this Act.

(f) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(g) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b) and the availability of appropriations—

(1) at the request of the Director of the Census, the agencies identified as ''Principal Statistical Agencies'' in the report, published by the Office of Management and Budget, entitled ''Statistical Programs of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2015'' shall transfer funds, as specified in advance in appropriations Acts and in a total amount not to exceed $3,000,000, to the Bureau of the Census for purposes of carrying out the activities of the Commission as provided in this Act; and

(2) the Bureau of the Census shall provide administrative support to the Commission, which may include providing physical space at, and access to, the headquarters of the Bureau of the Census, located in Suitland, Maryland.

(b) PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act. This Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for the Bureau of the Census or the agencies described in subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 7. PERSONNEL.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall have a Director who shall be appointed by the chairperson with the concurrence of the co-chairperson. The Director shall be paid at a rate of pay established by the chairperson and co-chairperson, not to exceed the annual rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule (section 5316 of title 5, United States Code).

(b) STAFF.—The Director may appoint and fix the pay of additional staff as the Director considers appropriate.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for a comparable position paid under the General Schedule.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HURD of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader and my friend, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business, and on Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House on Thursday or Friday.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 2745, the SMARTER Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD). The bill will ensure that no matter who reviews mergers and acquisitions, be it the Federal Trade Commission or the Department of Justice, there will be uniform rules so that every transaction is reviewed fairly.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I did not see or hear ''the budget for this coming year.'' I know the Committee on the Budget marked up the budget yesterday. As I understand it, they completed their work, and they have reported a budget. I do not see it on the calendar for next week, which means that the earliest we could consider a budget would be April.

Speaker RYAN, as the majority leader knows so well, indicated we are going to pursue regular order, which would be the adoption of a budget, the establishment of a 302(a) allocation, which means the overall expenditure level for discretionary spending, and then the markup and consideration in this House of the 12 appropriation bills.

It would appear, if we are not going to do it next week, could we expect to see the budget on the floor, Mr. Leader, in April?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct that the Committee on the Budget successfully reported a budget resolution last night. I want to take a moment to thank Committee on the Budget Chairman TOM PRICE for his work, and the whole committee.

There are more conversations among Members which will be required before moving the budget to the floor, and therefore it will not be scheduled for the upcoming abbreviated week, but I will let the gentleman know as soon as we do schedule it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for that information.

As the gentleman probably recalls, back in January Majority Whip Scalise was quoted as saying: ''We will forge ahead with spending bills and other initiatives in the coming year.'' He implied that the House would start early on its appropriation bills.

Now, I can remember, as a long-time member of the Committee on Appropriations, that early for us was early

May for actual appropriation bills to be on the floor. In December, Speaker RYAN stated: ''By having this budget agreement that my predecessor put in place, we no longer have a dispute over the sequester.''

Now, it is my understanding, Mr. Leader, that the budget that is being proposed is inconsistent with and does not carry out the agreement that was made between the Speaker and our leader and on which the House voted, a significant majority of the House voted to pass a budget deal. It is my understanding this budget does not carry it out.

After saying: Let's set aside the dispute over the sequester, the Speaker went on to say: ''By getting the slate cleaned now''—Mr. Leader, this was December 22 that the Speaker said this. ''By getting the slate cleaned now''—which meant this argument over sequester, which of course your chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said is unreasonable and unworkable, in effect, and ''ill-advised'' was the word that he specifically used.

The Speaker said: ''By getting the slate cleaned''—by making that deal—''by getting this behind us, we can start our appropriations process early next year''—now, we are beyond early next year, of course—''and do it the right way, individual bills, all 12 bills, open up the process . . . do it the way the Founders intended in the first place.''

My question to you is, Mr. Leader, do you expect that we will start considering appropriation bills on or before the end of April? Does the majority leader contemplate the consideration of all 12 appropriation bills, as the Speaker indicated he wanted to do, with full consideration open to amendment prior to the July adjournment, for essentially 6 weeks, coming back in September?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

You always make me smile when you come with your quotes. At times they seem selective.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time just for a second, it always gives me great pleasure to bring a smile to your face, Mr. Leader.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, if the gentleman just wished me happy St. Patrick's Day, that would have done the same thing.

Mr. HOYER. I will wish you happy St. Patrick's Day, and I congratulate Kelly on that beautiful green blouse she is wearing.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for his mood today, but I do want to correct the RECORD; and this is probably a good reason why we are not bringing the budget to a shortened week next week, because you have some misinformation.

□ 1245

The budget that passed the committee abides by the exact number of what the agreement was. So I would find that you would probably be very supportive.

Secondly, one thing that I would find is that it is our full intention to do all the appropriations bills on the floor. We believe in regular order. I remember a time here when I was in the minority that we didn't have any appropriations bills on the floor. I did not spend the time to get the old quotes about that, because I think America wants us to move forward.

We want to allow time for conversations on the budget.

Appropriations have been going through with their committee meetings. So we are in line to get them done on time and moving them forward.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and observations.

He and I, frankly, have a factual disagreement on whether or not the budget that was reported out does, in fact, reflect the agreement. Technically, he may be accurate.

But, of course, the problem with this budget taking so long to present—which I know the majority leader and the Speaker were hopeful it would have been done either in very late February or very early of this month—clearly, the disagreement, as everybody knows, is that so many of your caucus did not want to abide by the agreement that the three leaders of their party voted for back in December. And we understand there are additional actions going on to placate those on your side of the aisle who don't want to follow the agreement; and, in fact, they are looking for cuts beyond to return to sequester. That is why I referred to the sequester in my opening remarks, although the Speaker said we have gotten beyond that argument. Well, obviously, we haven't gotten beyond that argument. And that is, obviously, why your budget has been delayed and why we are not considering it before we leave here for the Easter break and, therefore, will not consider the budget in March.

So I understand that we have a different perspective perhaps—not a disagreement necessarily, but a different perspective on what the budget process is presenting.

If I can go on, Mr. Leader, let me ask you this. Very frankly, we are concerned about adjourning next week. We are very concerned, Mr. Leader, that we have a brief week. Essentially, in the 2 weeks that we have been here—this week and next—we are going to be meeting 3 full days. We come in at 6:30 on one day. We will leave early today. We will leave early on Wednesday of next week.

We have three crises confronting Americans, and we ought to be dealing with those, Mr. Leader. We would urge that we not adjourn next Wednesday. We would urge that we meet Thursday. Friday, of course, is Good Friday; and Sunday is Easter. Those are very serious holidays for an overwhelming number of us, and we ought to observe those.

But in the spirit of that holiday—of Good Friday and of Easter—we ought to at least sacrifice some of our time in the week following that to address these three crises.

Mr. Leader, I just had the opportunity to meet with a young man, who is in the eighth grade, and his brother, who is in the sixth grade. They are from Flint, Michigan. They have to pay for the water that they drink at school because the water at school is unsafe for them to drink.

Now, the administration has dealt with that, partially. Those of us who have been to Flint, Michigan, have seen a lot of people on the ground—from Health and Human Services to the CDC to the Health Department, from a lot of agencies of the Federal Government there to help. We should be acting on giving some direct help to Flint, Michigan, and assisting.

It is, I think, unfathomable why the State of Michigan that caused this problem by shifting the water supply from Lake Huron through Detroit to the city of Flint—controlled by a receiver, appointed by the Governor, not the mayor or council of Flint, Michigan. It is unimaginable to me that we would be charging children for water that they ought to be supplied, as almost every school in America does.

So, we ought to be dealing with Flint.

Secondly, Mr. Leader, we have a crisis for a large number of Americans. Both of these crises are somewhat related but are separate and distinct issues we ought to be dealing with, and you and I have had the opportunity to discuss them. I appreciate your leadership and concern.

You and I convened a joint meeting with the Department of Health and Human Services; with the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; NIAID and NIH's Tony Fauci; Secretary Burwell; and Dr. Frieden were there talking to us about Zika.

Zika is a health crisis for America and for Americans, and we ought to be dealing with that. We ought to be dealing with it by giving to the administration the resources it needs to respond to this to make sure that America's health is safe and to make sure that the Americans who are living in Puerto Rico have the resources to deal with the eradication of the mosquito that transmits this disease and is a threat to health generally, but particularly the health, as the gentleman knows, of pregnant women or women who may become pregnant.

So Flint and Zika.

Lastly, I would mention that we ought to be dealing with the crisis that confronts Americans in Puerto Rico who are going to be unable to pay their bills. On May 1, they will have another large indebtedness due.

We have been considering for many months now the authorization for Puerto Rico to be able to declare bankruptcy so that it can, in a reasonable, ordered fashion, settle that which they owe in a way that they can accomplish.

All three of these issues, Mr. Leader, we believe are critically important for us to address now. They have been pending for months—some for as long as a year, in terms of Puerto Rico's prospective bankruptcy.

I would ask the leader if he would consider coming back after Easter and doing the work that we ought to be doing to meet these three crises. I believe if we did so, the American people would say that we are a responsible body doing the work that needs to be done.

Frankly, Mr. Leader, over the last 3 weeks, we have done things that could have mostly been done under suspension. We are filling time. We need to fill that time with policies addressing the crises that confront us.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are three questions in there, and I want to answer each and every one of them.

As the gentleman did note, next week is Holy Week. We have Holy Thursday; we have Good Friday, and, of course, Easter.

Now, the gentleman spoke with great passion, but there is one thing I think you missed in this. I hope you have the same passion for those at the EPA who knew of Flint and stayed silent, who did not warn those of the water that had been poisoned.

The gentleman talks very boldly about wanting things done, but we should talk about what has happened.

As we speak today, we just had a hearing on Flint, Michigan, where you had Gina McCarthy in; you had the Governor of Michigan in.

Secondly, the gentleman knows that, when it comes to Zika, we had a meeting together, where we pulled in all those in government who are dealing with this issue. And they will tell you, there is no short answer for it. They will tell you the mosquito is not as easy as just spraying. And they will tell you, each and every day, they are learning something more.

The White House did not send us a supplemental until just a few weeks ago. We have done nothing but move even faster. There is no agency—from the NIH or the CDC—lacking in money to be acting today, and they will answer that question for you. They have money to go forward and do the work that they need to do and that we believe needs to happen. We can argue later about where that money comes from. But in no way have we stopped or slowed down. We have actually been in front of this.

If I recall correctly, it was me who approached you on the floor and requested that we work together on this. It was me who called you and said: Let's make this bipartisan. So we brought all the committee members in with the Secretary and Directors. So in no way do I want the American public to think for one moment that we are not doing the work.

Now, there is not one easy answer for it. You can look around the world to Australia; they have been battling this for quite some time. There are challenges, but we want to make sure we get it done. I want to work with you to make that happen, but I don't want to play political games with it.

You know as well as I do, if you think we are here just on Good Friday and there is going to be a fundamental change, there won't be. But we are making change on the work we are doing.

When it comes to Puerto Rico, we have been working on Puerto Rico. We have been working on Puerto Rico so much, the committee chairman just went there the last time we had a district work period to investigate. So did Congressman SENSENBRENNER and Chairman BISHOP.

Yesterday the Speaker, myself, the committee chair from the Judiciary Committee, Congressmen GOODLATTE, SENSENBRENNER, and BISHOP, all met. After that meeting, Congressman SENSENBRENNER directly went to speak to Leader PELOSI on what we are doing because we are doing this in a bipartisan manner. I think you are going to see hearings being scheduled very shortly. We want to get this right.

I understand your frustration because my frustration is across the Chamber over here with the Senate, because we have acted many times on the direction of where we are going.

The last part I would bring up is that we are going to have disagreements on the budget. And maybe your argument is thinking the budgets are different. They are different. We have brought a budget to the floor every year we have been in the majority here, and they have balanced. Every time the President has sent a budget here and we have put this on the floor, there have only been two votes on the other side of the aisle for the President's budget.

So, yes, we are going to have disagreements on the budget because we are going to fight over here to balance the budget and give us a brighter future. And, yes, maybe philosophically, you think we need to spend more money. But that is a disagreement that I think the American public expect you and I to have a disagreement on and fight for what we philosophically believe in.

I just firmly disagree with your last question on all three—not from a basis of politics, but a basis between you and I knowing what we are doing. You and I both know personally what we have been working on. We haven't hidden the fact. We haven't made it partisan. We have been very open with it. We are going to solve the problem.

I am not going to play political games with you and say, if you come on a Saturday, we are going to solve it. I am going to put us in a room on the exact day that we should be. I am going to have the experts in the room as well. We can disagree with where we want to go. But at the end of the day, we are going to solve the problem.

And I welcome working with you as we solve them.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I want everybody to know that he is correct. He came to me to work in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, we have come to one another at various times to work in a bipartisan fashion. And I am pleased to work with the majority leader.

I think the majority leader—as I have said with him not present and I will say it here today—is someone with whom I can work, have worked, and expect to work. I think he is honest and straightforward when he makes his representations to me, Mr. Speaker, so I want to thank him for that.

But I want to reference all three of the issues that you just discussed. I am going to go in the opposite direction you went. The gentleman started out with the EPA. I am going to start out with the budget.

As the gentleman I am sure knows, there is a $1.5 trillion asterisk in this budget: savings to be determined at some time in the future. Hooray. What courage.

□ 1300

What I am saying about the budget is we had a deal. We agreed, in a bipartisan fashion, an agreement that you and I both voted for.

Mr. Speaker, we both voted for it. It wasn't what either of us probably wanted, Mr. Speaker, but it was an agreement. It was compromise. It was how this body should and does work.

And the problem is we have had such great difficulty saying we are going to implement that agreement, notwithstanding what Speaker RYAN said just a few months ago.

So from the budget standpoint, A, I don't share the gentleman's optimistic view, Mr. Speaker, that it is balanced. It is easy to put an asterisk in there and say we are going to get $1.5 trillion somewhere, somehow, from someplace. It is much more difficult to say where you are going to get it. And what the American people have seen is that asterisk is never realized.

So he and I disagree on the fact that, A, we haven't worked in a bipartisan fashion. We did. It was very tough. The Speaker, you, Mr. SCALISE, Leader PELOSI, and I, all five of us voted for an agreement.

Very frankly, it is our perception, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader's side of the aisle has not been able to carry out their agreement because of internal divisions within your party. Frankly, that is reported on. It seems to be self-evident, and that is our view. Our view is we had a number agreed upon.

It is not about spending more money. It is what we agreed to spend, in a bipartisan fashion, that is not being adhered to.

Secondly, when the gentleman says there is money somewhere, of course there is money somewhere, but it is not a zero sum game. Somebody will be

disadvantaged and hurt and left behind if we take money from the program that this Congress appropriated to be spent on Ebola.

The gentleman came to me, we did have a bipartisan meeting, which I have referred to and the gentleman has referred to. Tony Fauci was there, Secretary Burwell was there, Dr. Frieden was there from the Centers for Disease Control.

All of them said that the suggestion that we take money from Ebola and put it towards Zika would harm the effort to ensure that Ebola does not come back to our shores and, in fact, is controlled overseas as well, because if it is overseas, it will ultimately come on shore here in America; so that they have asked for the resources to deal with Zika now. The longer we wait, the more difficult it will be.

I agree with the gentleman entirely, that we are finding out new things as each day goes by, as each week goes by. But the fact of the matter is we need to give them the assurance that they will have the resources to deploy the kind of effort that we need to make sure that Zika does not become an epidemic here in this country, in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, and in other places in the world.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is, to me, very ironic. I have heard this year, in years past, EPA, get out of our lives. EPA, stay out of our communities. EPA, we don't need your advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Michigan, knowing full well that the water from the Flint River was not the kind of water that we ought to be feeding to our children and to our adults, and refusing to spend the money to treat the pipes so that they would have been lined and the lead from the pipes would not leach into the water and adversely affect the health of the children of Flint, nevertheless, went ahead.

In January of last year, the EPA advised the Governor of Michigan and the Department of Environmental Quality in Michigan, you are getting lead in your water. It is dangerous. January 15, 2015.

Notwithstanding that advice, the Receiver, appointed by the Governor of Flint—the mayor wasn't in charge, the city council wasn't in charge. The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, appointed by a Republican Governor, kept feeding the water to the people of Flint. And we have now determined that EPA kept after them after January 15, and their advice was ignored and, in fact, said, look, we have got it. We can handle this. We have experts.

Frankly, a professor from Virginia Tech started testing the children and found that, tragically, the lead levels in the blood of the children of Flint were going up to dangerous and harmful levels.

So, Mr. Leader, very frankly, your party has made it very clear repeatedly on the bills that you have brought to the floor, you don't want EPA involved. I don't mean you personally. Let me make that clear, Mr. Speaker.

But the votes on this floor have been to reduce EPA's authority, to reduce their involvement, to reduce reliance on EPA's wisdom on behalf of the health and environment of our country.

So then on all three of those issues, Mr. Speaker, let me say something in conclusion.

I know it is Holy Week. And what Holy Week teaches us is that we need to care for one another; that we need to make sure, Mr. Speaker, when there are those in trouble and at risk, that we act. If that is not what Holy Week is about, I don't know what it is about.

We ought to be about the business of responding, Mr. Speaker, to these three crises. Now, we don't have to do it on a Saturday, and I agree with my friend, the majority leader.

We say that all the time, ''my friend,'' but KEVIN MCCARTHY is my friend, Mr. Speaker. I have great respect for him. He is hardworking, he is honest, and he cares about our country. Let there be no mistake.

But what I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is simply to elevate a sense of urgency to respond to two emergencies that confront Americans; and that we, therefore, have a responsibility to act, act promptly, decisively, and effectively. I am urging that we do that, and I am urging that we not waste time in accomplishing that objective.

I am through, unless the majority leader would like to respond further. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to respond to a few points you made.

The money that we are talking about using for Zika, so nobody is delayed, is leftover money from the emergency supplemental voted in 2014. I know it is dealing with Ebola, but it is $3 billion sitting over there. They have some leftover money that they should make sure that they don't wait 1 day to start working.

Now, you talk of the budget. We just passed a budget out of the Budget Committee that had a discretionary number of $1.07 trillion. Nowhere does it show that that is not the agreement.

Now, you and I can debate a lot, but since Republicans took the majority, if you look at the numbers of—and I know in your last year in the majority, you didn't produce a budget. But we have saved America tremendous, more than $800 billion by taking the majority.

Now, you and I both know that the real challenge for America is the mandatory spending, and we have to get to that.

Now, when you talk about the EPA, the challenge that I find, and nobody should ever have water like Flint had. But I am very passionate about this issue. I am passionate that the children have drinking water. You know why? Because that same thing is happening in my State because of lack of water.

Every year we have been in the majority, we have passed a bill here dealing with California water, but it goes nowhere in the Senate.

I want the same for children across the country, because it is not just these two areas, there are lots of places we have to deal with this.

But if I remind the gentleman, I think it was just a month ago, bipartisan on this floor, the vote was 416–2, telling the EPA not to hold information because, when it came to Flint, they knew of it and they waited months before they brought that information forward.

So you and I work together, just as both sides of the aisle in here. They said the EPA needs to stop. If they have information on any community, don't hold that, release it. People need to be warned. People need to be advised.

I was proud of the fact that both sides joined together, and I look forward to our being able to work on the other issues.

Now, you and I may have a disagreement on the timing, because what I have found, these committees have been working. We want to get it right. And in no way, in no shape, have we not kept you, one, a part of it, or if we even have a meeting, advised of it.

Congressman SENSENBRENNER walked from a meeting with the Speaker, the committee chairs, and me directly over to your Leader PELOSI, the same time that we have been dealing with this within the committee, showing all what is being worked on, and I hope we can keep that same working together as we solve the problem.

I wish the gentleman from Maryland good luck in his NCAA bracket. But as he knows, Cal State Bakersfield has never lost in the tournament. Now don't take it we have never been in it, but we have never lost yet.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate his wishes of good luck, and I hope they result in many Maryland victories. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, we don't have a difference on objectives. And yes, the gentleman from Wisconsin did walk across yesterday, yesterday.

The Puerto Rican bankruptcy challenge has been confronting us for more than two-thirds of a year. This is not something new. Zika is new, but Puerto Rico's bankruptcy challenge is not new.

So I am simply saying, Mr. Speaker, that these are matters of urgency, of crisis, and we believe that we ought to work on those. We believe working together, as the majority leader said, we can get that done, and we would hope that we would do so.

Unless the majority leader wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2016, TO MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 21, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE LEGACY OF ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

(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, in celebration of Women's History Month, I rise to honor a pioneer for women's suffrage from my district.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton was born in Johnstown, New York, where she attended Johnstown Academy until the age of 16. As Members of this House and people across our country know, Elizabeth would go on to be one of the true trailblazers of the women's suffrage movement for our Nation.

She helped organize the Seneca Falls Convention, where she presented a Declaration of Sentiments, a call for women's rights, proclaiming that men and women are equal, which was a revolutionary concept in 1848.

As the youngest woman ever elected to Congress, I certainly would not be here today on the House floor without the passion, activism, and dedication of Elizabeth Cady Stanton. And so it is my honor to celebrate her legacy today for Women's History Month.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Women's History Month, but also highlight the harmful impact of poverty on women all over our Nation.

This month we celebrate Women's History Month and reflect on the generations of American women and their many contributions that have brought us to this place in our history.

For example, as Women's History Month was being created back in the 1970s, the Honorable, the late Shirley Chisholm, my mentor and friend, she was making history. She became the first African American woman to serve in Congress, and the first woman and African American to run for President of the United States.

Throughout her career, she broke many glass ceilings, while remaining unbought and unbossed.

Today we see women challenging the status quo everywhere, from sports and politics, to STEM fields and corporate boardrooms. In fact, I am proud to serve in this Congress that has 104 women, the most in history, with our very first Speaker, NANCY PELOSI.

But too many women are still fighting to break down barriers and lift themselves and their families out of poverty. It is truly a disgrace that in 2016, despite making up 50 percent of the workforce, women still earn 77 cents, on average, for every $1 a man makes.

Even worse, African American women earn 64 cents and Latina women earn 55 cents for every $1 a man makes.

□ 1315

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S STRATEGY TO END HOMELESSNESS

(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, in 2015, the Department of Housing and Urban Development released a new strategy that will affect ending homelessness and the programs involved. However, this top-down approach is forcing homeless shelters to change the way they serve the most vulnerable members of their communities or risk losing access to Federal grants.

In my district, at least two different homeless shelters have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in grant funding that they once received. The Esplanade House has provided a housing option to homeless families with children in Chico, California, for over 25 years. The programs they have put in place for their residents have achieved remarkable success rates. Because of HUD's new approach, the Esplanade House's ability to continue to help the less fortunate members of their community is in jeopardy.

I have sent a letter to Secretary Castro and plan to meet with his staff to make sure our concerns are heard and that this new approach is revised. Indeed, it has taken away accountability of their clients, and now just makes handouts.

A Washington-knows-best approach that doesn't take into consideration the impact it has at the local level is the wrong way to fight homelessness. We need to empower these local entities to be more effective in fighting homelessness in the future.

HALT ANTI-IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS ON AMICUS BRIEF

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on House Republicans to halt their proceedings to file an anti-immigrant amicus brief with the Supreme Court on behalf of the entire House of Representatives. The document in question hasn't even been made public, and the House of Representatives is trying to speak on behalf of the entire Chamber and our Nation without allowing us to even see the language.

What will the brief say? Will the Court tell the House of Representatives to encourage tearing families apart by rounding up and deporting DREAMers? Will they advocate ending birthright citizenship and repealing part of the 14th Amendment? Will it call for building their big, beautiful, 50-foot-tall wall along our southern border?

Comprehensive immigration reform has historically been an issue that receives bipartisan support, and I welcome this discussion. We are here as a nation of immigrants. Let's work together to fix our broken immigration system.

RECOGNIZING UALR MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Arkansas at Little Rock men's basketball team on their successful 2015–2016 season. On Saturday, February 28, the Trojans won their first outright Sun Belt Conference title after 25 seasons in the league.

In the first year under Chris Beard's leadership as head coach, the team embarked on one of the greatest turnarounds in the program's history, improving on a 13–18 record 1 year ago to a current record of 26 wins and 3 losses.

They are now moving on to victories, and I look forward to their continued success. As we see on the eve of March Madness, I look forward to seeing their big win against Purdue.

ISIL IN SYRIA

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the barrage of attacks committed by ISIL are crimes against humanity.

The administration's strategy in Syria and against ISIL up until now has been to do the bare minimum, which has only exacerbated the deteriorating situation. Assad remains in power and has, himself, committed an untold number of war crimes through the use of chemical weapons and barrel bombs against his own people, all while giving ISIL time to develop and to strengthen.

Last month, the administration failed to comply with the legally mandated deadline to submit a plan to Congress. However, just this week, the House unanimously passed a nonbinding resolution condemning the attacks as genocide; and today, Secretary Kerry determined that Christians, Yazidis, and Shiite groups are victims of genocide. Because of the Obama administration's inaction and failure to develop a comprehensive strategy, minorities continue to be targets for these atrocious attacks.

Now that the administration has begun to recognize the severity of these massacres, it is time to finally create a comprehensive strategy that will address the root causes of this conflict, including the continued presence of Assad in Syria.

HEZBOLLAH TERROR DESIGNATIONS

(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, earlier this month, the Gulf Cooperation Council pledged to designate Hezbollah, an Iranian proxy, as a terrorist organization. This positive move was followed up with a similar designation by the Arab League. This is in stark contrast to President Obama's strategy, where he continues to appease the Iranian regime at the expense of our traditional alliances in the region.

Do problems still exist within some of the Arab League nations as it relates to support for terror and terror financing? Of course they do.

I will continue to press all of those nations to do more to curb these problems and to tackle all extremist groups, not just Hezbollah. But designating Hezbollah as a terrorist group is a step in the right direction. We must work with these nations and encourage greater cooperation to root out all extremist groups.

Mr. Speaker, instead of allowing Iran's continued provocations to pass without repercussion, the Obama administration should be holding Iran accountable for its actions. It is long past overdue.

PENN STATE FARM EMPHASIZES VALUE OF AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Agriculture Committee, I rise today to commend the efforts of students at Penn State University in their efforts to set up a student-run farm in State College, Pennsylvania, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, the university's Student Farm Club has been working toward securing ground for this farm for the past couple years, finally obtaining an acre of space at a meeting in January.

The farm will operate as a laboratory where students will have the chance to study food production as well as distribution and marketing. Food grown there will be delivered to the community through student-run, community-supported agriculture, which connects consumers with growers.

Now, I know that this is just the beginning for Penn State's Student Farm Club, as they hope the student-run farm will expand in years to come.

Agriculture is the number one industry in my State, and it is key to Penn State University's past, present, and future. I wish these students the best of luck in this endeavor.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Agriculture Week to recognize the tireless work of our farmers, ranchers, and producers. I am proud to represent Nebraska's Third District, the number one agriculture district in the Nation.

As the world's population grows, demand for food is projected to increase by as much as 60 percent by 2050. This provides great opportunity for Nebraska agriculture.

Our innovative producers utilize the latest advancements in the industry, including biotechnology. When biotechnology is applied to cultivated crops, producers increase yields while using less land, less water, and fewer chemicals. Not only is this good for the environment, it also lowers the cost of food at a time when one in eight people worldwide is suffering from chronic malnutrition.

Study after study has shown the safety and vast benefits of biotech crops. I am confident our farmers and ranchers can meet growing global demand, but the Federal Government must let them do their jobs. As founder and co-chairman of the Modern Agriculture Caucus, I am committed to promoting sound policies to help producers do what they do best: help feed the world.

NO MORE UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind all of us that those who sent us here did so because they trust us with their voice to set the priorities in the people's House, because that is the way that our Founding Fathers intended it to be—a government of, by, and for ''We, the People.''

But what was established as three branches of government has evolved into an overextended executive and an overly active court system, with the American people's voice getting lost. Americans are frustrated, and I am, too. That is why I introduced the USA Act, to promote a more effective, accountable, and timely oversight of our entire Federal Government.

Too much of the government is currently on autopilot. We must challenge the status quo by ensuring that spending and decisions made by the executive branch departments, agencies, and programs come under the citizens' scrutiny.

No more unauthorized spending. It is time to hold Federal bureaucrats accountable for being so disconnected from their mission and reclaim the power of the purse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the USA Act.

VIOLENCE AGAINST CHRISTIANS IS GENOCIDE

(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, facing persecution, murder, and torture each day, Christians overseas are persecuted for their religious beliefs. These individuals are being slaughtered, raped, and sold into slavery and forced to watch as their churches are burned down.

This morning, the State Department labeled these atrocities as genocide. This is mass genocide by ISIS and other radical jihadist groups that is taking place throughout the world.

Less than a year ago, 30 Ethiopian Christian men were marched to a beach, beheaded, and shot by radical Islamist terrorists because of their religion. These killers proudly put the video of the executions on YouTube.

In total, over 1,000 Christians have been killed by the radical Islamic State. These atrocious, cold-blooded massacres are an attack on the very nature of human existence: the right to practice one's religion.

Declaring the torture, crucifixion, and murder of Christians and certain religious groups genocide is now the official position of the United States. Genocide in any form is a grave injustice to those who are persecuted for their beliefs. Those people who murder Christians and other minorities because of their religion must be brought to justice because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do.

And that is just the way it is.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Genocide is defined in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) as ''any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part1; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; [and] forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.''

The definition of Genocide is codified in 18 U.S. Code Sec. 1091:

(a) Basic Offense.—Whoever, whether in time of peace or in time of war and with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group as such—

(1) kills members of that group;

(2) causes serious bodily injury to members of that group;

(3) causes the permanent impairment of the mental faculties of members of the group through drugs, torture, or similar techniques;

(4) subjects the group to conditions of life that are intended to cause the physical destruction of the group in whole or in part;

(5) imposes measures intended to prevent births within the group; or

(6) transfers by force children of the group to another group;

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, next week, the Supreme Court will hear the most important religious freedom case in decades. It is Zubik v. Burwell. The purpose of this Special Order is to talk a little bit about religious freedom and what is at stake here.

Before I begin, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has long been a champion of human rights across the globe and understands the importance of religious freedom and is also the chair of our Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my good friend and colleague, KEITH ROTHFUS, for his tremendous leadership on protecting the weakest and the most vulnerable among us, including the unborn and their mothers who are at risk of violence perpetrated by abortion, and for his dedication to protecting conscience rights, again, the subject of today's Special Order.

Next week, the Court will hear oral argument on a landmark case for religious liberty. The impact of the Court's ruling in this case cannot be overstated, but the question before the Court is really quite simple: Can the government coerce the Little Sisters of the Poor and other people of faith to violate their conscience?

The Obama administration is telling these religious sisters, women who have given their life in service to God by taking care of the elderly poor, that their conscience is irrelevant and that they must follow the Federal Government's conscience rather than their own.

This abuse of government power is absolutely antithetical to the American principle of freedom of religion and the First Amendment. Unless reversed, Obama's attack on conscience rights means that government can impose discrimination against Americans who seek to live according to their faith.

The Little Sisters have 30 homes for the elderly across the United States. Each Little Sister takes a vow of obedience to God and of hospitality ''to care for the aged as if they were Christ Himself,'' and they wear religious habits as a sign to others of God's presence in the world. Yet the Obama administration is dictating to the Little Sisters and others about how they should interpret their own religious beliefs. That, in a word, is outrageous.

□ 1330

The Sisters object to having their healthcare plans used to funnel drugs and devices that they have a moral objection to, including drugs that could even destroy a young human life. The sisters say that facilitating the provision of these items is a violation of their religious beliefs, and the government is saying: No, it isn't. We know better than you.

Under the Obama administration's coercive mandate, the Little Sisters and other religious organizations, like Priests for Life and Geneva College, are put in the impossible situation of being forced to violate their religious beliefs or face Obama-imposed crippling fines of $100 per day per employee. In the case of the Little Sisters, that would mean about $70 million per year.

This obscene penalty is completely unfair, unreasonable, and unconscionable. The Obama administration is saying: We will punish you; we will hurt you; we will stop you from serving, unless you provide health care according to the government's conscience, not your own.

President Obama has no business imposing his morality on people of faith, but that is exactly what this oppressive mandate does.

Let's make no mistake about it, this mandate is very much Obama's willful intention. The imposition of this attack on religious freedom is no accident. It comes straight from the pages of ObamaCare.

In December of 2009, in the run-up to passage of ObamaCare, Senator MIKULSKI offered an amendment which provided the authorizing language for this oppressive mandate; and some, including Senator CASEY, rigorously supported Senator MIKULSKI's amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when President Obama spoke in 2009 at Notre Dame University—which, I would say parenthetically, has also filed suit over the mandate—he spoke about drafting a sensible conscience clause. Yet today, protection of conscience is another highly visible broken promise of ObamaCare.

The Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, has a duty to protect the right of the Little Sisters of the Poor and others to live according to their conscience, to ensure that they serve the elderly poor according to their conscience.

Again, I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for his leadership.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, again, for his long leadership on this very important subject of protecting life and protecting conscience.

He mentioned something about the government deciding what is or is not a sincerely held belief. It has been long established, Mr. Speaker, that that is up to the religious adherent-to-be, making that decision, not the government, not the government to interpose itself and tell an individual what is a sincerely held belief for the individual. That is a fundamental freedom that the individual has.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), who also has concerns about what is at stake.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROTHFUS.

Also, I appreciate following somebody like the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has been a tremendous leader on life and on the individual liberties that we are guaranteed and that, indeed, were the cornerstones of the founding of this country and are our religious rights. So I am glad to be able to support Mr. ROTHFUS today in this Special Order about our First Amendment to the Constitution.

We know that next Wednesday, it appears the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments for the Little Sisters of the Poor in the consolidated cases of Zubik v. Burwell.

Now, why is it we are even having to do this? How far have we gotten out of touch, as a Nation and as this oppressive government, that we have to go to court to assert the religious rights and freedoms of individual organizations, like Little Sisters and others that are joining them? It is outrageous to me because, again, a cornerstone of the founding of this country is religious rights.

The Little Sisters of the Poor is a tremendous faith-based organization consisting of Catholic nuns who serve the elderly in over 30 countries around the world, giving from their hearts to help people in a way they see fit in their views and their religion with God.

My scheduler, Caitlin, hosts a weekly movie night at the Little Sisters D.C. home, where she and many others can attest to the incredible work that is done by these nuns.

The HHS mandate under ObamaCare is now forcing religious organizations, like the Little Sisters, to provide health care plans, contraceptives, drugs, and things that they find that are against their belief system, that violate their deeply held belief system system; yet the club of ObamaCare and this Federal Government, hitting them over the head saying ''you have to provide this,'' goes against our founding principles, and I think the whole country should be outraged by this, merely so that a few can have something provided to them for free by an organization that shouldn't have to be doing so.

Indeed, John Adams once stated: ''Nothing is more dreaded than the national government meddling with religion.'' It is a fundamental liberty critical to a thriving and free society.

We have been blessed in a free country, where we can have our expression free, not having to adhere to a healthcare mandate or being forced to bake a cake because of someone else's idea of violating religious views. It is not government's place to determine what a person's religion requires or adheres to. Our laws should support and encourage citizens to worship without fear of reprisal from an oppressive Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for religious organizations, such as Little Sisters of the Poor, and protect them from this horrific HHS mandate. And for the Supreme Court, once they decide to weigh in on a decision, not just to have yet another partisan down-the-line decision based on politics but, indeed, look into their hearts and look into their souls to what is right for the founding principles of this Nation and for people like Little Sisters of the Poor to carry out their God-given and God-driven agenda to help the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank Mr. ROTHFUS for the time and for leading this Special Order here today.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LAMALFA for those observations and to hear about some personal interactions with the Little Sisters of the Poor and the tremendous work that they do.

We see the Little Sisters of the Poor at my parish about once a year. They are the most unthreatening individuals you would imagine. They stand at the door. Some of them are older, so it appears that some of them may have a little bit of arthritis as they are bent over holding a basket. And in that basket is a request for donations. They beg. They beg for people to support their work, which is caring for the most vulnerable people in our society, the elderly poor.

We haven't gotten here in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very important for us to take a look at the historical context of religious freedom and its importance.

Freedom of religion is fundamental in our country. An interesting note, here in my pocket is the Constitution, and religious freedom is literally the very first freedom mentioned in our Constitution. It is in the Bill of Rights.

''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

The very first freedom mentioned.

After freedom of religion, there is freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the right of the people to peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. But the very first freedom mentioned is the freedom of religion.

It is interesting because we also talk about rights in our society. As a footnote, our founding documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—talk about rights. But the very first right in one of our founding documents is the right to life.

In our Declaration, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

The very first right in our founding documents is the right to life, and the very first freedom in our founding documents is the freedom of religion.

Why was it so important? Because there is a long history, Mr. Speaker, of how religion has been treated throughout the world.

You can go back to the beginnings of the development of the Christian faith in Europe where we saw this religious sect begin in the Holy Land and then spread to the capital of the Roman Empire.

It was the Roman emperors who first persecuted the people of faith, who had the Christian faith. We saw how the emperors forced early Christians to violate their conscience.

It might not seem as any big deal. All they wanted was for individuals to burn a little pinch of incense before the Roman gods because the emperors were concerned about threats to the empire; and they thought if they could appease the Roman gods, if they had everybody in the empire doing that little pinch, it was not going to hurt anybody.

In fact, a lot of Christians went along with it. But there were those who did not because they could not do that in their conscience. And what happened to them? They were murdered. They were murdered because they did not burn that pinch of incense to the Roman gods.

So we look back through history and we understand now that it was wrong for an all-powerful government to go after people of conscience's sincerely held beliefs. We all recognize that as abhorrent right now.

But it wasn't just 2,000 years ago or 1,800 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that we saw these persecutions happening. There was a gentleman in 16th century England, in 1535. We know him now in history as ''a man for all seasons.'' Thomas More, an extraordinary intellect, was a poet, lawyer, father, husband, Speaker of the House of Commons, chancellor.

Mr. More was a man of serious faith and serious conscience. He had a very good relationship with his friend, King Henry VIII, but King Henry had a problem. He had made an arrangement to have special permission granted where he could marry the widow of his brother who had died, Catherine of Aragon.

But after some time, Henry was concerned that he did not have a male heir that he wanted to leave the throne to. So he thought he needed another wife.

We know the course of history: He divorced Catherine, and he married Anne Boleyn. He wanted the people of England to accept that. He knew that his dynasty was at stake, so he required people to accept that.

Thomas More, in conscience, could not. He was jailed in the Tower of London. His books were taken away. He refused to speak on the matter because he thought that silence would protect him. Then there was perjury, and he was convicted of treason for opposing the king, and he was beheaded, all because he was following the dictates of his conscience.

This was the context, Mr. Speaker, in which Western history was developing. And as the Renaissance was happening—and More was part of the English Renaissance—and as we went into the later 16th century and the 17th century, the development of thinking on religious freedom—and there were religious wars throughout Europe, and all these minorities seemed to be getting oppressed by the government—a number of sects decided that there would be a better place where they could practice their faith in conscience, and that place was the New World across the ocean.

□ 1345

It took a lot of trouble to get to the New World—dangerous new territory, treacherous crossing, unknowns—but these were people who were looking to build a city upon a hill. We know the stories of Pilgrims, who sought religious freedom, and of, later, the Puritans. My own State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was established as a colony where people of conscience would be protected.

William Penn, in his Pennsylvania Charter of Privileges in 1701, wrote:

''No people can be truly happy, though under the greatest enjoyments of civil liberties, if abridged of the freedom of their conscience as to their religious profession and worship.''

Penn, himself, was jailed for his exercising his conscience, as he wrote from Newgate Prison in 1670:

''By liberty of conscience, we understand not only a mere liberty of the mind but the exercise of ourselves in a visible way of worship, upon our believing it to be indispensably required at our hands, that if we neglect it for fear or favor of any mortal man, we sin and incur divine wrath.''

All of these individuals were seeking protection, were seeking a place where they could exercise their freedom of conscience. Maybe that, Mr. Speaker, is why the freedom of religion is the first freedom mentioned in our Bill of Rights.

Our Founders, the Fathers of our country, understood the importance of religion. President George Washington remarked in his farewell address that religion and morality are ''the firmest props of the duties of men and citizens'' and ''the indispensable supports of the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity.''

Six years prior to his farewell address, Washington wrote a letter to the

Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island, which contained, arguably, one of the most beautiful articulations of religious liberty in American history:

''The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy—a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it were the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights, for, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.''

Alexis de Tocqueville, who visited this country in the 1830s, explains in ''Democracy in America,'' in looking back at the experience of the Pilgrims: The Pilgrims came, de Tocqueville said, ''to make an idea triumph.'' They founded a community, the Pilgrims, and a society where government could not encroach on their particular religious practice. This is part of the fabric of our country.

Look at the experience in history. All of the Founders were well-versed in our history, the Western history—of the importance of conscience, of religious freedom. Outside observers coming to this country, like de Tocqueville, were seeing it and understanding the importance of people of faith to correct the errors that were in our country. The movement to abolish the abominable practice of slavery happened because people of faith stood up and recognized the inherent indignity of the practice and the violation of fundamental human rights. History in our country is just replete with instances of people of faith who have stood up to make a difference. One hundred years after the end of the Civil War, it was people of faith who began the marches in the South. It was people of faith from the north who went down to help.

Dr. Martin Luther King was a pastor. He went to seminary in my home State of Pennsylvania, to the Crozer Theological Seminary. He was motivated by what was the fabric of his life, which was grounded in scripture. He asked the big questions.

Just before his death, Dr. King says:

''Conscience asks, 'Is it right?' And there comes a time when we must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because it is right.''

People of faith, people of conscience, we have seen them very active in the effort to protect all human life since the Supreme Court, in 1973, took what then-Justice White said was an exercise in raw judicial power and said that certain human beings aren't persons.

We know that we have had more than 50 million abortions since that time, but it has been people of faith who have been looking for solutions, who have been seeking to help women in crisis. Whether it has been Catholic charities, crisis pregnancy centers, people of faith, they have been standing up and providing assistance to women in crisis, walking with them, helping to carry the burdens that they are experiencing—of women who have often been abandoned and isolated, who don't feel like they have a friend but then who find a hotline where a voice picks up—somebody who has been motivated by his faith to be sitting by that phone, wanting to help, asking to help.

Next week, the Supreme Court is going to be taking a look at this case. Again, it may be the most important religious freedom case the Court has heard. The Court is going to make the decision: For the individual who objects to signing a form based on his religious belief, is that a legitimate exercise of his conscience?

That is not the government's decision, Mr. Speaker. The government should not be subjectively telling an individual in this country, who has a fundamental First Amendment right—a first freedom—to exercise his religion, what is legitimate and what is not. That is what is at stake here.

It is interesting that my diocese—the diocese in which I live, the Diocese of Pittsburgh—is the lead plaintiff named in the case, Bishop Zubik.

Bishop Zubik has written:

''Religious freedom is not secondary freedom; it is the founding freedom. Religious freedom in this country means that we pledge allegiance to both God and country, not to God or country.

''We have the right not just to worship, not just to pray privately. We also have the right to try to have an impact on our society for the common good. We have our rights to express our beliefs publicly and try to convince hearts and minds. We not only have a duty but the right to live out the faith in our ministries of service.

''Religious freedom is not a passive act. Religious freedom is intentionally action. Religious freedom has to be expressed. Religious freedom has to be lived. Religious freedom has to be out in the open, among the people. Freedom of religion can never be confined to merely the freedom to worship. It defies the Constitution and does a mortal injustice to society.''

The First Amendment doesn't say ''freedom to worship.'' It says ''freedom of religion.''

For those who are Christians, you can go to Matthew, chapter 25, and the mandates that we have from Jesus.

Looking at whether in your life you fed the poor, clothed the naked, gave drink to the thirsty, visited those in prison, when you go up to the pearly gates, those who have lived in accordance with Matthew 25 may still ask the question: When did I help you? When?

''When you did it to the least of my brothers, you did it to me.''

That is not happening inside the church, Mr. Speaker. That is happening on the streets. It is happening in hospitals. It is happening in health clinics. It is happening in food banks. It is happening on counseling hotlines. These are people of faith who are engaged in public society, who want to help others. In a spirit of solidarity, they are standing with those who are suffering, and they are wanting to help—motivated by their faith.

That is what the Little Sisters of the Poor do. I mentioned how the Little Sisters come to my parish and beg. They are not a very threatening bunch, Mr. Speaker. They have homes across the country in which they are taking care of the elderly. They offer an opportunity for dignity for the people who have lived long and hard lives. At the end of their lives, they may not have much to show for it from a monetary perspective, but they may have lived very rich lives in the way they were helping in their communities. That is not a condition for going to stay with the Little Sisters of the Poor. They love unconditionally and they provide a chance for people in their senior years to have a little bit of respect and a little bit of dignity.

The Little Sisters of the Poor are up against a leviathan—Goliath—the all-powerful United States Federal Government at the Department of Health and Human Services.

It says, ''You will sign this. You, Sister, will sign this.''

''But,'' Sister says in her conscience, ''I can't do that.''

''Sister, it is an opt-out.''

Sister is saying, ''Yes, but if I sign that document, that sets in chain the provisions of services that violate my conscience. You are forcing me to take an act to be the cause—the cause of something I don't believe in.''

''But, Sister, you will. You will do this.''

Think back 2,000 years, 1,800 years. The Empire needs to be protected from barbarians who are going to be coming across—the Goths, whoever it is. We have to sacrifice just a pinch—just a pinch—to our Roman gods to be protected.

Thomas More: King Henry's surrogates go to Thomas in the tower. ''Just sign the document. Just sign the document. It is not going to hurt. It will bring peace. It will make sure that the king's dynasty will continue. We are tired of religious wars in Europe, and if the king doesn't have a male heir, then we are going to have all kinds of continued wars. There is a very good justification, Sir Thomas, to sign that document.''

Thomas says, ''I can't. I can't.'' He lost his head.

People of faith in England and in Holland—wherever—knew that if they got to these shores, they could live in freedom of conscience.

□ 1400

Now we have the all-powerful government coming in and saying: You will

comply; you will sign. Oh, Sister, that is not a violation of your religious freedom. Trust us.

Really? Really? How is it that the Federal Government could be the arbiter of what is a sincerely held belief? Doesn't that set the government up perhaps as an entity itself making religious decisions?

I thought the Federal Government was not supposed to make religious decisions. If the Federal Government has a bureau of what is a sincerely held religious belief, that is a pretty serious issue that the Court needs to take a look at.

I wonder what you would call that bureau? Bureau of legitimate religious practices? Bureau of legitimate religious beliefs? Bureau of what we will allow you to believe in this country? Is that what this is?

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that religious freedom is not a priority here for those who promulgate these regulations.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), who is a stalwart defender of human life.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ROTHFUS for setting up this time so we can draw attention to this case of the Little Sisters of the Poor and for his eloquent defense of the right to life.

I am here today to also support the Little Sisters of the Poor and all the faith-based groups in our country that seek to help the poor and unfortunate among us.

Northern Michigan, where I come from, is home to many of these organizations, and I am very familiar with the good works that these groups do in our communities. We need to be doing more to encourage this type of service and make faith-based organizations even more important in our country, not put undue problems in their way and make them do things that they don't believe in.

The undue burden that is being imposed on many of these organizations by the Federal Government is completely wrong. Thanks to the President's healthcare law, faith-based organizations are being forced to participate in a convoluted system that leads to abortion, a practice that is contrary to their and my deeply held beliefs.

I stand with the Little Sisters of the Poor and many of my constituents in northern Michigan in the belief that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb. Both unborn and born children have a right to life, and we have a duty to defend this right. This is a civil right. This is what our country was founded upon. Life is the first of the freedoms that are enumerated.

My hope is that Americans who believe in the sanctity of life will keep strong in their efforts to stop the Federal Government's intrusion into our religious freedom.

I, myself, am frankly amazed that we live in a country that was founded on the right to life and liberty—and we all have heard the phrase ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness''—and that the Federal Government is paying for losing a civil right: the right to life.

I don't know what it is exactly, how this country that is founded on principles like that could have gotten to this state. It is one of the reasons I am standing here. I never was involved with politics in my life until this administration came upon the scene and started destroying the fabric of our Republic.

I think often, too: How does this happen? How does God allow this to happen? This time in our lives, in our country, is truly a test of our faith.

Really, Mr. Speaker, I am here to be sure that all Americans continue to fight and not lose the hope that our country will solve this problem and get out of the business of paying for abortions and the tragedy of abortion over the many years that it has been legal in this country. I call upon those Americans to continue to work hard, to keep strong in their efforts, to bring an end to this tragedy that is going on in America and the overreaching Federal Government that is allowing it to happen.

I again commend Mr. ROTHFUS for doing this and really call out to all Americans to not lose hope that we are going to put a stop to this and to continue to fight for the lives of the unborn and unfortunate.

I again applaud those faith-based organizations that continue to fight and go to court over this and that we need to continue to do this.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BENISHEK.

Again, you think about the dignity of the human person and, as he talked about, the importance of the right to life, just a fundamental right.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, the first right in our founding documents, beginning with the first freedom being the freedom of religion.

It is amazing to me how the freedom of religion in this country has informed the world and what took root in this country 240 years ago, which is the notion that we were not going to have an established church and that we were going to allow people to freely exercise their faith and how that has led to this proliferation in our country of the practice of faith. And comparing what is happening in the United States versus other countries, particularly in Europe where there was an established church, we know that more people go to church in this country than in Europe.

It was the American experience, I think, that has really informed others, including the Catholic church, of which I am a member. I hark back to what President Washington had written to the Hebrew congregation:

''The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation. All possess, alike, liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship.''

It is amazing to look at that letter and then to reflect how the Catholic church came together under, now, Pope Saint John XXIII with the Second Vatican Council, which the whole idea was to open up the church and to engage modernity and to see what was out there that might inform how people are ordering their lives.

The Second Vatican Council issued a number of remarkable documents, including a declaration on religious freedom, the Dignitatis Humanae. It states:

''The exercise of religion, of its very nature, consists before all else in those internal, voluntary and free acts whereby man sets the course of his life directly toward God. No merely human power can either command or prohibit acts of this kind.''

The Second Vatican Council, they had to recognize how religious freedom developed in this country because there was no coercion. Conversely, there is the long history going back hundreds of years, centuries, back to the Roman martyrs where the emperor was forcing people to act against their conscience, King Henry VIII.

Here we have, today, an all-powerful Federal Government sitting in judgment on what somebody's sincerely held belief is. The Court needs to protect this fundamental freedom. The Court needs to protect conscience. This country is a better place because of it.

It is interesting because, as the Affordable Care Act has been implemented, the purported compelling interests that the government uses about providing access to health care, they have set up a regime, a scheme where not every single plan is being required to provide the services that the Little Sisters of the Poor find objectionable or that the Diocese of Pittsburgh would find objectionable or Geneva College, a Christian college in my district, would find objectionable, because they grandfathered some plans. They grandfathered plans that cover millions of people.

So I guess it is a compelling interest when they are going after a little religious charity, but it is not a compelling interest if they are going against a big corporation that might have a grandfathered plan.

Oh, it is just signing a little paper, Sister.

No, it is not; it is coercion.

If the Little Sisters of the Poor are providing health insurance to their employees without the mandated services that include abortion-causing drugs, if they provide a health plan that covers cancer, covers maternity benefits, covers a broken bone at the emergency room, but doesn't cover those services they find objectionable, they will be fined $36,500 a year for one person. All told, when you add it all up, it is $70

million. But if they provide no plan—no plan at all—it is $2,000 per employee. If that doesn't send a message of coercion, I don't know what does.

I urge the Court to recognize the right of conscience and to be tolerant of that. This country is a wonderful country. ''Tolerance'' is one of the words that we have inscribed down here on the rostrum of the House of Representatives—''tolerance.''

It is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge the folks at the Department of Health and Human Services to give a better appreciation for tolerance.

This country just has a long history of protecting religious freedom from the very beginning through the movement to abolish slavery, through the movement to ask for the cashing of the promissory note that Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King talked about, to the pro-life movement, to the charities, the hospitals, the clinics, the schools, and the food banks that have all been run by religious organizations. It is about these organizations wanting to take care of people.

Although not a party to the case, I think of a story involving the Missionaries of Charity, that order founded by blessed Teresa of Calcutta, who will be canonized a Catholic saint this September by Pope Francis, who spoke here in this Chamber.

Mother Teresa's nuns have established a number of homes around the world. We know that they had a home for the elderly in Yemen, and some of those residents were murdered just weeks ago by radical jihadists. Four of the sisters were murdered as well.

Mother Teresa has established homes in our country, and I remember hearing a story about a home in San Francisco in either the late 1980s or early 1990s. It was a home that was caring for people with AIDS. There was a story of one gentleman who was going to die, and he needed a place to stay.

□ 1415

The Missionaries of Charity took him in, and they nursed him back to health. He went back out and continued his life, but he got sick again and came back again. The sisters welcomed him back.

As he neared the end of his life, he was scared until Mother Teresa picked him up in her arms. For once in his life, he found unconditional love and peace because a person of faith whom we all recognize did great things because of faith, that person found peace.

Millions of people in this country have found peace because of the free exercise of religion. Let's not crush that. Let's protect these fundamental freedoms of religious freedom, the tremendous good that is being done. We should not make religious organizations adjuncts of the all-powerful Federal Government: You can practice your charity as long as you do it the way we want you to. We lose something there, Mr. Speaker.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who has long been an advocate for the types of freedoms I have been talking about, religious freedom, and the first right that we have been talking about, the right to life.

I yield to Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), my friend. I mean, just within days of Mr. ROTHFUS arriving here at the Capitol as a United States Congressman, we were together, abiding together, standing together, and it has been my great honor to do so. I have come to know his heart. He is a man of intellect, a man of character.

Mr. ROTHFUS. So the gentleman from Texas will control the time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues in support of fundamental American values, among which are commitments to religious freedom, human rights, and religious expression.

As a Catholic, my faith plays a significant role in every aspect of my life and fosters a respect for the religious rights and freedoms of others.

Next week, the Supreme Court will hear from our religious non-profit organizations, including the Little Sisters of the Poor, which have challenged the HHS mandate and its impact on their religious rights and freedoms.

I believe in the importance of patient-centered health care for women, and I also want to ensure that conscience rights and religious liberties are protected.

At its core, this case is about the state forcing religious organizations to provide for services that violate their beliefs.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, to hear my friend Mr. ROTHFUS talk about the Little Sisters of the Poor—I have not met them personally as he has. I don't know them personally as he does, but it is rather clear they bear a great deal of resemblance in the way they carry themselves, in the way they help others, in the way they are incredibly selfless, that they are living their lives truly committed to doing what Jesus said when he said: If you love me, you will tend my sheep.

These Little Sisters of the Poor, these Catholic nuns, since I haven't met them personally and dealt with them personally, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), my friend, has, I take it from his description and from what I have seen of them on television and heard them speak on radio and television and in the written media, these are precious, extraordinary women, the kind of people about which Jesus spoke when he said: They will inherit the Earth.

Unfortunately, between that time when they inherit all things, they have to endure the slings and arrows of people who ridicule and persecute Christians for their beliefs. It is so remarkable that we are supposed to have this incredibly educated judiciary, this incredibly educated group of people in the United States, when, as I have heard repeatedly in my district over the last few months, you know, there is sense, s-e-n-s-e, in Washington and at the Capitol, but it's not common sense there.

It is common sense where the Little Sisters of the Poor are located. It is common sense where I live in Texas, common sense among the 12 counties that I travel constantly. There are places around the country it is common sense, but not here, because the people around the country can read the First Amendment to our Constitution. It says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This is a Nation, according to our Founders, who had a tremendous amount to say about our foundation. I know that we have had people educated to the level of Ph.D.—perhaps even beyond, whatever that is—and yet they have not gotten a complete education of the basis on which this Nation was founded. They have been convinced by people who have taken tiny little parts of our founding and seen little trees and shrubs and ignored the forest.

If people on the Supreme Court and in our Federal court system would dare to look at a full history of this Nation, they might actually read what the Pilgrims themselves said in their own writing, their own agreement, because in 1620, November 11, 1620—I am quoting from the Pilgrims:

''In the name of God, Amen . . . having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick.''

Or how about September 26, 1642, some educational institution called Harvard that has also been educating people out of common sense. Thank God there are people who have graduated from Harvard and have been able to maintain some level of common sense. But Harvard said:

''Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well the main end of his life and studies is to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life (John 17:3) and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning. And seeing the Lord only giveth wisdom, let every

one seriously set himself by prayer in secret to seek it of Him (Proverbs 2:3).''

Or how about this entry in George Washington's prayer book. Perhaps some of our courts' liberal judges, some of them have probably heard of George Washington, and I know in some of our schools we have had to drop the study of real history because they are teaching to the ridiculous test that some bureaucrats think should be appropriate because the Federal Government has gotten too involved and gone beyond what the Constitution allows them to require and do. But George Washington's prayer book included this prayer:

''O, most glorious God and Jesus Christ, I acknowledge and confess my faults in the weak and imperfect performance of the duties of this day. I called on Thee for pardon and forgiveness of sins, but so coldly and carelessly that my prayers are come my sin and stand in need of pardon. I have heard Thy holy word, but with such deadness of spirit that I have been an unprofitable and forgetful hearer . . . Let me live according to those holy rules which Thou hast this day prescribed in Thy holy word. Direct me to the true object, Jesus Christ, the way, the truth and life. Bless, O Lord, all the people of this land.''

Wow. That was the father of our country, in his prayer book that is.

So I think about the wisdom. Proverbs says fear the Lord's beginning of wisdom, and I think about the wisdom of a lady who is not that well formally educated, Ms. Milam in Mount Pleasant, Texas, one of my mother's best friends.

My late mother had some awesome friends, and I loved to hear them talk.

Ms. Milam's daughter, Emma Lou, was talking to her mother, Ms. Milam, and it was my great honor when I was able to drive as a 14-year-old and Ms. Milam would call over and tell my mother: Tell LOUIE I have got some homemade rolls.

And I would head over to Ms. Milam's house because they were incredible. She had real butter.

She didn't have a very advanced education. I don't know if she got to seventh or eighth grade. I know she didn't go too far at all in school, but she was a very, very smart woman. And having discussions, sometimes eating rolls and real butter, and hearing the wisdom of this lady—I think she was 90, maybe, when she said this, but her daughter was talking about someone there in our hometown where I was growing up, Mount Pleasant, and she mentioned a guy there.

Ms. Milam said: He is a fool.

Emma Lou, her daughter, said: Mother, he has his Ph.D.

Ms. Milam said: I don't care. He will always be a p-h-u-l, fool.

There are people in this country, they may have their Ph.D.s, but they will always be, as dear Ms. Milam, Emma Lou Leftwhich's mother, you say he will still be a p-h-u-l, fool.

She may not have been the most accurate speller, but she knew a fool when she saw and heard one.

So we have people who have not been properly educated about our history, and so they go about miseducating others by telling people like me when we were students: By the way, Benjamin Franklin was a deist, someone who believes if there was something that created the universe and it didn't just all amazingly happen from a big bang or whatever—some of us believe there could be a big bang and still have been intelligent design to what happened.

But we were told Ben Franklin, no, he didn't believe that there was a God that intervened in the ways of man, that if there was a deity or something of force that set things in motion, that that thing, force, deity, whatever it is, if it still exists, it never interferes with the laws of nature, the ways of man. It just lets everything play out, so we are on our own.

But if you look at the words Ben Franklin wrote and spoke himself, we know what he said in 1787, June, at the Constitutional Convention, because he was asked for a copy. He wrote it down. Madison took notes, but Franklin wrote it down. In part, he says—and, of course, he was 80 years old, a couple years away from meeting his Judge, his Maker. This brilliant man said:

''I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His''—God's—''notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?''

□ 1430

''We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' ''

He said:

''I firmly believe this; and I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little partial local interests . . . and we ourselves shall beome a reproach and a byword down to future ages.''

This is a man who is one of the greatest Founders of this country, who made clear, standing before all of these brilliant people in Philadelphia and the little Independence Hall and told them unashamedly that if we do not invoke God's help here in our effort to put together a Constitution that this country will work and live under, then we will succeed no better than the builders of Babel. It will all come crashing down, as the Tower of Babel did.

Yet we get far enough from that amazing speech in 1787—and yes, it is true that because they didn't have a treasury; they didn't have money; they weren't getting paid; they weren't able to hire a chaplain, as they had throughout the Revolution. The Continental Congress had a chaplain that led in prayer every day before they started.

They didn't have money. They didn't have a treasury. They couldn't hire a chaplain. There were denominations of Christians there that didn't trust other members to do a prayer that was satisfactory for all, so they all had to hire a chaplain during the Continental Congress days to do the prayer for everyone, that they could all be assured was a fair prayer to each of the Christian sects. Even the Quakers would not get upset if they picked the right Christian chaplain. So that is what they did.

But it is true, after Franklin made this speech, that it was pointed out they have got no money. They can't hire a chaplain. So they will get to that later—and later, they did. Because since that first day that Congress was sworn in, in 1789, in Federal Hall there in New York, right after George Washington put his hand on his own Bible and added the words to the end of his oath of office ''so help me God,'' he goes in, he makes a brief speech—back in those days, they did that, a brief speech—to Congress. Then they all went down to St. Paul's Chapel, which is still there, that was protected from the concrete and debris and steel—all those things that came flying—totally protected by a sycamore tree that fell there in the cemetery. It was totally protected—even the fragile stained glass windows—from any harm.

The chapel where George Washington and the first Congress, after they were sworn in, came down Wall Street and actually had a prayer service together in St. Paul's Chapel.

Is it any wonder that, after 9/11, the only building that was not harmed in what was considered part of Ground Zero was St. Paul's Chapel, where that first prayer session came together? Jonathan Cahn has written eloquently about that.

When I was there a few months after 9/11, that is where everybody was bringing their wreaths and their messages that just broke your heart: Has anyone seen this person? It is St. Paul's Chapel.

It is not just me that says it. But let's go to another of our Founders. A lot of people don't know that he was a Founder, Noah Webster.

In 1783, Noah Webster wrote and published the first book on proper spelling for words, which eventually morphed into our dictionary. Generation after generation has learned at the hands of Noah Webster, and a lot of people don't realize what an important role Noah Webster had as a thinker, as a brilliant man, as a confidant to George Washington, as a confidant to Alexander Hamilton, another of our Founders.

But that brilliant man, Noah Webster, said this:

''The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scriptures ought to form the basis of all of our civil constitutions and laws. All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery, and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible.''

Wow.

Of course, Jedidiah Morse, the father of American geography, as he is called, and the father of Samuel B. Morse, stated:

''Whenever the pillars of Christianity shall be overthrown, our present republican forms of government, and all the blessings which flow from them, must fall with them.''

Of course, this is what the Supreme Court has been doing, the very thing that our Founders, including this direct statement of Jedidiah Morse made: when the pillars of Christianity fall, then self-government is going to fall with it.

And that is why John Adams had made the point that he did, that this form of government is intended only for a religious and moral people. It is totally ineffective to govern any other kind.

Yes, they had some things wrong. No one should have been enslaved when a Constitution and a Bill of Rights were adopted, as it was. No one should have been. People should have been treated equally—not by behavior or conduct, because there have to be laws governing behavior and conduct and choices—but regarding things that you have no control over: race, creed, color, gender, national origin. And it took a little while to get that right.

People talk about Jefferson. People say he didn't even believe in God. Are you kidding me? Jefferson, whose memorial is not far from this very Capitol—a beautiful dome overlooking the Tidal Basin—has inscribed on the walls:

''Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?''

John Quincy Adams, our youngest diplomat in the history of the United States, appointed by George Washington. Became President in the election of 1824. He was the only person to have been President and, after he was President—defeated in 1828 by Andrew Jackson—runs for Congress in 1830. Nobody ever did that before or since. Why would anybody run for Congress after they had been President?

Well, in the case of John Quincy Adams, it was because he believed God had called him to do what William Wilberforce was doing and had almost completed doing in the British Empire, and that is, eliminating slavery because of his beliefs of the teachings in the Bible.

By the way, John Quincy Adams overlapped with Lincoln for about a year just down the hall here. We now call it Statuary Hall. It has got a brass plate where his desk was. There is a brass plate where a skinny, not that handsome guy sat in the very back for 2 years, overlapped with Adams.

I asked the historian Steve Mansfield about this. He said, there is no question about it that Abraham Lincoln, sitting at the back of Statuary Hall—the back of the House Chamber down the hall, listening to the speeches of John Quincy Adams over and over about the evils of slavery and how in the world could we expect God to continue blessing America when we are putting brothers and sisters in chains? He said, there is no question; those speeches materially affected Lincoln more than anything else in his 2 brief years in the House of Representatives, so much so that after the compromise of 1850 and slavery appeared to be perpetuated, that eventually he had to get back involved in politics to try to get rid of slavery.

Why? Because Lincoln, who started as an infidel, as Mansfield's book ''Lincoln's Battle With God'' points out, he bragged about being an infidel in the early 1820s. But by the time he became President, he had no question whatsoever: There is a God Almighty who has control of the universe. He does let us make free choices. And Lincoln felt like he may have made some wrong choices that contributed to trouble in the country that broke his heart, caused him depression. But he believed.

He was materially affected by the man who believed that God had called him to bring an end to slavery. And in obedient response to what he believed was God's calling, he materially affected that young freshman sitting at the back of Statuary Hall to the point that he ended up being the leader that brought about the end of slavery.

My friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) was quoting from and relating to Martin Luther King, Jr. What was he? He was an ordained Christian minister who believed in God, who believed in the saving grace of Jesus Christ, just like the little Sisters of the Poor, who have dedicated their lives to helping others who don't have the ability to care for themselves. They have spent so much of their lives that would equate to millions and millions of dollars providing health care and help to people in need.

And what happens? We have, as Thomas Jefferson related, gotten so far from remembering where our rights come from that this Nation is in peril of continuing to stay free.

You have other statements. John Quincy Adams says:

''The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: It connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity.''

From the day of the Declaration, they—the American people—were bound by the laws of God and by the laws of the gospel which they nearly all acknowledged as the rules of their conduct.

Well, certainly.

Under the freedom of religion in our First Amendment that was adopted June 15, 1790, nobody can be forced to become a Christian. God gives us free choice. And that is part of the foundation of this Nation and the freedoms. And the minute that a majority of this country think our freedoms come from a government, those freedoms are gone.

The Nation—at least a majority—must accept that our freedoms are a gift from God that should be protected by the government, and the minute a majority believes otherwise, then it is—as defendants used to say, after they were sentenced in my court, sometimes they would say: It is all over but the slow talking and the low walking.

And so it will be over for this Nation when a majority believes that freedom is something this government in Washington gives benevolently to us. Because once that belief is a majority belief, then the government giveth and the government taketh away.

□ 1445

What that government will find, as every government that has ever been instituted, whether king, dictator, emperor, Parliament, Congress, it ultimately will always find that when you do not know the basis, the foundation of the world, then your government will not last just a whole lot longer. That is why the Founders kept trying to make sure we understood this.

Alexis de Tocqueville, that my friend, Mr. ROTHFUS, referenced, who came over here to do a study of what was making America so special and great. This one is not often quoted, but it is a quote from 1835:

> There is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America, and there can be no greater proof of its utility and of its conformity to human nature than that its influence is powerfully felt over the most enlightened and free nation of the Earth.

There are so many quotes that are part of our history. Franklin Roosevelt, 1935, says:

> We cannot read the history of our rising development as a nation, without reckoning with the place the Bible has occupied in shaping the advances of the Republic. Where we have been the truest and most consistent in obeying its precepts, we have attained the greatest measure of contentment and prosperity.

It was the Ambassador to the U.N. from Lebanon, and later President of the U.N. of the General Assembly said this in 1958, ''Whoever tries to conceive the American word without taking full account of the suffering and love of salvation of Christ is only dreaming.

''I know how embarrassing this matter is to politicians, bureaucrats, businessmen and cynics, but whatever these honored men think, the irrefutable truth is that the soul of America is at its best and highest Christian.''

But you don't have to be a Christian. You can be an atheist, agnostic, Buddhist, Muslim, whatever you want to be, as long as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is foremost in your guiding principle here in this country.

But this administration has done what really would be unthinkable in any other administration. It basically has an undeclared—publicly undeclared war against Christianity. And it has

sown seeds around the world so that when I have met and wept with people, victims in Nigeria and around the world, they don't understand why America doesn't stand up against Christian genocide around the world and their suffering. Because when you look, the United States Government will litigate against the Little Sisters of the Poor, Mother Teresa, basically, and say: You have got to believe what we tell you to believe. You have got to practice the religious beliefs we tell you to believe. We don't care how moral and Christian and wonderful and humble and helpful you have been. We don't care. You are going to do what the new God of this country says, the five majority on the Supreme Court. That is the new God.

It is about marriage. It is about everything else. Until the five majority in the Supreme Court wake up and allow freedom of religion not to be prohibited, consistent with the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, then we have not a whole lot of time left as a free people.

As an Australian group told me, if something happens to the United States, forget trying to come to Australia. We are gone as soon as you are.

It is time we stand up and make sure religious freedom lives again completely free in America.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 719. An act to rename the Armed For Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2426. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 21, 2016, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4663. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additions to the Entity List [Docket No.: 160106014-6014-01] (RIN: 0694-AG82) received March 15, 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 Foreign Affairs.

4664. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 15 [Docket No.: 150302204-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE93) received March 16, 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 Natural Resources.

4665. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Information Required in Notices and Petitions Containing Interchange Commitments [Docket No.: EP 714] received March 15, 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. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4771. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4772. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to accept commercial flight plans for travel between the United States and Cuba until certain known fugitives are returned to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 4773. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to nullify the proposed rule regarding defining and delimiting the exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a full and complete economic analysis with improved economic data on small businesses, nonprofit employers, Medicare or Medicaid dependent health care providers, and small governmental jurisdictions, and all other employers, and minimize the impact on such employers, before promulgating any substantially similar rule, and to provide a rule of construction regarding the salary threshold exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4775. A bill to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 4776. A bill to establish a national program to identify landslide hazards and reduce loss from landslides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 4777. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 4778. A bill to direct the Comptroller General to submit to Congress a report on medical items and services being offered in the facilities of recipients of assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.) or of their affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 4779. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to prevent Federal prosecutions for certain conduct, relating to CBD oil, that is lawful under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 4780. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy for Department of Homeland Security operations abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 4781. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to make certain functions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation subject to appropriations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4782. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4783. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4784. A bill to increase competition in the pharmaceutical industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4785. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4786. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a pilot program for commercial recreation concessions on certain land managed by the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 4787. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to award competitive grants to institutions of higher education to combat lionfish in the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, through the Cooperative Science and Education Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 4788. A bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4789. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4790. A bill to promote innovative approaches to outdoor recreation on Federal land and to open up opportunities for collaboration with non-Federal partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. BRAT (for himself, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 4791. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require deposits into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account to be subject to appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4792. A bill to update the oil and gas and mining industry guides of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 4793. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land south of Lake Okeechobee, Florida, for the purpose of flood damage reduction and water storage, treatment, and conveyance purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rollovers between 529 programs and ABLE accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4796. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to specify a minimum number of days of parental leave available for a member of the Armed Forces in connection with the birth of a child of the member or in connection with the adoption or foster care of a child by the member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 4797. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to reduce lead in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 4798. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote family unity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4799. A bill to hold the salaries of Members of the House of Representatives in escrow if the House does not pass all of the regular appropriation bills for a fiscal year prior to the beginning of that fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4800. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a land exchange involving lands within the boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and title XVIII of the Social Security Act, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct audits of medical loss ratio reports submitted by health insurance issuers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 4802. A bill to require consideration of the impact on beneficiary access to care and to enhance due process protections in procedures for suspending payments to Medicaid providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 4803. A bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4804. A bill to provide for a task force within the FBI to deal with certain malicious and false threats in order made to obtain a response by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act to provide that information held by health care clearinghouses is subject to privacy protections that are equivalent to the protections that apply to information held by other types of covered entities under

the HIPAA Privacy Rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 4806. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate national primary drinking water regulations regarding lead and copper; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the same level of Federal matching assistance, regardless of date of such expansion, for every State that chooses to expand Medicaid coverage to newly eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require students who do not complete a program of study to repay Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 4809. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require the disclosure of political intelligence activities, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches regarding political intelligence contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4810. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to cooperate with Israel to develop directed energy capabilities to detect and defeat ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4811. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to coral reef ecosystems and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 4812. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to enter into an agreement with the Harriet Tubman Statue Commission of the State of Maryland for the acceptance of a statue of Harriet Tubman for display in a suitable location in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4814. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 by April 15, 2016; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 650. A resolution providing for the safety and security of the Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty/Hurriya in Iraq and awaiting resettlement by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and permitting use of their own assets to assist in their resettlement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H. Res. 651. A resolution condemning the recent violent terrorist attack against Taylor Force and the recent wave of terrorism against Israel and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas' failure to condemn such attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 652. A resolution recognizing the Nordic Heritage Museum in Seattle, Washington, as the National Nordic Museum of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

179. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 220, urging the President and Congress of the United States to explore and support policies that will lead to the establishment of facilities within the United States for the reprocessing and recycling of spent nuclear fuel; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4771.

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. PEARCE:

H.R. 4772.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4773.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4774.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4775.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4776.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 4777.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which reads: ''The Congress shall have power . . . To establish Post Offices and Post Roads''.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 4778.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 : ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 4779.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 4780.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4781.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 4782.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4783.

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

Article I, §8, cl. 2; Art. I, §8, cl. 7; Art. I, §8 cl 11; and Article I, §8, cl. 12.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4784.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4785.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4786.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause). Under this clause, Congress has

the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. By virtue of this enumerated power, Congress has governing authority over the lands, territories, or other property of the United States—and with this authority Congress is vested with the power to all owners in fee, the ability to sell, lease, dispose, exchange, convey, or simply preserve land. The Supreme Court has described this enumerated grant as one ''without limitation'' Kleppe v New Mexico, 426 U.S. 529, 542–543 (1976) (''And while the furthest reaches of the power granted by the Property Clause have not been definitely resolved, we have repeatedly observed that the power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitation.'') Historically, the the federal government transferred ownership of federal property to either private ownership or the states in order to pay off large Revolutionary War debts and to assist with the development of infrastructure.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 4787.

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

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4788.

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

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4789.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4790.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 4791.

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

American immigration law stems from Congress' power to ''establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization'' (Article I, Section 8, Clause 4) and to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations'' (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3). Only Congress has the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises'' (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1), and Article I, Section 9, Clause 1 states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law,'' explicitly requiring congressional authorization for funds to be spent. Furthermore, it is clearly both ''necessary and proper'' (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18) that Congress maintain control over funds through appropriations to ensure that the President ''take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed'' (Article II, Section 3).

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4792.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 4793.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 4794.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 4795.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4796.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4797.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4798.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4799.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4800.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4801.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4802.

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

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4803.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: the Commerce Clause

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4804.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 4805.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4806.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4807.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4808.

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

Article 1, Section 8:

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4809.

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

Sections 5 and 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4810.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKAI:

H.R. 4811.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 4812.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 4813.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4814.

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

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 169: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 228: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 230: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 605: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 664: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 670: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 704: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 729: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 879: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 969: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 971: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 986: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1025: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1170: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1178: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1218: Mr. KEATING, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1220: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1233: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1309: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1310: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1342: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1427: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1453: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1621: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1643: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1653: Mr. KILMER and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1655: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1660: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1714: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1736: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1769: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MICA, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1779: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1814: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1941: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1950: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1958: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2102: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2124: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2167: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2315: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2403: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2473: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2546: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2713: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2737: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2802: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2896: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2911: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 3074: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3084: Mr. REED and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3117: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3119: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3225: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3226: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3229: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 3591: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3640: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3691: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3706: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3790: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3808: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3817: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 3870: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3892: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4007: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4019: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4073: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4099: Mr. MARCHANT and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4113: Ms. NORTON and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 4167: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 4184: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4212: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4247: Mr. MICA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 4253: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4255: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4262: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 4263: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4277: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4294: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4323: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4336: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4352: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4386: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4389: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4442: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4479: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4480: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4488: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIND, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4497: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4499: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 4501: Mr. KILMER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4514: Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4529: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4534: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. REED, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4555: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4585: Ms. MENG, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4595: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4613: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 4614: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4636: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 4651: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 4653: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4683: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4703: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4730: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4731: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 4742: Ms. EDWARDS and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4754: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4760: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4764: Mr. WALKER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 4768: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 32: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 54: Mr. BOST and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 169: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H. Res. 432: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H. Res. 540: Ms. PELOSI and Ms. EDWARDS.
H. Res. 551: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 590: Mr. COLE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABRAHAM, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 591: Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 615: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 637: Ms. PELOSI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

52. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Directors of the Fleetwood Area School District, Fleetwood, PA, relative to supporting equitable funding for school districts in the Commonwealth; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.