United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2016 No. 58

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 18, 2016, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2016

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:

Gracious and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You bring forth blessings from just deeds. Listen to our prayers for the Members of this people's House. Give them the wisdom to meditate upon Your revelation, Your law. Help them find confidence in Your love, especially in times of difficulty.

May their efforts reflect the mindset and gracious manner revealed in Your loving commands, and may their work contain the depth of justice and the expansive embrace of human goodness that You reveal to Your people.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL 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.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the advocacy efforts of the McMahon/Ryan Child Advocacy Center, a wonderful and renowned central New York organization that is dedicated to ending child abuse through intervention and education. This month, McMahon/Ryan is launching its Go Blue 4 Kids campaign to help end child abuse.

Go Blue 4 Kids is a first-of-its-kind collaboration among five central New York healthcare leaders who are focused on raising awareness about child abuse prevention. In recognition of April being National Child Abuse Awareness Month, myself and hundreds of my constituents will be wearing blue, painting a blue pinwheel, or attending local events to raise awareness about child abuse prevention.

As a former Federal prosecutor, I am all too aware that much remains to be done if we are to guarantee a safe and happy upbringing for all American youths.

I ask my colleagues to join me and the 24th District of New York to join the Go Blue 4 Kids campaign. I commend McMahon/Ryan for the excellent work they do in our community, and I will continue to support their efforts to end child abuse.

CAMBODIAN GENOCIDE REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this week the Cambodian American community of Long Beach will observe Remembrance Day, commemorating 41 years since the end of the Cambodian genocide.

This horrific event, in which the Khmer Rouge killed approximately 1.7 million Cambodians from all walks of life, devastated Cambodia for years, depriving the country of a generation of its best and its brightest, and leaving a lifetime of trauma for Cambodians living in the United States and around the world.

I have introduced H. Res. 436, along with over a dozen of my colleagues, to ensure that we never forget the unspeakable horrors of the genocide and honor the memory of its many victims.

Today I ask my colleagues and people across this country to join us in coming together to remember the Cambodian genocide to commemorate the

Printed on recycled paper.

almost 2 million people who were killed.

TAX DAY

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in advance of tax day to address the U.S. Tax Code and its impact on our economy.

There is no escaping the fact that our Tax Code is written in a manner that is burdensome to individuals. It is complex and unruly. However, I want to speak briefly about the dire effects that it has on small businesses.

Over 28 million small businesses in this country are the true economic drivers. As the tax changes continue to plague small businesses, we have a major problem. Instead of concentrating on servicing their customers, growing their company, or creating jobs, they are overwhelmed with tax provision changes. This is a never-ending story.

When that small business in Nevada diverts efforts and resources to deal with tax compliance issues, they are not focusing on why they are in business. They need a Tax Code that is simpler, fairer, and flatter.

As the debate surrounding tax reform continues, let's make sure that our Tax Code doesn't impact job creation.

JACKIE ROBINSON DAY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is Jackie Robinson Day, declared such by Major League Baseball, but it should be declared such by the United States of America.

On April 15, 1947, Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier. For 80-some odd years, there were no African American players in the major leagues. Branch Rickey put Jackie Robinson on the Brooklyn Dodgers and baseball became integrated. It truly became America's national pastime.

Today, Major League Baseball players will all wear number 42, a number retired and allowed to be worn only on this day in honor of Jackie Robinson on the occasion of integrating Major League Baseball.

Jackie Robinson was a great American and a great athlete. He lettered in four sports at UCLA. He was a great major league player with the Brooklyn Dodgers and was honored by being inducted into the Hall of Fame.

Today there is a Jackie Robinson Foundation that gives young people scholarships to go to college and to do good deeds. He was very much interested in moving America forward in civil rights, and he did all he could.

I was fortunate to travel to Cuba with the President. I met his widow, Rachel, and his daughter, Sharon, who gave me a button—and this is a replica of it—designating April 15 as Jackie Robinson Day. I think we should all think about his contributions to America and what contributions we can make to America to make us a more perfect Union.

Thank you, Jackie Robinson.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF PORTER TOWNSHIP, CLINTON COUNTY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 175th anniversary of Porter Township, Clinton County, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, which was founded in 1841 and named for the current Governor at the time, David Porter.

The township was settled by Scotch Irish pioneers and was known in its early days for the Washington Iron Works, built in 1809 and operated until 1878.

Like so much of Clinton County, Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, and the Commonwealth as a whole, the township has been also dependent on the timber industry over its 175-year history. To this day, the timber industry remains vital, contributing an estimated $90 million per year to the county's economy.

At 175 years old, Porter County is older than 24 States. This is, indeed, a milestone to celebrate. The celebration begins this weekend, on Saturday, with an opening ceremony that will include guest speakers, a hymn sing, and an ice cream social. Further events are planned through the end of the year, including a 5K Color Walk/Run and tours of township farms.

Again, congratulations to the officials and residents of Porter Township on this huge milestone.

LET'S MOVE FORWARD AND PASS A BUDGET

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last year, Congress put aside political grandstanding and actually made some progress: a budget agreement that was supposed to be a framework for 2 years. It wasn't a perfect agreement, but it kept us from going off a cliff. It did some good for the folks we represent. It set aside much of the damaging across-the-board cuts and gave Federal agencies, businesses, and workers some certainty and predictability.

Congress simply passing a budget at this point is a bit like a dog playing the piano. The song may not sound perfect, but it is a dog playing the piano. Congress actually passed a budget.

But here we go again. As I stand here, we, once again, don't have an annual budget. I struggle to explain to my constituents how Congress is, once again, snatching defeat from the claws of victory and how this dysfunction remains the norm.

The solution here is simple. Let's stick to the compromise made just a few months ago. Let's stick with what a majority of the House and Senate actually backed just a few months ago. Let's avoid shutdowns and dysfunction and get to work on moving this economy and this Congress forward.

CONDITION OF THE GENERAL FARM ECONOMY

(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, this week the Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing—and will be holding more—on the condition of the general farm economy.

We see prices of commodities going down extremely from a high just a couple of years ago. Indeed, farm income is down approximately 56 percent, according to the USDA.

Steps need to be taken to ensure stability in the ag economy because it is a large part of the export market for us, and the stability of U.S. food prices and the economy in rural America rely on it.

We need to have the type of policy that helps keep business in America doing well. It isn't just devising policy here in Washington, D.C., but also not making a regulatory burden and causing the prices of inputs to continue to spiral upward as we watch farm prices at the gate go down.

We need to do much more to have a friendly atmosphere for business. That includes agriculture in this country. And we hope to come up with solutions as we put the spotlight on the Agriculture Committee in the coming weeks.

IMMIGRATION POPULATION SETS RECORDS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent study shows the immigrant population, both legal and illegal, has grown to record levels, now surpassing 15 percent in one-third of the States. And in six States—California, Florida, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, and Texas—the population of immigrants and their children is over 25 percent.

A report by the Center for Immigration Studies found that since 1970, the number of immigrants and their children has increased six times faster than the overall population. Congress needs to analyze these facts as it considers assimilation, cost of government services, and the impact immigration has on jobs and the economy.

America has the most generous immigration system in the world. However, our immigration policies must put the interests of American workers and taxpayers first.

NO RATE REGULATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2666.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 672 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2666.

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

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

From the first indication that the Federal Communications Commission intended to reclassify broadband Internet access service as a title II service subject to utility regulation, the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology has made it a priority to ensure that the FCC bureaucracy never has the authority to actually get in and micromanage and regulate rates.

The Internet is a model of innovation, flourishing under decades of light-touch or no-touch regulation. That is how it has flourished, Mr. Chairman.

□ 0915

In recent years, as the FCC has repeatedly attempted to regulate the management of Internet traffic, the potential reach of those regulations has grown, prompting concerns that the FCC would retreat to the world of rate regulation that typified the monopoly telephone era.

Unfortunately, these fears proved well-founded when the FCC announced in early 2015, Mr. Chairman, that it would reclassify the Internet as a utility-style service as part of the newest net neutrality rules—rules that are currently being challenged in the courts, I might add.

I would like to begin by addressing one of the most common attacks against this legislation, Mr. Chairman: that we are attempting to ''gut'' the FCC's authority to implement net neutrality rules. That simply is not the case.

We are supportive of clear, bright-line rules of the road for ISPs and the way they treat Internet traffic. We are for that. In fact, last year I released a discussion draft bill, along with Chairman UPTON and Senator THUNE, that would codify those very rules.

What we don't support is the use of outdated, ill-suited regulations to achieve those goals. This bill isn't intended to touch the net neutrality rules, and, in fact, an amendment I offered up in committee markup goes so far as to make an explicit exemption to ensure that the bill would not impact the FCC's work to ban paid prioritization. What this bill does is prohibit the FCC from regulating the amount charged to a consumer by an ISP for the provision of broadband service, a fact made clear by our definitions.

There is another objection, Mr. Chairman, we have heard repeatedly, and that is that the FCC had chosen to forbear from several of the provisions in title II and that the Chairman of the FCC had promised not to regulate rates anyway, so this bill is really unnecessary.

Again, this is simply not the case. The FCC did forbear from various sections of title II, but the authority to regulate rates through enforcement was and is still very much on the table. In addition, while Chairman Wheeler did promise before our subcommittee and multiple other committees of the Congress that he would not regulate rates, there was nothing to bind him or his successors to that commitment.

The need for the certainty of a statutory ban on rate regulation became even clearer just a few weeks ago when the bill's sponsor, Representative KINZINGER, actually asked the Chairman of the FCC, Chairman Wheeler, whether he believed the FCC should have the authority to regulate rates. Chairman Wheeler's response: ''Yes, sir.''

Given the philosophy of the Chairman himself, it is clearly more pressing than ever that this bill becomes law. The FCC cannot and should not be able to regulate the rates charged by ISPs to their customers. This sort of regulatory overhang clouds the decisionmaking of providers and dissuades them from offering innovative, pro-consumer pricing plans and service offerings, lest the Commission come back after the fact and penalize them.

Take T-Mobile's Binge On service as a prime example. Consumers are able to access video offered by any participant in the program without that data counting toward their monthly usage limits or charges. Edge providers win because their content is viewed more often. The service provider wins because they actually attract more customers. It is called the marketplace. It is innovation in the marketplace responding to what consumers want. Most importantly, consumers win because they are able to access the desired content with no cost or penalty.

Sounds pretty good, doesn't it?

Now, I am not here to advocate for one company over another, but this is called innovation in the marketplace. This is what entrepreneurship is all about. But, unfortunately, under the opaque rules of the FCC, T-Mobile had no way of knowing whether this sort of Binge On pricing scheme would violate the Commission's rules. They didn't know.

And while T-Mobile has taken this risk, many providers may now choose not to do so, ultimately depriving customers of choices they otherwise would have. You see, everybody is a little afraid, does this Chairman or the next Chairman come back, after the fact, and say: Well, you know, that is really not something we think is too dandy to do, so we are going to penalize you. It is called after-the-fact regulation.

So, as an unfortunate corollary to this chapter of Internet history, the same kind of flip-flop we are concerned we will see on rate regulation is exactly what we have seen with respect to Binge On. You see, Chairman Wheeler was ''okay with it'' until he decided maybe not.

As a former businessowner myself, I can tell you that you can't make business additions based on a hope and a prayer of your regulator. I was actually regulated by the FCC. I knew the rules. I followed them. They were clear. They were bright-line.

In an incredibly innovative marketplace, which the Internet thrives in, can you imagine having the lack of clarity and the ability to go back after the fact and, in effect, rate regulate? This will stifle competition, innovation, and consumer choice.

Finally, I would like to address charges that this bill would leave customers helpless to overcharge, or worse, by ISPs. We would all share that concern. We don't want that, and this bill provides protection.

The notion that the FCC, an agency that didn't have authority over Internet service providers' rates until last year—until last year—is the only line of defense between customers and fraud is, frankly, silly. It is a silly claim.

Customers have gotten along just fine without the aid of the FCC regulating rates; and this notion that the FCC is the only cop on the beat for consumers would come as a surprise—a real surprise—to many States attorneys general and consumer advocates

across the Nation. All those protections, and fraud, abuse still prevail out there.

This bill is a carefully tailored piece of legislation that is targeted at just one thing—one thing, Mr. Chairman—and that is unnecessary bureaucratic, Washington-based rate regulation. We used the most narrow definition, inserted rules of construction, and made specific exemptions to the prohibition, all in an attempt to address the concerns that were raised by the witnesses in our hearings that we held, Mr. Chairman, Members at markup and others who participated in the process.

We listened to all of those voices say: How do we make this right? How do we make it narrow? How do we get at just the issue here of a bureaucracy that wants to expand and grow and micromanage and rate regulate?

We sought to prevent unintended consequences, unlike the FCC, who crafted their rules to have the broadest and furthest reaching scope. Imagine that, Mr. Chairman, from a bureaucracy that writes rules, that they would write rules that are broadly written so they have more power for themselves. In fact, many of the changes we made to the bill at full committee markup were inspired by an amendment offered by Representative MATSUI of California. Drawing on her suggested changes, we amended the bill to be a more targeted draft.

We also considered amendments by multiple other Members of Congress but felt that they would not have resulted in the kind of prohibition that this situation narrowly calls for, one that clearly prohibits all flavors of ratemaking, not just before-the-fact tariffing where they say you can charge $7, that is it—that would be tariffing before the fact—but also after-the-fact regulation, where they come back, Mr. Chairman, and say: Oh, by the way, whatever you were charging, we have now kind of thought about that, and we think it was too much or too little or whatever.

While I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues across the aisle cannot support this bill, it wasn't for lack of trying. It wasn't for lack of a hearings process or taking many of their suggestions to heart and modifying our underlying text. I nonetheless, though, strongly believe that this legislation is an essential step in maintaining the robust and vibrant Internet ecosystem that drives our economy, powers innovations, and prompts and promotes new jobs and investment like no other service. The last thing we want to throw on there is the cold water of Washington bureaucracy after-the-fact regulation that will stifle competition and innovation that has so benefited consumers in this great Internet economy in which we find ourselves.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2666, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are debating a bill that the majority has titled the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act. It sounds terrific.

On the surface, this bill appears to do what Democrats and Republicans both support. We both support this. What we support is very clear: preventing the FCC from setting the monthly rate that customers pay for Internet access service. But in reality, this bill is about undermining the FCC's authority to protect consumers and ensure a free and open Internet for all.

I listened very carefully to the chairman, whom I respect, who is my friend, talking about innovation, talking about the effect that that has on so much that we do.

I represent the innovation capital of our country and the world, Silicon Valley, so I think that I understand something about innovation and the ingredients that make it work. As the ranking member of the subcommittee, I have made it very clear that I do not support setting rates for customers to pay on Internet access, nor do any of my Democratic colleagues on the committee.

In fact—and the chairman left this out. The chairman left this out. In fact, during the subcommittee and full committee markup of this bill, I offered an airtight, one-page amendment, right here—right here, one-page amendment—to codify that the FCC will permanently forbear from setting the rates that customers pay for Internet access. It is airtight. It is as clear as a bell, but it was rejected twice.

Now, why would the majority reject exactly what they say they are seeking? It is a good question. It is a rhetorical question, but it should be raised. I think it is because this bill is about more than the FCC setting the rates that customers pay for Internet access.

The FCC is the cop on the beat in the communications marketplace. That means the FCC has the responsibility to keep watch over the companies that provide our cell phone, cable, and Internet services to ensure that everyone is treated fairly.

I think, in the absence of the following, not one consumer organization in the country supports the bill that is on the floor because it is overly broad. The definition of rate regulation in this bill leaves the door open for courts to strike down the FCC's authority to protect consumers and act in the public interest if they interpret any of its actions as impacting broadband Internet rates. That is what this bill does. That is what we object to. We do not object to, essentially, what the title of the bill is, No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access.

These protections include prohibiting Internet service providers, ISPs, from capping the amount of data that customers can use; outlawing pay-for-privacy agreements where consumers have to pay fees to avoid having their data collected and sold to third parties; enforcing net neutrality rules against blocking Web sites; and reviewing mergers that increase consolidation and limit choice in the broadband Internet market.

As I said a moment ago, it is no wonder this bill is opposed by over 70 public interest groups, including the National Hispanic Media Coalition, the Consumer Federation of America, and the National Consumer Law Center. And the White House has said that it will veto the bill.

We could have come here with a very simple bill that essentially is what my amendment stated: no rate regulation. That is what the majority says that they are for, except the bill goes way beyond that.

I want to make it clear to my colleagues and to the American people that may be tuned in to this debate: This bill, in its broadness, is an attack on consumers and an attack on the FCC's net neutrality rules. Now, that is not a surprise because the majority has never supported that. And that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2666.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD three letters from consumer organizations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

APRIL 12, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: We understand that floor consideration of H.R. 2666, the ''No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act,'' is expected following a meeting of the House Committee on Rules this week.

The undersigned groups strongly urge you and your colleagues to vote against H.R. 2666, because it would block the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from fulfilling its essential consumer-protection responsibilities. This would be disastrous for all of the people and businesses in America that use the Internet. Simply, H.R. 2666 would prevent the FCC from doing its job to protect the American people.

H.R. 2666's overly broad definitions and undefined language would create extreme regulatory uncertainty. It would hamstring the FCC's ability to carry out its congressionally-mandated responsibilities. The impacts of this legislation are wide-ranging and difficult to fully enumerate, given the broad definitions of ''rates'' and ''regulation'' in the bill, which conflict with legal precedent. Yet several harmful impacts are readily apparent.

First, it is clear that the bill is yet another attempt to undermine the FCC's Open Internet Order and the principles of net neutrality. The Order ''expressly eschew[ed] the future use of prescriptive, industry-wide rate regulation'' and the FCC forbore from the legal authorities that enable it to set rates.

Although the FCC is not setting rates, stripping away its authority to review monopoly charges and other unjust and unreasonable business practices would harm everyone. It would especially harm the families and small businesses that rely on an affordable and open Internet to find jobs, do schoolwork, or reach consumers to compete in the 21st century global marketplace.

This legislation threatens the FCC's ability to enforce merger conditions that provide low-cost broadband to disadvantaged communities, harming low-income Americans who already have limited broadband access, and further widening the digital divide.

It would give a free ride to companies currently imposing punitive data caps and introducing zero-rating schemes, which the FCC has rightly questioned and continues to investigate. And despite the bill's imprecise references to interconnection and paid prioritization, it would leave open the very real possibility that these companies may try to extort and extract additional payments from websites and applications to reach their customers—even though the ability to download and upload the content of their choosing is exactly what broadband customers pay for.

By using the term interconnection in an undefined manner, H.R. 2666 also creates significant uncertainty about what, if anything, the FCC can do to protect the public from interconnection-related harms. Congestion at interconnection points—locations where the Internet's backbone infrastructure connects to last-mile providers such as Comcast and AT&T—has hurt consumers and online businesses in recent years, and this bill would leave the public vulnerable to those harms.

Lastly, the legislation would undermine the FCC's efforts to protect consumer privacy, including oversight of so-called ''pay-for-privacy'' plans that require customers to pay significant additional fees to their broadband provider to avoid having their online data collected and sold to third parties.

In sum, the broad definition of ''regulation'' in H.R. 2666 would make it difficult, if not impossible, for the FCC to review and then prohibit even clearly anti-competitive and anti-consumer actions by broadband companies. Under the bill, broadband providers could characterize any and every rule or determination the FCC makes as a ''rate regulation'' if it prevents these ISPs from charging abusive penalties or tolls.

Over four million Americans called for the FCC to protect an open Internet. It is time for members of Congress to stop sneak attacks that would allow big cable companies to break net neutrality rules without consequences. We strongly believe that the limited and inadequate exemptions in the current bill are neither credible nor sufficient. These limited exceptions for a small number of regulatory issues are not enough, as they simply create opportunities for companies to circumvent them.

Congress has made the FCC the guardian of the public interest. The Commission must be able to protect America's Internet users from unreasonable business practices.

It is unfortunate that the Energy & Commerce Committee Majority twice rejected proposed compromises that would have been harmonious with the FCC's decision not to set broadband rates, while ensuring the Commission still had the ability to protect consumers. Instead, this bill is little more than a wolf in sheep's clothing that would reduce the FCC's oversight abilities and strip away communications rights for hundreds of millions of Americans.

We respectfully urge you to vote against this bill to show your support for America's consumers and businesses that need the free and open Internet.

Sincerely,

18MillionRising.org, Alternate ROOTS, Arts & Democracy, Center for Media Justice (CMJ), Center for Rural Strategies, Cogent Communications, Inc., Color Of Change, Common Cause, Common Frequency, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Watchdog, Daily Kos, Demand Progress, Engine, Faithful Internet, Families for Freedom, Fight for the Future, Free Press Action Fund, FREE! Families Rally for Emancipation and Empowerment.

Future of Music Coalition, Generation Justice, Global Action Project (GAP.), Greenlining Institute, Human Rights Defense Center, Instituto de Educacion Popular del Sur de California (IDEPSCA), Line Break Media, Martinez Street Women's Center, Media Action Center, Media Mobilizing Project, National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients, National Hispanic Media Coalition (NHMC), New America's Open Technology Institute, Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, Open Access Connections, People's Press Project, PhillyCAM, Progressive Technology Project, Prometheus Radio Project, Public Knowledge.

School for Designing a Society, St. Paul Neighborhood Network (SPNN), TURN, United Church of Christ, OC Inc., Urbana-Champaign Independent Media Center, Voices for Racial Justice, Women Action Media, Working Films, Working Narratives, Writers Guild of America, West.

CONSUMER UNION,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND MADAM LEADER: Consumers Union, the policy and advocacy division of Consumer Reports, urges the House not to approve H.R. 2666, the ''No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.'' We believe this legislation is unnecessary, and we are concerned that it would undermine the Federal Communications Commission's net neutrality rule and other important responsibilities of the Commission in protecting consumers and competition in the broadband marketplace.

We share the concerns voiced during the bill's consideration in Committee, that ''rate'' and ''rate regulation'' could be interpreted to interfere on a broad scale with the Commission's authority to prevent all manner of discriminatory treatment simply because there is some direct or indirect price-related manifestation or effect. Indeed, the Committee states in its report that the term ''rates'' should ''be interpreted broadly, extending beyond a simple price to any provider-offered fee, rate level, rate structure, discount, incentive, or similar customer-facing proposal.'' We are concerned that, other than outright denial of service or interconnection, anticompetitive discrimination would most likely take the form of some kind of price differential—including data caps, throttling, anticompetitive subsidies, and paid prioritization, just to name some of the most obvious.

Moreover, there is no indication that the Commission has any intent to regulate rates for broadband service, now or in the future, or that it has seriously entertained the possibility of doing so. Indeed, the Open Internet Order explicitly disclaims such intent. This bill is a flawed and harmful solution to a non-existent and wholly theoretical problem.

The Open Internet Order is key to ensuring that the benefits of the Internet are widely available—that everyone has access to it on equal, nondiscriminatory terms. We hope the House will allow the Commission to appropriately enforce the Open Internet Order, without injecting new and unnecessary uncertainty into the scope of its authority. We urge that H.R. 2666 be defeated.

Respectfully,

GEORGE P. SLOVER,
SENIOR POLICY COUNSEL,
Consumers Union.

COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2016.

Re CCIA Letter on H.R. 2666—No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As you know, an open Internet has been a driving force of economic growth, innovation, and a key to American competitiveness. It is a crucial input for businesses large and small, and an essential component of the lives of everyday Americans for expression, education, and work.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act, threatens the FCC's ability to enforce sensible rules to ensure the Internet remains competitive and open. As you consider this legislation this week, I hope you will take into account the negative consequences this bill would have for consumers and businesses that rely on Internet access.

Despite the bill's title, H.R. 2666 goes far beyond rate regulation. A closer look will not just reveal the potential for higher costs to consumers and businesses, but also significant regulatory uncertainty. Of considerable concern are the bill's intentionally broad definitions. For example, the bill's definitions of ''regulation'' and ''regulate'' include the Commission's enforcement authority. This would prevent the Commission from pursuing its longstanding Congressional mandates of promoting competition and consumer protection. Without such authority, the FCC would not be able to review and prohibit anti-competitive actions that could hurt consumers and businesses.

During consideration by the Energy & Commerce Committee, Democratic Members sought to find common ground with amendments that would more clearly define what the bill seeks to prevent—ratemaking for broadband. However, these efforts were rejected on party-line votes. The bill's ambiguity remains a significant concern for businesses and will impair the FCC's obligation to ensure that basic rules of the road will protect the openness that has made the Internet so useful. I urge you to consider the effects on the open Internet and vote against H.R. 2666.

Sincerely,

ED BLACK,
President & CEO, Computer & Communications Industry Association.

□ 0930

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN). She is the vice chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee and a very important member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor today and stand in support of this bill. It is the right step.

The gentlewoman from California references the amendment that she had wanted, but her amendment was not exactly what that bill is.

What we are seeking to do is to encourage the FCC to make good on the promise that they have made. In March 2015, Chairman Wheeler was speaking at the Mobile World Congress in Barcelona.

He was talking about net neutrality and rules and regulations. He said:

This is not regulating the Internet. Regulating the Internet is rate regulation, which we don't do.

Whoops, they do. That is what they are trying to do.

Now, there is a difference in what the gentlewoman was seeking to do in committee, not have tariffs or regulation. But if they had gone ahead and done it, then we would have to get into a process of trying to undo. That is what people don't like. They don't like that kind of mess.

What they want is something very explicit. That is what Mr. KINZINGER's bill does. It very explicitly says: FCC, you cannot, you shall not, and you will not do rate regulation. It is not what the American people want to see. It is what the FCC has promised they will not do.

So what we are doing is helping a federal agency keep their word, keep their promise, and not get into rate regulation. Of course, we all know that what they would like to do is regulate the Internet so they can tax the Internet, so they can then come in and set all the rates, and so they can then come in and assign priority and value to content.

It is a commerce issue, it is a free speech issue, and it is an issue for the American people who want to make certain that the information service they have known, appreciated, and utilize every day in the virtual marketplace is not going to be regulated by a Federal Government agency.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I would note that the FCC chairman is not a Member of Congress. It is only Congress that can write a statute. The amendment that I offered codified—codified—that there would be no rate regulation of the Internet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from California, the ranking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a deceptively simple bill, H.R. 2666. The bill states that the FCC may not regulate rates for broadband Internet access service, but I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to not fall for this rhetoric and misinformation.

Just because this bill is short in length does not mean it is narrow in scope. It is designed to gut the FCC because, as experts have pointed out, the definitions in the bill for rate regulation could mean almost anything.

While the Republicans claim that they intend the bill to be narrow, we have heard over and over that their draft would swallow vast sections of the Communications Act. Most notably, this bill could undermine the FCC's ability to protect consumers.

Democrats repeatedly offered help to improve this bill. But make no mistake, there was not a negotiation. We offered suggestions, but were rebuffed time and again. In fact, we raised concerns from the beginning that the original bill failed to define rate regulation.

Then, at the eleventh hour, the Republicans provided their own take-it-or-leave-it definition with no Democratic input. This is not negotiating.

The result of this one-sided conversation is the definition of rate regulation that simply confirms our worst fears. The definition is so broad that it effectively would gut the agency.

Now, we have said repeatedly that we do not want the FCC to set rates. But we can't support a bill that undermines the FCC's core mission. We can't support a bill that prevents the agency from acting in the interest of the public.

We can't support a bill that prevents the agency from protecting consumers from discriminatory practices, and we certainly cannot support a bill that undercuts the FCC's net neutrality rules. The Republicans rebuffed all of our efforts to narrow H.R. 2666 so that consumers are not harmed.

If we are at all serious about passing a narrow bill, then accomplishing these goals would not be that hard. Our collective interests should be aligned. But that clearly is not the intent of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to cast a vote against H.R. 2666.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIR. The majority has 19 minutes remaining. The minority has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER). He is the author of this legislation and is a very serious member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology and a great patriot for this country.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee, and I thank the other side of the aisle. Even though this is something that we are going to put through and we would love to have a lot more support from the other side of the aisle, we do appreciate the working relationship.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that this is, in my mind, very simple. When the FCC, in essence, chose to reclassify broadband Internet access service as a common carrier, that gave them the classification and the ability to regulate rates of private companies.

Understanding this, it was the concern, as we looked around, that we want to make sure that the FCC does not have the power to regulate the rates charged for Internet access.

If you look back in the history of this country and, really, what technology and what the Internet has been able to do for jobs, for economic growth, and for everything along that line, it has all been because it is free of government regulation. So let's just put this into law, that the FCC shouldn't have the authority.

In a couple of hearings, Chairman Wheeler, the chairman of the FCC, was asked: Do you believe you should have the right or the ability to regulate the rates charged for Internet, for broadband access?

He said: No. I forbear that.

In fact, I asked the chairman: What if we put into law a simple statement that said that the FCC shouldn't have that authority?

Amen, basically, is what he said.

Now, over the next year, we have run into some more issues. All of a sudden 3 weeks ago I asked the chairman the same question again, and he admits that, actually, the FCC should have the ability to regulate broadband Internet access.

This is Congress simply doing its job. Congress' job is to determine what authority the FCC should and should not have. That is what we were invented for. That is what we were created for, to determine those laws and those rules.

All we are doing is taking back a little bit of power from the FCC and saying: Look, let's keep the Internet free market. Let's keep broadband free market.

Congress is going to have its say in this. I hope the other side of the aisle and my colleagues join me in supporting this measure.

It is the right thing for our country, and it is a great first step in preserving the Internet as free for future generations.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH). He is an outstanding member of the committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I said on Wednesday during debate on the rule, the bill before us today is a vague solution in search of a nonexistent problem.

While we all share concerns about the idea of broadband Internet rate regulation, Chairman Wheeler has made it absolutely clear that the FCC will not seek to regulate those rates.

But since this bill is before the House anyway, I thought I would offer an amendment that would address an actual problem that can be fixed by the FCC.

Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 requires broadcasters to disclose the true identity of political advertising sponsors.

The FCC currently relies on an outdated 1979 staff interpretation of the law that does not account for the dramatic changes that have taken place in our campaign system over the last 6 years, including the Citizens United and McCutcheon decisions. The rule

makes sense. The American people ought to know who is actually trying to influence their votes.

Unfortunately, sponsors in today's world don't indicate who is actually paying for the ad. No. We get sponsors like Americans for Kittens and Puppies. That is not very helpful in disclosing to the American people who is trying to influence them.

It would be, for instance, if somebody ran an ad promoting sugared soft drinks and, instead of Coca-Cola or Pepsi being the actual people paying for the ad, you would have the advertising agency: This ad is sponsored by Ogilvy & Mather or McCann Erickson. That is not very helpful to the American people.

So this has resulted in a major loophole in which special interests and wealthy donors can anonymously spend limitless amounts of money to influence the outcomes of our elections. That is not what Congress intended.

Despite having the authority to do so, the FCC has refused to take action to close this loophole. My amendment, by restating the original constitutional intent, would have sent a message to the FCC that it is time to act.

We all know how much secret money has flooded our politics, weakened accountability in government, and made it harder for voters to develop a true opinion of the individuals they will send to Congress to represent them.

My amendment would have helped to change that and, hopefully, would have begun to restore a minimum level of honesty in our electoral system.

The amendment was germane within the rules of this body, and the solution it provided was well within the authority of the FCC.

Most importantly, an overwhelming majority of Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—want us to do this. They want us to reform and fix our broken campaign finance system.

Unfortunately, Republicans on the Rules Committee voted against the interests of a majority of Americans and blocked my amendment from coming to the floor.

While they killed my amendment, I am glad the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. LUJÁN, will be up for consideration today.

It will give us a chance to debate the lack of disclosure and transparency in campaign ads. Unlike the underlying bill, it offers a specific solution to a real problem.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), another terrific member of our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of Mr. KINZINGER's bill.

The Internet has dramatically changed the global economy and how every one of us lives daily life. It is the great equalizer, providing an open platform to boost innovation and job creation, expand expression and free speech, as much as any invention in history.

But some unelected officials here in Washington are eager to regulate it, and some in office across the country are eager to tax it. We must prevent both.

The prosperity and opportunity we have come to know from the Internet will be compromised if Internet access becomes another victim of an overweening governmental agency.

The apps on your mobile phone and for your online accounts, your social sphere and your personal and professional information come not from the permission of unelected officials, but from the work of innovators who have invented this 21st century technology.

They must remain empowered to continue their innovation. We cannot allow the government a foothold for Internet control.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2666.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a wonderful and important member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my ranking member on the Communications and Technology Subcommittee and the chair of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

There are two questions here. First is net neutrality. One of the biggest decisions that the FCC made was to protect net neutrality.

Before they issued their order, they had literally millions of comments from people all across this country, in your district and in mine, urging that net neutrality be maintained and preserved. The chairman and the FCC did that with their order.

Now, that has raised some questions as to whether the assertion of FCC authority is going to result in micromanaging through regulation, and that would be a legitimate concern if it were a concern.

But the chairman has made it extremely clear that he has no intention whatsoever of doing any kind of rate regulation under title II. He is not going to do it. It hasn't been done.

So this bill, which is going to ''prohibit rate regulation'' has some significant and potentially very dangerous consequences for two things, net neutrality and protection of consumers.

We need an FCC that is going to be there to protect consumers against some potentially bad practices, like cramming or overbilling, things that traditionally the FCC has done as the agency that is protecting consumers against bad practices.

□ 0945

The reason why many experts believe that this bill would result in that happening is because there is no definition of rate regulation. There is none. The burden on legislators, when we propose something, is to be clear and specific as to what it is that is being proposed. There is no definition whatsoever in this bill about rate regulation. This bill is founded on an apprehension that something bad will happen, but it gives an undefined answer to prevent an undefined event from happening. So the effect here is that you have a bill that is playing on the fear of the unknown.

My preference would be for us to not pass this bill, not endanger the authority of the FCC to take steps that help consumers in your district and in my district, and to focus where we should be focusing, in my view, on steps that we can take to improve broadband access in speeds, particularly for rural areas, rural Vermonters. There is a common goal that we have in our committee to try to get the broadband out and deployed at higher speeds in all of our areas, particularly the rural areas that are in jeopardy.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out for the RECORD that on page 4 of the bill, H.R. 2666, on line 7, there is a definition of broadband Internet access service. We also have the definition of rate; we have the definition of regulation all spelled out in the bill. And very specific to the issue of cramming and illegal actions on truth-in-billing and all, those are also called for in the bill.

He may be looking at an old draft of the bill or something, but it is not the legislation before us. We do define what rate regulation is. We do make sure that the FCC continues to enforce subpart Y, part 64, title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, relating to truth-in-billing requirements. That is lines 18 through 20 of the bill. So those things actually were addressed in the legislation that is now before the House.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, it actually was great to follow my colleague from Vermont, who is a thoughtful individual, who always raises good questions, who really is open to debate, and he stumbles onto the truth in this.

This does have an issue of net neutrality. Our problem has always been, we now have a Federal agency imposing what there was no need or desire, by many of us, to fix. So now we are trying to make sure that this Federal agency doesn't kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

There is a fear. He was correct in also saying there was a fear.

So how do you ease that fear?

You enshrine into law the promises made by the administration and by the Chairman of the FCC. You take away the fear. It is not like, well, maybe this is what he said, but maybe he will do

this. Just codify it. Then we know what the law is. Then everyone who brings it into litigation can say, well, here is the black and white law. Of course, we also have trouble with the courts. We would hope that the courts would read the black and white language of the law and then rule that way.

All we are trying to do is trust, but verify. What we see is that the net neutrality debate was a fix seeking a problem, which there was no problem. No one can stand on our side today and say we have not advanced greatly by this new technological age and that we need more government to help cause it to flourish more.

We are afraid of a Federal agency. We are afraid that the FCC has gone too far. We need to enshrine this into law. Everybody knows the ground rules. That is all my colleague, Mr. KINZINGER, is trying to do.

I would ask my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, may I get an update on the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), who has an incredible background in rate regulation and the commission there and is a terrific member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chair, as the chairman said, I served nearly 10 years as a title II rate regulator on the North Dakota Public Service Commission, and I know what title II rate regulation looks like. The Internet is not an appropriate vehicle or medium for this type of regulation. The Internet is not a monopoly railroad, the Internet is not a monopoly telephone company, it is not a monopoly electric or gas utility. The Internet is a dynamic, competitive innovator. Even the threat of this type of regulation stifles that innovation, and we do not want that to happen.

I want to address the amendment that was referred to by the ranking member of the subcommittee, who I have great respect for. She referred to the term ''permanent forbearance.'' That is a contradiction in terms. Forbearance is, by definition, temporary. He who has the authority to forebear has the authority to unforebear. That is exactly what her amendment did. That is why it was not adequate to this bill.

This legislation simply codifies that which the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission promised: to not regulate rates. If they promised to do it, God bless them. But we don't know that the next Chairman and the next President will live up to that promise. This law ensures that that promise is kept by codifying it.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the biggest goal of the innovation initiative is to bring government into the modern age, making the policies that come out of Washington reflect and adapt to the world today.

What has shaped our world more in the 21st century than the Internet?

Education, commerce, communication, information. Everything in our lives has changed because of the Internet.

How did the Internet become something so important, so useful, and so widespread?

Government left it alone. It expanded to reach and help billions because bureaucrats weren't allowed to micromanage it.

I remember hearing this from AOL founder Steve Case. It was back in 1985. He said only 3 percent of people were online for an average of just 1 hour a week. Today, the Internet has reached about 40 percent of the world. That is an amazing growth.

Unfortunately, the freedom that led to this amazing success is at risk. Right now, it is an open question whether the FCC can regulate Internet rates. Congress needs to clarify that it has no authority to do so.

If the FCC were to regulate rates, it could harm every American across the country that has a Wi-Fi connection by imposing artificial restraints on their plans and service options, it would stop needed investment in expanding and improving the Internet, and it would block innovation that we depend on to create better and faster Internet. Regulating rates means its bureaucrats think that they can manage the Internet better than the private sector, which has already brought fast and affordable connections to millions across the country.

I know the FCC and President Obama promised they wouldn't regulate broadband Internet rates from their offices in Washington, and that is a good thing. But that doesn't mean I am not concerned. I don't know about you, Mr. Chair, but after 7 years of broken promises, I have a hard time trusting this administration will follow through.

So today we are voting to hold the administration to its word. They promised not to regulate rates. This legislation bars the FCC from regulating rates. It is as simple as that. I can't imagine why anyone would object.

I want to thank Congressman KINZINGER for his work on this legislation, holding the FCC and the Obama administration accountable.

The innovation initiative is all about giving the American people the freedom to grow and prosper. With this, the Internet stays a little freer, executive overreach is held back, and we leave space for the people to innovate without the Federal Government trying to control it all.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LONG), another distinguished member of our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, you don't need a Ph.D. from MIT to understand what is going on here. Despite President Obama and Federal Communications Commission Chairman Wheeler's past promises not to regulate the retail rates of Internet service providers, the Chairman announced last week that the FCC will start a new regulatory framework for the evolving business data market, and told other House Energy and Commerce Committee members and me last month that the FCC should have the authority to regulate broadband rates.

Today, services provided over modern high-speed broadband facilities to customers are unregulated. It is a vibrant market where broadband companies compete vigorously for customers.

If the administration gets in their way, the FCC will reverse course, price regulate business services, and create disincentives for further investment and deployment of high-speed fiber networks throughout the Nation. These burdens would harm investments, stifle innovation, and cost tens of thousands of jobs.

Mr. Chair, our economy and American workers cannot afford this impact. I urge my colleagues to join me and support this crucial bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), another member of the Republican leadership, who is also a really important member of our committee and subcommittee.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank Chairman WALDEN, and I want to thank my colleague, Congressman KINZINGER, for his leadership on bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, what we are trying to do here is to continue to allow the great innovation that we have seen from the technology industry. It has happened not because government has sat there and regulated every aspect of what they do. It is because government, frankly, hasn't figured out how to regulate them because the industry moves so fast. I think that has been a good thing.

It has shown that if you allow an industry to go out there and invest private money in creating great new technologies, great new products, and you look at the development and deployment of broadband, it is literally changing people's lives for the good. It

has allowed America to be such a great technological leader.

But then when you see the threat of the FCC setting rates, regulating broadband, it will send a chilling effect that will not only kill that investment and slow down the ability and the growth that we have seen that has been so revolutionary in this country, but it will kill jobs in this country.

We need to stop the threat of the FCC being able to set rates in a way that can slow down that growth. We have seen such tremendous growth in the technology industry by the government not being in this arena. What Congressman KINZINGER is doing with this bill protects taxpayers and protects the growth and innovation that we need in this country.

I urge adoption of the bill.

□ 1000

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), another great member of our committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act, which will prohibit the FCC from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service.

This bill will help prevent further FCC overreach, save tens of thousands of jobs, keep rates affordable for consumers, and provide certainty for the future of broadband regulation.

For the last year and a half, the FCC has insisted it would not regulate broadband Internet rates. That changed last month when Chairman Wheeler reversed course and contradicted all previous testimony on the FCC's intent to regulate rates.

Many of our local businesses and organizations would suffer from further FCC overreach. Many already suffer from the uncertainty and vague new legal standards that have been imposed by the FCC. Regulating rates before and even after they are issued would further infuse the worst government meddling into a market that should remain nimble and competitive.

I thank Congressman KINZINGER for his excellent and timely work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2666.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a gentleman who cares deeply about this issue.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 2666.

In 2015, the FCC reclassified Internet service providers as title II common carriers, giving themselves the ability to regulate Internet rates and user privacy. The administration has promised that this new agency power will not be used to regulate broadband rates; however, FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler has admitted that the FCC should have the authority to do so. This regulatory uncertainty is why this bill is needed.

H.R. 2666 would prohibit the FCC from regulating rates charged for broadband Internet access and would hold the administration to the promise it made to American consumers. Preventing government interference with broadband retail rates would give smaller providers greater confidence when making investments, particularly those that would increase Internet access in rural and small communities.

I urge my colleagues to help prevent the government micromanagement of Internet access by supporting H.R. 2666.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), an important member of the committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. I thank our ranking member, Ms. ESHOO, and the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act, which would prohibit the FCC from regulating rates for broadband Internet access.

I agree with the premise behind the bill. The Commission should not be setting rates for broadband access. In fact, we have heard from FCC Chairman Wheeler. He has stated several times that he does not intend to set rates.

Like millions of Americans who made their voices heard last year, I support a free and open Internet. I do not believe the FCC needs to get into the business of regulating consumer broadband rates. H.R. 2666, however, is overbroad and far-reaching. The unintended consequences of the bill before us would undermine important consumer protections and would threaten a free and open Internet.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill before us today.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The gentleman from Oregon has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the chairman for his work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

The bill does just that—prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from unnecessarily regulating broadband rates. This legislation ensures that not only the current Commission but future Commissions will not have the option to regulate broadband Internet rates, which will protect the free market, encourage competition, and promote jobs; and that is what we need to be all about.

Plain and simple, unelected Washington bureaucrats at the FCC have set out with another solution in search of a problem. By shifting the classification of broadband Internet to be a title II common carrier, the FCC is, simply, reclassifying broadband Internet to fall under their rulemaking purview.

This is nothing more than another power grab by the administration to regulate and control yet another industry. It is estimated that, if rules regulating broadband services are carried out, it could cost over 43,000 jobs, and I think we can all agree that it is not time to gamble with American jobs. When bureaucrats in Washington play the regulation game, no one wins.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2666, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting discussion on the floor this morning. For people who are tuned in, I think that I want to stay away from Federal talk, telecommunications talk, governmentese.

What this debate is all about is the Internet. There is a clear difference between how the Democrats view the Internet and how to protect its openness and its accessibility, and that rests in net neutrality—not a very sexy term. What it means is that no ISP can get in the way of the consumer. All you have to do is look in your purse or in your pocket. What you take out and the content that you view and whatever the Internet carries, no company can get in the way of that—to chop it up, to slow it down, to speed it up, to charge more.

Now, our Republican colleagues have fought mightily, and I salute them with their mightily launched campaign in that they don't believe in that, and that is really what is underneath this. They talk about Federal bureaucracies. They don't like that. They talk about bureaucrats. They don't like them. They talk about the President. They don't like him.

What is at the heart of all of this is that we believe in that open, accessible Internet. We do not believe that the executive branch—in this case, the FCC—should be able to regulate broadband rates. We have said so. We have said so time and again.

The gentleman from North Dakota objected to my amendment. He said that it was an oxymoron. Our amendment codified. No one else codified. We offered codification in the law that not only this FCC Commission but all future Commissions—all future Chairmen—could not exact rate regulation. I don't know what needs to be done in order to get to ''yes'' around here, and it is curious to me that all of the speakers on the other side never referenced what we put on the table—that there is agreement.

Really, this bill goes beyond that, and that is what we object to. There is

not one consumer organization in our country that supports what the majority is doing. We stand with consumers. They need a cop on the beat—we don't need the rate regulation of broadband by the FCC—just the way other agencies are supposed to look after the best interests of the American people. In fact, in the Communications Act, the public interest is stated over 100 times. We believe in that. The majority has gone too far with this bill. It can hurt small businesses, and it will hurt consumers. That is where we draw the line.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2666. It goes too far. We were willing to meet and join hands and have something sail through the House—and I think it would have in the other body as well—and that is that there be no rate regulation of broadband Internet. I don't know. Maybe the majority was shocked that we agreed with their talking point. We are serious about it. We offered a solution to it that was rejected not once but twice. Very disappointing. For all of these reasons and with what my colleagues stated on this side in the magnificent statements that they made, I urge the House to reject this legislation because it goes well beyond its stated intent.

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

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

I do appreciate the comments by my friend, and I consider her a good friend. We have worked together on a lot of issues successfully and have found common ground time and time again. Then there are days like today when we just see things differently and, perhaps, read them differently. That is what democracy is, after all, all about: competing ideas that come to an open marketplace where we can have an up-or-down vote by the people's Representatives.

Let me talk about a couple of things, Mr. Chair.

First of all, there is the issue of net neutrality, itself. As my friend from California knows, I put together a draft bill in January of 2015—nearly a year and a half ago now. That bill read: no blocking, no paid prioritization, no throttling, and it required transparency, which are the core principles of an open Internet order. My colleagues on this side of the aisle are for all of those things. The door remains open for Democrats to join us in sponsoring that legislation. We looked forward to that, hopefully, in going forward, but we couldn't reach agreement on those very clear positions.

My colleague said, Gee, they are for not having the Federal Communications Commission regulate rates for broadband Internet access service. I think that is an accurate description of what the gentlewoman said she was for. Let me go to page 3 of the bill and just, simply, read from line 6, section 2: ''Regulation of broadband rates prohibited.'' Line 7: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Communications Commission may not regulate the rates charged for broadband Internet access service.'' That is what this bill does.

Now, here is where people may get a little confused because, on the one hand, we say no tariffing. That means no setting of the rates ahead of time. We agree that that is a bad idea. You have heard that from both sides of the aisle here. Yet, you see, the door that remains cracked open is the one they refuse to close; so the chilling winter air of regulatory overreach blows through that crack in the door because, if you don't close the ability of the agency to come in after the fact and say ''what you did on your rates we no longer think is correct,'' then you have after-the-fact rate regulation, which is even more uncertain than up-front tariffing, than an up-front setting of the rates. It is with this that we find ourselves in disagreement with my friends across the aisle. You see, they are willing to say no tariffing in advance, but they are not willing to close the door that allows the chilly air that will freeze out innovation—a post-action regulation—from occurring.

Having been in small business for 20-plus years earlier in my life and in the radio business, I know what regulation is. I know how to follow them. I know what a public file is. I actually kept them and did all of these things in our little radio station; but I cannot imagine if, after the fact, my regulator could come back and say: Do you know those ads you sold to the local car dealer? Even though they were printed on your rate card and they were publicly disclosed and all of that, we think, maybe, that was a little too high.

□ 1015

So you have to go back and you have to change things. There is no definition of how far back they could go. Could they go back 6 months? A year? 2 years? 10 years? I don't know.

See, I guess you get to the point that the Internet thrives today in an environment where it was never regulated. That is what really made it go off the charts, is the innovators in Silicon Valley and I daresay in my district, in Oregon, and elsewhere, all over the world literally. There is no central-only point of innovation when it comes to the Internet and technology. It is global.

The economy has flourished globally and has done all that without three Commissioners—or two Commissioners and one Chairman, three people in America deciding what you can and can't do.

You have got to go: Mama, can I? Daddy, can I? Can I after the fact? Is it going to be okay? This is the new environment when you treat the Internet like an old, black, dial-up phone.

Fundamentally, that is what Chairman Wheeler decided to do with pressure from the White House. They lost their independence as an agency when they went down this path to say that the Internet is now like an old phone line. Or, as you heard the former member of the Public Utility Commission from North Dakota, my friend, Mr. CRAMER, who was in the rate regulation business, say, the Internet, it is not appropriate to regulate it as an old common carrier, an old railroad system that is a monopoly because the Internet is not a monopoly. We want innovation for consumers. We want the competition in the marketplace that we know drives down prices.

When you have three people in America wanting to set the rates after the fact, which is what would happen in the FCC with a partisan Commission, as it is constructed today, they get to make the call, not consumers who say: you know, I kind of like that Binge On thing. That is new and innovative.

And the Chairman will say: Well, yeah. We let that go. We think that is okay. That is the point. The Chairman got to say: We think that is okay.

Prior to title II regulation, the chairman didn't have a say in that. The marketplace did. The consumers could go: I don't like that, so I am going to that carrier. Some other carrier can say: I don't like what they're doing, and I am going to offer you this.

Now all that is going to get second-guessed by a government that is too big and is too much in our lives, and that is only going to get more regulatory in its scope and scheme.

Finally, let me just restate the argument raised earlier that somehow consumers could be hurt by truth-in-billing fraud or paid prioritization. We specifically addressed those in the bill that came to the floor.

We listened to our colleagues. We listened to those who testified. We made changes in the bill. We didn't do everything that everybody wanted because this is a compromise process.

It is a good piece of legislation that protects consumers, encourages innovation, and does what our constituents want us to do: draw clear statutory lines that agencies have to follow, not devolve all authority to them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 2666.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2666

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF BROADBAND RATES PROHIBITED.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Communications Commission may not regulate the rates charged for broadband Internet access service.

SEC. 3. EXCEPTIONS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission to—

(1) condition receipt of universal service support under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) by a provider of broadband Internet access service on the regulation of the rates charged by such provider for the supported service;

(2) enforce subpart Y of part 64 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to truth-in-billing requirements); or

(3) enforce section 8.9 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to paid prioritization).

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of this Act, broadband Internet access service shall not be construed to include data roaming or interconnection.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term ''broadband Internet access service'' has the meaning given such term in the rules adopted in the Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order that was adopted by the Commission on February 26, 2015 (FCC 15–24).

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) RATE.—The term ''rate'' means the amount charged by a provider of broadband Internet access service for the delivery of broadband Internet traffic.

(4) REGULATION.—The term ''regulation'' or ''regulate'' means, with respect to a rate, the use by the Commission of rulemaking or enforcement authority to establish, declare, or review the reasonableness of such rate.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–490. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–490.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 20, strike ''; or'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 22, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:

(4) promulgate regulations that require a television broadcast station, AM or FM radio broadcast station, cable operator, direct broadcast satellite service provider, or satellite digital audio radio service provider, to the extent such station, operator, or provider is required to make material in its public inspection file available on, or upload such material to, an Internet website, to make such material available or upload such material in a format that is machine-readable, such that the format supports the automated searching for particular text within and among documents, the bulk downloading of data contained in such material, the aggregation, manipulation, sorting, and analysis of the data contained in such material, and such other functionality as the Commission considers appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 672, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will make it easier for the American people to figure out who is trying to influence their vote through campaign ads.

Right now, when someone is placing a political commercial on the air, the TV station is required to upload to the FCC public site information that identifies the name of the ad's sponsor, the duration of the ad, and the cost of the ad. But the FCC's site is cumbersome, slow, and impossible to search, which defeats the purpose of this requirement.

This amendment clarifies that nothing in the underlying bill will prevent the FCC from requiring those entities that must submit a public inspection file to do so in a machine-readable format, which would guarantee that it is easily sortable, searchable, and downloadable.

Adopting the Luján amendment will send a message to the FCC that there is strong congressional support for making this information more accessible so that the American people have at least a chance to figure out who is trying to influence our elections.

Furthermore, this amendment would fix a real-world problem, unlike the underlying bill, which is a vague solution in search of a nonexistent problem.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment states that nothing in the bill shall affect the FCC's authority to require that TV and radio stations and video and audio satellite providers make their public inspection files available online or in a machine-readable format.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the radio business for 21 years. I would guess I am probably one of the few, if only, people who have actually had to maintain a public file.

I don't know if the gentleman knows all the things that are in those public files. I would be happy to go through the very long list of them.

I don't think the way the amendment is constructed is perhaps what he is seeking. I understand the part about public disclosure of time purchase, who is purchasing it, and all of that.

But the public file includes all FCC authorizations, applications and related materials, contour maps, ownership reports and related materials, portions of Equal Employment Opportunity file, the public and broadcasting manual itself, children's television programming reports, DTV transition education reports, citizen agreements, then the political file, letters and emails from the public, material relating to FCC investigations and complaints, issues/program lists, donor lists for noncommercials educational channels, records concerning children's programming commercial limits, local public notice certifications and announcements, time brokerage agreements, must-carry or retransmission consents elections, joint sales agreements, and it goes on and on.

Ours was a full drawer. We were just a little AM and FM radio station, and it was a full drawer in a filing cabinet.

By the way, if you didn't have each file in the proper order, you could be fined. You had to have the political catechism in there. You had to have all these things.

I understand what the gentleman is going for, and I am for disclosure. We had to do it. We did it. People came and looked at the file. It was all open and transparent, and now it does have to be online already.

I just think this is an inappropriate place to go down this other path, when we are dealing with rate regulation of the Internet. I realize the gentleman cares passionately about the political disclosure issue, but I would just argue, Mr. Chair, that this is the wrong place.

I think the amendment is clumsily worded in terms of the scope and magnitude that would occur in terms of making all this machine-readable. Because I am thinking about a little AM radio station out there that is barely keeping the doors open, and we are going to tell them they have got to have their contour maps machine-readable? I don't even know how to do that. I know some programs like Adobe you can click, and some you can't. I don't know. It is a pretty big new requirement on these stations.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Luján, Pallone, Yarmuth, and Clarke amendment.

This commonsense amendment would ensure that the FCC can easily determine who is paying for political ads. More specifically, this amendment would guarantee that nothing in this bill would prevent the FCC from requiring that TV broadcast stations, AM and FM radio broadcast stations, cable operators, direct broadcast satellite service providers, or satellite digital audio radio service providers

upload the public inspection file in the format that is machine-readable.

Unfortunately, there is a large amount of unlimited money moving through our electoral system. This amendment gives all voters the peace of mind of knowing our elections are fair and transparent.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

First, in response to Chairman WALDEN—and I know that he shares my interest in creating effective disclosure of campaign contributions and ads—this amendment does not mandate any particular form of machine-readable information. It only says that the Commission is not prohibited from requiring that certain parts of information are readable in machine format.

I want to read a few quotes on disclosure:

''Disclosure requirements deter actual corruption and avoid the appearance of corruption by exposing large contributions and expenditures to the light of publicity.''

''With modern technology, disclosure now offers a particularly effective means of arming the voting public with information.''

''Today, given the Internet, disclosure offers much more robust protections against corruption.''

''Because massive quantities of information can be accessed at the click of a mouse, disclosure is effective to a degree not possible at the time Buckley, or even McConnell, was decided.''

All of the quotes are from the majority opinion in McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission, written by Chief Justice Roberts.

Now, I don't agree with the decision, but I sure do agree with his position that disclosure is critical to the integrity of our electoral system in the wake of this decision.

I believe that adopting the commonsense Lujan amendment shows that Congress values transparency in government and will help restore a level of trust with the public.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise for my closing statement to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Again, I think it is overly broad. Beyond that, the gentleman from Kentucky kind of hit it on the head when he said that this doesn't require the FCC to do anything in terms of the machine-readable technology and all. Because, in theory, in reality, the way it is written, it basically says: nothing in this bill prevents them from doing something, by the way, which they can already do.

The whole point, though, is this has nothing to do with the issue at hand in the legislation. Our constituents really believe we should take one issue at a time.

The issue here is about controlling a bureaucracy from doing something it has never had the power to do before: giving clarity in the marketplace, that they cannot regulate the rates of Internet service providers, which, in effect, has the ability of regulating innovation in new offerings for consumers.

So I must oppose this amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–490.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 20, strike ''; or'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 22, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:

(4) act in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 672, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2666. This amendment would help to rein in some of the unintended consequences of the bill by preserving the FCC's authority to act in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The public interest is a key principle that the Commission has used to protect consumers since Congress first created the agency in 1934, and it is just as important today.

The FCC has consistently looked to the public interest standard when taking action to protect consumers, foster innovation, and increase competition.

The standard has been a hallmark of many of the most important policies of the Commission. To give you a sense, the words ''public interest'' appear over 100 times in the Communications Act. That is 100 times. That is how pervasive it is.

Even with the amended version of the bill that was reported out of committee, serious concerns remain that the bill is going to have far-reaching and unintended consequences.

For example, it could be that the Commission would no longer be able to investigate data caps, pay for privacy practices.

The Commission could also lose further protections for various types of unfair and discriminatory practices that affect how much they pay for broadband.

My amendment would seek to limit some of those unintended consequences by ensuring that the Commission continues to have the authority that has historically served it so well.

Moreover, by preserving the FCC's authority to act in the public interest, my amendment would safeguard the broad aims that the Communication Act embodies.

□ 1030

This amendment would continue to appropriately focus the FCC toward promoting the public good. I urge my Members to support it.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, this one is a little more insidious than the last one because what it does is precisely what the gentleman says it does. It says, ''Nothing in this act can affect the FCC's authority to act in the public interest, convenience, or necessity.''

And he is right. That term of art is all over communications law. Let me make that clear: all over communications—it is so broad, you can drive a rate-regulated truck back through it, a de facto after-the-fact regulation. And that is the point.

When you give the bureaucracy wide-open language that says ''in the public interest,'' it sounds good on its face, but the practical impact for someone who wants to regulate, it is on their own authority, they go, well, we think that rate is in the public interest to bring down after the fact.

See, then what we have done is empower others unelected to make decisions based on a term of art which, while it may be pervasive, is also wide open. That is what we are trying to avoid here, Mr. Chairman.

See, the FCC could say, we are not going to rate regulate unless we want to rate regulate because we will determine on our own whether it is in the public interest to do so.

All that sounds good, ''public interest'' sounds good, and it is good and it is an important part of our law, but in this case, remember where we start. Until Chairman Wheeler was directed, in effect, by the White House to treat the Internet like an old utility, none of this was regulated. That is the vibrant Internet we have today, and that is what Republicans are trying to preserve, an open Internet.

We are all with you on blocking and throttling and pay prioritization and those issues. I have got draft legislation to legally say no to all of that.

But when it comes to suffocating innovation in the marketplace and new offerings to consumers and really the vibrant competition that has been out here to this point, we have to draw a line with our friends.

They say you don't want to tariff in advance, and we are with them on that, but the worst thing—the worst thing—when you are in business is the uncertainty of after-the-fact decisionmaking by your regulator—after-the-fact decisionmaking by your regulator. Unfortunately, Mr. MCNERNEY's proposal here, his amendment would allow that door to remain open, allow the agency to have this unfettered authority.

Now, we have got provisions throughout the bill and in other law, both at State and Federal level, to protect consumers against fraud and to protect consumers on truth-in-billing. All those things are there. Those protections remain.

Our sole purpose here and why we have been very narrow and specific and clear in our legislation is rate regulation is not something the FCC should take on. Consumers should have that power and authority, and people who want to innovate against the giant companies out there should be able to enter that marketplace with creative new packages that allow consumers to make choices and not have to go to Washington, D.C., and seek privilege and an audience with the chairman to find out if what they are proposing might be okay after the fact if they do it.

Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in opposition to Mr. MCNERNEY's amendment. He is a good member of the committee. I like working with him, but in this case, the amendment is horribly flawed and would do grave damage to the marketplace.

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate—or I sort of appreciate the chairman's comments, and I do appreciate the idea of broadness here; but if you look at what the actual bill says, ''may not regulate rates charged for broadband Internet services,'' that is the definition of broad. You can't get any broader than that. So we want to rein that in a little bit.

We don't want unintended consequences out here, but let me say what my amendment says. ''Act in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.''

Would the chairman like it if I took out ''convenience''? Should I just say ''act in the public interest and necessity''? Would that be good enough, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. What I think would be really good is you withdraw your amendment and vote for the underlying bill that is really clear in its scope and faith and is a really good legislative product.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Well, again, I appreciate the chairman's and Mr. KINZINGER's work on this, and I appreciate working with the chairman on this, but I am going to have to insist that we look at this amendment and take it seriously. I do want to protect the public interest. That is really what this comes down to.

Again, the term shows up 100 times in the act, so let's not turn our back on the intent of the act. Let's move forward in a way that protects the public interest.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would again urge opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–490 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 231, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—179

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)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
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)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
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
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)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
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

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Black
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Delaney
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Fincher
Hanna
Jones
Lieu, Ted
Marchant
Nadler
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Simpson
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Tsongas
Waters, Maxine

□ 1056

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. ALLEN, NUGENT, YOUNG of Indiana, GROTHMAN, and MESSER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. POLIS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SESSIONS was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1206, H.R. 3724, H.R. 4885, AND H.R. 4890

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, the Rules Committee issued four announcements outlining the amendment processes for:

H.R. 1206, No Hires for the Delinquent IRS Act;

H.R. 3724, Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act;

H.R. 4885, IRS Oversight While Eliminating Spending Act; and

H.R. 4890, a bill to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy.

The amendment deadline for each bill has been set for 10 a.m. on Monday, April 18. For more details and the text of the bill, please contact me or visit the Rules Committee Web site.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 231, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

AYES—173

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
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
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)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
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
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
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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

NOT VOTING—29

Black
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Cárdenas
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Delaney
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Fincher
Hanna
Jones
Kildee
Lieu, Ted
Marchant
Nadler
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Schweikert
Simpson
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Veasey
Wagner
Walz

□ 1102

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 151, I was meeting with a constituent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service, and, pursuant to House Resolution 672, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I am in its current form.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

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

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Yarmuth moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2666 to the Committee on Energy Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ Upon enactment of this Act it shall be in order to consider in the House of Representatives the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and on any amendment thereto to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Mr. WALDEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Ladies and gentlemen, today, April 15, is the deadline for Congress to enact a budget resolution; but here we are, set to leave town without taking any action.

To their credit, Republicans did write a budget and it was approved by their members of the Budget Committee. So why, after months of promises of a return to regular order, would Speaker RYAN refuse to allow a floor vote on the Republican budget, the budget of his own party, the party he leads?

Our obligation here in Congress is to control the purse strings of the country. So why would a former Budget Committee chair not want a vote on his party's budget, unless he didn't want people to know what is inside of it.

I don't blame him. Our Democratic budget invests in education, infrastructure, medical research, job training, job creation, American priorities that improve our communities today and increase revenue in the future. It is why they are called investments. In contrast, the Republicans took the European austerity approach: eviscerating each of those investments and taking health coverage away from 20 million Americans, ending Medicare as we know it, and jeopardizing the retirement of millions of Americans. It also makes us less competitive, and encourages companies to ship jobs overseas.

Nobody knows the backlash from this rebuke of American values better than Speaker RYAN, because the budget he wrote 4 years ago, when he was running for Vice President, had to be disavowed by his Presidential candidate running mate, Mitt Romney. It was so abhorrent to the American people that even his own running mate couldn't support it.

So I get it, Mr. Speaker. I like your budget even less than you do. But you have it, and the people deserve to know what is in it and where their Representatives stand on it.

You know, earlier this week, Speaker RYAN gave a speech explaining why he wasn't going to be a candidate for President, and he said one of the reasons was we have too much work to do here in Congress.

Well, he sure is right. So why are we here, and why were we here yesterday and the day before working on bills that have no consequence to the American people when we should be doing the most important business we can, and that is to decide how much money we are going to spend and where for the American people.

This motion to recommit is simple. It says, upon the bill's passage, we will bring the Republican budget to the floor.

So don't hide behind procedural roadblocks to block debate. If you believe in your budget, make the case before the cameras and the American people. Let them see the contrast in our parties' values so they can decide for themselves.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against the motion because the instruction contains matter in the jurisdiction of a committee to which the bill was not referred, thus violating clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires the amendment to be germane to the measure being amended.

Committee jurisdiction is a central test of germaneness, and I am afraid I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Oregon makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Kentucky are not germane.

Clause 7 of rule XVI—the germaneness rule—provides that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

One of the central tenets of the germaneness rule is that an amendment may not introduce matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the pending measure.

The bill, H.R. 2666, as amended, addresses rates for broadband Internet access service, which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The instructions in the motion to recommit propose an amendment consisting of a special order of business of the House, which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

As the Chair ruled in similar proceedings yesterday, the instructions in the motion to recommit are not germane because they are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Accordingly, the motion to recommit is not germane. The point of order is sustained, and the motion is not in order.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
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)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
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
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
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
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

NOES—173

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
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
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)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
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

Black
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Delaney
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Fincher
Hanna
Jones
Lieu, Ted
Marchant
Nadler
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Simpson
Thompson (CA)

□ 1126

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 152 on H.R. 2666, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 150 for passage of the Yarmuth Amendment No. 2, rollcall No. 151 for passage of the McNerney Amendment No. 3, rollcall No. 152 for final passage of H.R. 2666 which took place Friday, April 15, 2016, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 150, the Yarmuth Amendment No. 2, on rollcall No. 151, the McNerney Amendment No. 3. I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 152 for final passage of H.R. 2666.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 2016, I was absent and was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 150—"No."
Rollcall No. 151—"No."
Rollcall No. 152—"No."

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) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader 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 and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and at noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House on 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 today.

Mr. Speaker, since next Monday is Tax Day, the House will also consider four commonsense bills aimed at protecting all taxpayers.

First will be H.R. 1206, the No Hires for the Delinquent IRS Act, sponsored by Representative DAVID ROUZER, and will ensure that IRS employees—the very people who are responsible for collecting taxes from every American—pay their own taxes.

H.R. 4885, the IRS Oversight While Eliminating Spending Act, sponsored by Representative JASON SMITH, will require fees collected by the IRS to be subject to congressional appropriations so that there is proper oversight into how the taxpayer money is spent.

H.R. 3724, the Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act, sponsored by Representative KRISTI NOEM, will prohibit the IRS from rehiring someone who has been fired for cause.

□ 1130

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4890, the IRS Bonuses Tied to Measurable Metrics Act, sponsored by Representative PAT MEEHAN, will ban IRS bonuses until they can demonstrate improved customer service. It just doesn't get any more common sense than that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that information. I want to ask him just one question on one of those commonsense bills that seeks to remove those employees who work for the IRS who collect taxes, that if they are delinquent, they will be removed.

Does that apply to the Congress of the United States as well which levies those taxes, that if we have any Members who are delinquent, that they, too, would be removed?

I yield to my friend.

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

The bill solely deals with the IRS, but he can always offer an amendment.

Mr. HOYER. I may do that.

First of all, let me thank the gentleman. We are confronting a crisis, as the gentleman so well knows, in Puerto Rico. On May 1, they will be unable to pay their debts.

I want to thank the majority leader who has been leading to reach a bipartisan solution. Unfortunately, as the majority leader and I both know, there was a failure in committee this week to move the bill forward. But I want to reiterate my appreciation to the gentleman from California, the majority leader, for his efforts to make sure that we do, in fact, address this issue before May 1. I want to thank him for that.

It is critical that we do so, it is critical that we do so in a bipartisan fashion, and it is critical to have a bill that both sides can support. I have told the majority leader, and I reiterate, we hope that on both restructuring and the composition and the authority of a board of review, an oversight board, that we can come to an agreement so that we can have such a vote and have it in the near future.

Secondly, can the majority leader tell me where we are? I know the budget has been reported out of committee. The gentleman talks about Tax Day. Obviously, we are now at the point when a budget was expected to be brought to the floor. Can the majority leader tell me where we stand on the budget process and the budget coming to the floor of the House of Representatives?

I yield to my friend.

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

I will first touch on Puerto Rico. I thank the gentleman for his work on that. Let me start by saying that any proposal that the House considers cannot be a bailout of Puerto Rico.

I know the committee had a markup and they postponed the vote on it simply because Treasury was still negotiating. We had heard from those on your side of the aisle that they did not want to pursue or continue until Treasury was done negotiating. So we look forward to continue solving this problem in a bipartisan manner.

I also understand the gentleman asking about the budget. I do believe the budget process is an important one, and we are continuing to work through it. It is out of the committee, and I look forward to getting it onto the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Let me mention two other items briefly because I know the gentleman has a time constraint. Zika and Ebola continue to be challenges to the health of Americans and, indeed, the health of the international community as well.

Obviously, we previously committed a significant sum of money to meet the Ebola crisis, which still remains with us. It is not on the front burner as it was for a period of time, but it is, nevertheless, as the gentleman knows, a very significant and serious one.

In addition, of course, we have the crisis that Zika poses to the health and welfare not only of women who either are or may become pregnant, but also to others as well.

Can the gentleman tell me where the funding—as the gentleman knows, the administration transferred some funds out of the money that was dedicated to Ebola. And I want to thank the gentleman for having a hearing, which he invited me. We joined in having that hearing, and we had Secretary Burwell of HHS, Tony Fauci of NIH, and Dr. Frieden of CDC—a very important hearing. They have transferred some money.

Does the gentleman have any information as to when we might move forward, both on backfilling the money that has been taken from Ebola and responding to the administration's request for funding for response to Zika?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do think the gentleman's work is bipartisan on our challenge with Zika and as we continue to move forward with it.

First, I am very happy to see that the administration did take our advice last week and began using the unused Ebola funding in our efforts to combat Zika. I know that was more than half a billion dollars. That money is going to go a long way to containing the disease. I had met with the chairman of Appropriations just today. They are continuing to look and monitor. We believe this money will take us throughout the rest of this fiscal year, but we will look and monitor where we need it and what we need to move forward.

As the gentleman knows, every day we continue to learn more about Zika. We are committed on this side, and I know on your side as well, to make sure that we eradicate this problem from ever furthering in America.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I look forward to working with him on both—continuing to focus on Ebola, while at the same time we focus on the immediate threat of Zika.

The last comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, is that Members ought to be disabused of the concept—and I have heard it, as well as the gentleman has heard it—that the legislation under consideration for Puerto Rico is a bailout. There is no money going to Puerto Rico. There is no guarantee of any of their indebtedness going from the United States to Puerto Rico.

This is simply whether or not we can construct a mechanism so that they can restructure their debt, which may prolong the period of time in which the debt is paid off. It may reduce by some amount the debt that is repaid. But as the gentleman knows—and he is shaking his head in agreement—we are not contemplating nor are we moving forward on a bailout for Puerto Rico.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2016, TO MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2016

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, April 18, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING TOM BOWERS

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Tom Bowers. Tom is a Commonwealth attorney for the city of Salem, Virginia, who today, in a formal award ceremony at Federal Bureau of Investigation headquarters, is receiving the Richmond FBI's 2015 Director's Community Leadership Award for his efforts to organize a Heroin Prevention Initiative in the Roanoke, Virginia, area.

Regrettably, the growing epidemic of heroin use is a plague on communities throughout the United States. Addressing this nationwide problem will require expanded coordination and involvement by local, State, and Federal governments, as well as law enforcement agencies and healthcare professionals.

I applaud Commonwealth Attorney Bowers and those working for him on the Heroin Prevention Initiative for their efforts to combat the heroin epidemic by bringing awareness to the pervasiveness of prescription drug and heroin use among youth in our area and helping to alleviate the damage to our community.

Others involved in this important work in this initiative include the Roanoke Area Youth Substance Abuse Coalition, the Prevention Council of Roanoke County, the Virginia State Police, the City of Roanoke Police Department, the Vinton Police Department, and the Roanoke County Police Department.

I also would note, of course, that Tom Bowers represents the city of Salem, and the city of Salem folks are involved as well.

Congratulations to Commonwealth Attorney Bowers on being presented the Richmond FBI's 2015 Director's Community Leadership Award.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, Irvington, New Jersey, Christmas Day, December 25, 2013: Pierre Clervoyant, Jr., 34 years old; Woodley Daniel, 32; Mushir Cureton, 27.

Rochester, New York, August 19, 2015: Johnny Johnson, 25 years old; Rayquan Manigault, 19; Jonah Barley, 17.

Hesston, Kansas, February 25, 2016: Brian Sadowsky, 43 years old; Josh Higbee, 31; Renee Benjamin, 30.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, March 9, 2016: Tina Shelton, 37 years old; Jerry Shelton, 35; Brittany Powell, 27; Shada Mahone, 26; Chanetta Powell, 25.

Waynesville, Indiana, May 11, 2013: Kathryn Burton, 53 years old; Aaron T. Cross, 41; Shawn Burton, 41; Thomas W. Smith, 39.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge the Senate to quickly act on House-passed VA accountability legislation.

According to recent VA Inspector General reports, wait time manipulation occurred at 40 VA facilities in 19 States. Yet, almost no one has seriously been held accountable for these failures.

This isn't even including the most egregious example of failures, like the VA employee who was convicted of charges related to armed robbery and still couldn't be fired.

The House has passed legislation to get at the root of this problem, and it is past time the Senate acts.

H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act, contains my legislation that forces VA employees to solve problems for veterans. If they can't, then the VA needs to make room for someone who can. Our veterans are too important to us, and they are counting on Congress to deliver them the care they need and deserve.

We have to send the VA accountability legislation to the President's desk now.

HONORING JUDGE FREDERICK P. AGUIRRE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Frederick P. Aguirre, and to congratulate him for his service.

Judge Aguirre is a member of the Latino community and a judge of the Superior Court of Orange County. He was born and raised in Fullerton, California, and he is the grandson of Mexican immigrants.

Judge Aguirre graduated from the University of Southern California with a degree in history, and he earned his law degree at UCLA. His career in public advocacy began when he attended the League of United Latin American Citizens, or LULAC. He began to attend the meetings, and by the time he was a senior in high school, he was the president-elect of the local chapter.

He is the cofounder of the Hispanic Association of Lawyers in Orange County; the Hispanic Advisory Council for Court Appointed Special Advocates, or CASA as we know it; the founder and the vice president of the Leadership Academy of the Superior Court; and the president of Latino Advocates for Education.

I know him best because he honors our veterans every year in a very large ceremony, calling out their service in the different wars.

I am honored to recognize Judge Frederick Aguirre for his outstanding achievements within the Latino community, the Orange County community, amongst our veterans, and for all citizens.

□ 1145

OBAMACARE FOR FINANCIAL PLANNING

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the Department of Labor finalized its fiduciary rule—or, as we could call it: ObamaCare for financial planning. This rule reclassifies and expands the scope of individuals who are considered ''financial advisers'' and adds the Department of Labor as a new regulator.

The investment advisory industry is already among the most regulated, but this rule will force a sweeping overhaul of the financial services industry. Most importantly, it will hurt middle class Americans.

This new rule change, which circumvents the Congress and the Constitution, will significantly raise legal and compliance costs, making it expensive, difficult, and impractical for companies like State Farm, which is headquartered in my congressional district, and their advising agents to continue to provide services to small businesses and hardworking customers.

Ultimately, this rule will drastically narrow the access that these families, who are trying to save for retirement, will have by making financial advice more expensive. It will even penalize small businesses that want to provide benefits for their employees, thereby discouraging small businesses from providing 401(k) plans.

I am committed to fighting the implementation of this rule, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week, we marked Equal Pay Day, which is the day more than 3 months into the year when women's earnings finally catch up to men's from the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, it all adds up—$430,000. That is how much the average income loss is for a woman throughout her career as a result of this unfair wage gap. This means our mothers and our grandmothers get less for their retirement security, and there are more of them in poverty.

Inequality hurts the heart and it hurts the pocketbook. It hurts women and their families. That is why we need paycheck fairness, affordable child care, paid family leave, and retirement security.

When women succeed, America succeeds.

SUPPORTING THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the 14th consecutive year in order to speak out on behalf of the LGBTQ youth community. It is unacceptable that, in 2016, young people are still experiencing discrimination across this country based on their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Kaleb Lennon, a young transgender student in my district, sees this day as a chance to combat the bullying, the slurs, and the put-downs that these children face on a daily basis. I am proud to lend my voice to Kaleb's cause. It is our duty to speak out against the bigotry and hatred facing this community. We must celebrate the diversity in this country and reject all forms of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this is my last year to take the floor and support these young people. I ask that, next year, my colleagues stand where I am and lend their voices to the support of the LGBTQ community.

Today, as youth across the country take a vow of silence to protest the silent response they see to bigotry, I ask one last time that you remember that, while you are silent, we here in Congress should not be.

STEERING AND POLICY HEARING ON POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight yesterday's Democratic Steering and Policy Committee hearing on the ''Failure of Trickle-Down Economics in the War on Poverty.'' The hearing highlighted the daily hardships that are faced by more than 46 million Americans. We know that too many families struggle to buy healthy food, to pay rent, and to access good-paying jobs.

I was very proud that, among the witnesses at the hearing—all of whom were phenomenal—was my constituent,

Oakland resident Violet Henderson, who shared her personal story of overcoming poverty. After leaving, unfortunately, the criminal justice system, after being paroled, she told her story. She is a phenomenal individual who is raising her two children and is a student. She succeeded against overwhelming odds. Her story is a powerful example of resilience and dedication, which so many struggling Americans have.

It should be a call to action for Members of Congress to help more people like Violet by supporting policies that will end poverty. Yet our Republican colleagues continue to promote harmful cuts to critical safety net programs despite knowing that these cuts will push more families over the edge; and the record of the members on Speaker RYAN's so-called Task Force on Poverty, Opportunity, and Upward Mobility are just as bad, if not worse. Time and time again, they have voted to cut SNAP, to erode higher education funding and Pell Grants, and to weaken affordable housing programs.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Violet Henderson's testimony.

TESTIMONY OF VIOLET HENDERSON AT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC STEERING AND POLICY COMMITTEE HEARING: ''THE FAILURE OF TRICKLE DOWN ECONOMICS IN THE WAR ON POVERTY,'' APRIL 14, 2016

Thank you Leader Pelosi, Congresswoman DeLauro, Congresswoman Edwards, and Whip Hoyer. Thank you to the other panelists up here with me. And I want to give a special thank-you to my Congresswoman, Congresswoman Barbara Lee. I'm here today because of you, Congresswoman Lee, both because you invited me to this hearing, but in a bigger sense, your leadership in Oakland and support of good reentry and economic policies has made it possible for me to escape poverty and live a life I am proud of and talk to you about today.

I am honored to be here, and grateful that you have given me the opportunity to speak about these issues. I am a worker, a mother, a grandmother, a formerly incarcerated person, a churchgoer, and a student.

I can speak only for myself but I hope that my testimony today can give voice to the millions of people who, like me, got caught up in the criminal justice system, worked incredibly hard to transform their lives, but still face lifelong stumbling blocks to financial stability. Unlike me, too many people who worked have never escaped poverty despite their hard work.

For me, like so many, the challenges started with childhood poverty. My father died when I was four years old. My mother had seven children to care for on her own and she really struggled. I grew up in the Aliso Village housing project in East Los Angeles. I never remember, as a child, having hope or vision about a bright future.

My ''escape'' came when I was fourteen years old. My 21-year-old boyfriend took me to Oakland and made me work the streets. At the time, I did not have the privilege of believing that I deserved more and better for my life. I was first arrested for when I was sixteen years old but I was not seen as the victim of sex trafficking. I was treated like a criminal. And I became one. My next boyfriend, who was 25 years older than I was, taught me how to become a thief. When I was 19 years old I was sent to prison for grand theft and conspiracy of several hundred dollars in a street scam.

Because I was a high school dropout, I got my G.E.D. while I was in prison, and afterward I took college-level classes. For the first time in my life I was exposed to learning, and I loved it. While in prison I met a mother and a daughter who were incarcerated at the same time. This broke my heart because the daughter had a child whom she missed dearly and tried to escape from prison to get back to her child. The moment I heard that the daughter tried to escape, I made a decision to change my life. I wanted children but I was going to put them through that. I have never looked back.

Once I got out, I had two wonderful children and dedicated myself to supporting them. I worked full-time as a cosmetologist but still did not earn enough to feed my family. For a while we survived because we had access to food stamps, which we needed even when I was working multiple full-time jobs. Then, thanks to an affirmative action program, I was able to join the local Laborers Union and I worked heavy construction for the next 20 years. It was hard physical labor but I was grateful for the opportunity because I earned more money than I had ever earned at any other job. It allowed me, as a single parent, to provide for my children, though we still struggled.

Working as a laborer became more and more difficult as I grew older and I looked for other work. When I was 54 years old I was denied office jobs because of my convictions, which were then 30 years old. Thanks to free reentry clean slate legal services—which Congresswoman Barbara Lee helped start in Oakland at the East Bay Community Law Center—I was able to clean up my record, and as a result I was able to get a great job, and thankfully one that this sixty-one-year-old body can handle. I'm coordinating the environmental/waste reduction program for a large city agency. It has been an inspiring and wonderful opportunity. I was even able to fulfill my life-long dream of becoming a homeowner and I bought a condo in Oakland.

A few years back I enrolled in a community college in Oakland to study Environmental Management, where I take night and evening classes. I have surprised myself by earning a 3.92 GPA, and was even more surprised when I was recently invited to transfer to the University of California at Berkeley.

But—and this why we are here today—despite my successes, and despite working as hard as a person can work, I have worried constantly about keeping my head above water financially. I have had stable employment, and I have catapulted myself out of the deep poverty my family knew when I was a child. BUT still, even now, I can't say that I have feel economically secure. I struggled mightily to hold onto my condo through the economic recession. I am 61 years old and worried about being able to retire anytime soon.

I don't exactly know how to define ''middle class'' but it can't mean what I have done for the last 3 decades of my life: Working full time, being very frugal, but yet also constantly worrying about meeting my basic financial obligations and the threat of eviction. And I am someone who has been exceptionally lucky in terms of the abundance of learning and employment opportunities I have had! I cannot imagine the financial burdens of people who have been less fortunate or live in areas with fewer programs.

My plea today is that you work for policies that reward all hard working people in America with a fair chance to support their families. This is the challenge my children face even though both of them are resourceful, intelligent, and have good jobs. I pray that my children will be able to know economic prosperity, which at very least means living without constant worry about day-to-day about making it.

I sit before you as a very different person from who I was as lost and hopeless 16-year-old girl on the streets. It has been a long journey of seeking forgiveness for the harm I caused others, and healing myself I hope my story can inspire women who are now struggling on the path I was on thirty years ago. I want them to be encouraged to persevere and make positive changes in their lives, and to have faith in the system. But the system must also have faith in us! Successful reentry requires government policies and programs that remove stumbling blocks to economic security.

I am exceptionally grateful to be here but I am not exceptional. I am an example of what's possible when we support people through smart and fair reentry and economic programs.

Thank you.

THE BUDGET AND THE ZIKA VIRUS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the privilege of participating with the Union Theological Center, in New York, to speak about our faith and our legislation. It causes me to come to the floor today to act upon that very strong faith in the Good Samaritan, which means that we are, in effect, our brothers' and sisters' keeper.

We have a devastating disease in the Zika virus that has now been announced as being more devastating than had been expected as it causes severe brain damage; and my State and Gulf States and other States across America are, in fact, in the target line. In Texas, for example, we recently had a Zika virus hearing, and our infectious disease experts told us that this is a devastating disease.

Yes, we can take money from someplace else and borrow from Peter to pay Paul, but I am asking this Congress, in the spirit of the Good Samaritan, to pass the President's emergency supplemental request of $1.9 billion. I will be asking the Secretary of Health and Human Services to come to Texas and sit down with our law enforcement and health professionals in order to make a difference.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this is budget day, and we have not passed a budget. We will not pass a Republican budget because it kills education; it doesn't protect Social Security; and it is not in the spirit of a Good Samaritan. Let us do what is right—pass a budget for the American people and provide for those in the line of danger with the Zika virus.

MISSED BUDGET DEADLINE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, there is something important for the American people to know: today is the day, April

15, that the law requires that Congress enact a budget resolution. Obviously, that ain't gonna happen. However, the Republican-led Budget Committee did share a budget blueprint with the GOP leadership. Ultimately, the leadership decided that it wasn't harsh enough on families, seniors, or children to pass through a Republican majority.

A Federal budget should be a reflection of our values as a Nation, and the details of the rumored proposal of a road to ruin that the Republicans want to release are just not good. Apparently, the attempt to end the Medicare guarantee for seniors, to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and to block investments in good-paying jobs was not sufficiently brutal enough for the radicals within the Republican Party. If this version of the budget could not muster enough support to be brought to the House floor for a vote, I fear what the Republican majority will actually propose.

House Democrats should continue to press for a budget that creates jobs, grows paychecks, and invests in the future of the American people, like we always do. We believe in those values, and that is what we will continue to fight for.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1670. An act to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

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. 1436. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

''A REPUBLIC, MADAM, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, being argued before the United States Supreme Court—the eight Justices remaining—is a case of United States v. Texas. It will take up the President's—I started to say his ''executive order,'' but, actually, in the case of His Majesty's program on amnesty, there actually was no executive order that was signed by the President. Like you find in a lot of countries around the world where there is a dictator, there was a speech made and comments made by the ruler. Then the Secretary of Homeland Security—in our case, Secretary Johnson—wrote a series of memos to carry out the dictation from on high, and they overrode the laws that were duly passed by both Houses of Congress and by previous Presidents.

That is where we run into some trouble. That is where you run into trouble in doing what Benjamin Franklin suggested might be possible to undo. As we know, a lady asked him at the Constitutional Convention, ''What did you give us?'' and he said, ''A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.'' One of the ways you do not keep representative government—self-government through the electing of Representatives to do the will of the people—is to go and have those elections and elect people who pass laws—I mean, the Founders wanted government to have gridlock.

As I mentioned before, Justice Scalia, in talking to a group of 50 or so senior citizens from my district, explained that the reason we are the freest country in history—or at least we used to be. The indicators indicate we are not the freest country anymore, but the reason we became, for a while there, the freest country in history was that the Founders did not trust government. They knew that, if it were too easy for a government to make laws or to just dictate what would happen in a country, then people would not be free.

They pledged their lives, liberty, sacred honor—they pledged everything. Many—most, actually—of the signers of the Declaration of Independence did not have very pleasant lives after the signing of that. Many lost their treasures, their fortunes. They never lost their sacred honor. They pledged it, and they never lost their sacred honor.

When you look at all of the sacrifices that were made to try to allow us to have representative, self-government—and as difficult as it is to pass a bill here in the House and have the Senate pass the same bill or a similar bill and, if they are not the same, to go to conference and try to work out a bill that is the same and get it passed in both Houses and send it to the President and get the President to sign it and have the Supreme Court say, yes, that it is consistent with the Constitution—that is very difficult.

All of those things have happened with regard to our immigration law that the President talked about, as any good ruler would; and, of course, as any good ruler, he had a Secretary of Homeland Security who did memos and said: Okay. We are going to just not pay any attention to that law. Here is the new law.

□ 1200

I was amazed to hear all of the major networks, including Fox News, talk about ''Here is the new program,'' ''Here is the new plan'' after memos were concocted that overrode the laws that were duly passed in the House and Senate and signed previously by the President, who just overrode the law and said: We are not going to do that. We have, in their opinion, the discretion to just ignore the law and do what we want.

There is a good article out of the Hoover Institution journal written by Michael McConnell. It just came out on April 15. I thought it did a good job of discussing these issues that are coming up before the Supreme Court on Monday.

Also, by way of further preface, the decision originated in the Southern District of Texas before United States District Judge Andrew Hanen, who happened to be one of the smartest people in his class and, actually, going through law school, one of the more liberal people in our class in law school, but a brilliant guy.

The more he delved into issues, the better lawyer he became. He was with one of the best firms in Houston. He has become a profoundly good arbitrator of justice as a United States judge.

So Judge Hanen wrote a very lengthy order in which he enjoined in carrying out the wishes that were dictated by the Secretary of Homeland Security because they violate the law. They say: We are ignoring the law. And the judge could see that there are massive consequences.

Although right here in this very room the President said that we are not going to cover people that are illegally in the country with his ObamaCare, it turns out that that wasn't true.

We have, apparently, massive numbers who get the income tax credit, whether legally or not. I have people constantly telling me they work for different income tax services and they provide services to people that don't have Social Security numbers that are legitimate.

They all know about the earned income tax credit, and they all want it on there. They all claim it. Whether they can tell you where their kids are or not, they want that credit.

There has been some massive projections of just how much in millions or billions is being paid out. We previously had reporting about, just in one little community, how numerous people claim to live in one home and claim to have as many as 30 kids or so in that home so they could claim all those earned income tax credits so they could get a big refund.

There is massive amounts of money that is being taken from those who earned it and given to those who have come into the country illegally.

I don't have the articles in front of me. There are articles out this week talking about that, actually, by more than the current unemployment rate—even the real rate, not the one that is just made up—it doesn't include the 94 million or so who are eligible to work, have tried to find work and given up trying to find work.

But either number you care to use, we have that percentage of people who have immigrated to America. Thank God for legal immigration.

Perhaps one in six people working in America are first-generation immigrants. That is great, but the trouble is

that a huge portion of those are illegally in the country.

The President can say all he wants to: Well, they are doing jobs that Americans won't do. When wages are lower that are being paid to Americans looking for work and working, it affects their homes.

It has affected their standard of living. It has caused people to be unemployed who would be employed if they weren't competing with people that took lower wages because they are here illegally.

Of course, yesterday we learned that the IRS Commissioner, the head of the IRS, Koskinen, is an accomplice. He has been complicit in the use of stolen, illegal Social Security numbers because he says: It is okay if they use stolen Social Security numbers for a good basis. We just don't want them to use it for a bad basis.

Apparently, for him, somebody filing a perjured and fraudulent income tax return and getting a refund of money that they very well may not be entitled to at all and should not be entitled to is one of the good purposes.

He clearly needs to be impeached and removed from office as head of the Internal Revenue Service. Hopefully, that will be happening in the near future.

There has to be consequences for violating the law, for helping others violate the law, by looking the other way and announcing you are looking the other way while people violate the law.

America is in trouble. We could very well be Greece right now if it weren't for the United States having the dollars, the international currency, and having our ability to print our own money, neither of which Greece has.

This case being taken up on Monday by the Supreme Court has the ability to basically make Congress a nullity by saying: You know what—look, the President was elected 8 years ago and 4 years ago.

So if he wants to just ignore laws and do what he wants that is not according to the law, shouldn't that be okay? It is incredible how some even who have advanced degrees are so uneducated on how you keep a republic.

Well, Michael McConnell says:

''One of the most closely watched cases before the Supreme Court this term is United States v. Texas, the immigration case that is scheduled to be argued on April 18. The Supreme Court surprised most observers when it asked the parties in that case to address a question they did not raise in their briefs: whether President Obama's 'Deferred Action for Parents of Americans'' (DAPA) order violates the 'Take Care Clause' of Article II of the Constitution. The Take Care Clause has never before been enforced by the Court and most people have probably never heard of it.''

Let me insert here: My dear friend from Florida, Congressman TED YOHO, has been advocating for some time we pass a bill that just sets out an enabling statute that says what Take Care means under the Constitution and sets some requirements out so we actually have some hard requirements against which to measure a President's performance in order to determine whether he has violated the Take Care Clause and ought to be removed from office.

Before you can determine the latter, you really need to know has the Take Care Clause been violated to a level that would justify high crimes and misdemeanors.

I appreciate so much Andrew McCarthy's book regarding impeachment where he lays out, really, impeachment was intended to be a political issue.

The Founders did not want impeachment to be like a criminal case where the prosecution has to prove a case beyond a reasonable doubt.

It is a mechanism by which we avoid revolutions and military coups, which have happened in countries around the world.

Here we have not had to have ever, thank God, a military coup or another revolution since 1776. We have had massive movements for which we are grateful, like the abolitionist movement that got rid of the atrocity of slavery, led mainly by Christian churches, and the civil rights movement, of course, which the ultimate leader was Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., an ordained Christian minister.

So these movements have not required revolution, have not required a military coup, because the Founders created something called impeachment.

According to Andrew's book—and I'm sorry I can't do it the justice it deserves—basically, impeachment is a political mechanism to allow people to remove from office someone who may not have violated a criminal statute beyond a reasonable doubt.

But more than half of the country—more than half of those representatives elected in the country believe that he should be removed. Then we avoid a revolution, a coup, those kinds of things.

This article from the Hoover Institute goes on:

''DAPA is a set of executive branch directives giving some four million illegal aliens who have given birth to children in the United States what the orders call 'legal presence' — even though they are here in violation of the law.

''This 'legal presence' entitles DAPA beneficiaries to work permits, a picture ID, driver's licenses, Social Security, Earned Income Tax credits, Medicaid, ObamaCare, and other social welfare benefits.

''Until the 2014 election, President Obama repeatedly and emphatically stated that he did not have authority to issue such an order without congressional action.''

Then, when he didn't like the results of the election, he went ahead and did it anyway. He had said: I am not a monarch. I can't just do these things.

And when he didn't like the result of the election, he decided to go ahead and be a monarch and do them anyway.

The article goes on:

''Twenty-six states have sued the federal government to challenge the legality of DAPA. The courts below held that the orders violate the Administrative Procedure Act because they were issued without public notice and comment, as is required for agency actions with the effect of law, and because they are in violation of the underlying statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

''By adding the Take Care Clause to the Questions Presented, the Court is taking care that the constitutional dimensions of this case will not be swamped by the administrative law details. But for most people, including most lawyers, the Take Care Clause is a great unknown—uncharted territory. So: What is the Take Care Clause and what does it mean?

''The Take Care Clause, found in Article II of the Constitution, the Executive Power Article, is comprised of only nine words: The President 'shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'

''But an understanding of those nine words requires an appreciation of their roots in English history. Like many other structural features of the United States Constitution, the Take Care Clause derives from the long struggle between Parliament and the Crown over the extent of 'prerogative powers,' that is, the monarch's asserted powers to create laws or otherwise to act unilaterally.

□ 1215

''Absolute monarchs rule by whim. What they say goes. Even before Parliament existed, however, the barons of England insisted that monarchs rule in accordance with law rather than mere executive whim or decree. King John, 1199–1216 AD, was a major offender against the rule of law. He arbitrarily increased taxes, abused the king's court, mustered soldiers for military misadventures foreign and domestic, and hanged innocents in Wales. Things came to a head in 1215 at Runnymede. Faced with armed insurrection, John agreed to the Great Charter, which established the principle that the king is not a law unto himself; even the king must act through settled law to bind his subjects.

''Thus began a centuries-long struggle between law and royal prerogative. The term 'prerogative' refers to powers invested in the executive that are not governed by law.''

John Locke, who was read by so many of our Founders and discussed during our Nation's founding, ''John Locke defined the term in his Second Treatise on Government.'' John Locke said this: '' 'This power to act according to discretion, for the public good, without the prescription of the law, and sometimes even against it, is that which is called prerogative.' The king's

prerogative powers included the veto, the pardon, the powers of war and peace, the power to create and fill public offices, and the power to dissolve the Parliament. All these he could do without the need for statutes passed by Parliament, and statutes passed by Parliament could not touch, limit, or regulate these prerogative powers.

''Prerogative powers are not all inconsistent with constitutional government. Under the Constitution, for example, the President has certain defined prerogatives, such as the pardon power and the veto, which are committed to the President's discretion.''

Of course, we know the prerogative of veto can be overridden by Congress, so it is not an ultimate prerogative.

''But much of constitutionalism consists of replacing prerogative with law. The Framers of the U.S. Constitution carefully reflected on the various prerogative powers claimed or exercised by the English king and granted, denied, or limited those powers when creating the Article II executive.''

Now, the early controversies over prerogative powers left that ''one of the most dangerous prerogative powers asserted by English monarchs was the proclamation power. That is the power to create new law without parliamentary approval. The term modern Americans would use for proclamations is 'executive orders.' Disputes over the proclamation power came to the fore during the Tudor dynasty, which was 1485 to 1603.

''Henry VIII believed his royal proclamations should have the force of law, as 'though they were made by act of Parliament.' The great 18th century historian and philosopher David Hume later called this 'a total subversion of the English Constitution.' After Henry's death, Parliament repealed the Act of Proclamations.

''The struggle over prerogative accelerated under the four Stuart kings prior to the Glorious Revolution of 1688. James I was an ardent believer in the divine right of kings; he wrote a book on the topic shortly before he ascended to the English throne called 'The Trew Law of Free Monarchies.' In James I's view, kings are unrestrained by law; their authority comes from God, and therefore the king is accountable only to God—never to man or law.

''In 1610 James I issued a royal proclamation prohibiting 'new buildings in and around London' and 'the making of starch of wheat.' The legality of these orders was tested in Case of Proclamations. Lord Ellesmere, the royalist jurist, argued that the courts should 'maintain the power and prerogative of the king' and that 'in cases in which there is no authority and precedent,' the judges should 'leave it to the king to order it according to his wisdom.' Chief Justice Coke—whose whiggish constitutionalism later informed the views of American Framers—held that the king could not lawfully 'change any part of the common law, nor create any offense by his proclamation, which was not an offense before, without Parliament.' Coke concluded, 'the law of England is divided into three parts: common law, statute law, and custom; but the king's proclamation is none of them.'

''Chief Justice Coke reiterated the point in the Case of Non Obstante, or Dispensing Power. Coke observed that the king does have some prerogative powers. For example, a royal pardon grants mercy notwithstanding—or, as English lawyers said at the time, non obstante—the lawful conviction. But Coke insisted that the king's non obstante, or dispensing, power never can be used to annul statutes. If the king attempted to dispense with a statute, Coke held, the king's effort would be 'void,' for 'an act of Parliament may absolutely bind the king.' ''

Parenthetically, of course, since our laws were derived through this knowledge of what was done here, the Framers believed that the law would absolutely bind the king that lives in the White House.

''The principles of the Case of Proclamations and the Case of Non Obstante are part of the American constitutional tradition. The Steel Seizure Case of 1952, our Supreme Court's foundational separation-of-powers decision, held that the President cannot make law; that is exclusively Congress' job. In other words, executive orders have the force of law only when implementing statutes, treaties, and the Constitution . . . Notably, many if not all of these controversies over the reach of royal prerogative arose when the king took a precedent that prior monarchs had used in modest and relatively uncontroversial ways—as Elizabeth had funded defense against the Spanish Armada—and stretched it to cover significant usurpations of power in ways contrary to the will of Parliament. That has continued to be the pattern in American separation of powers struggles, including the one over DAPA.''

It is a very good article that goes on and discusses other concepts, but Dan Stein had a good article regarding why United States v. Texas is the most important case the Court will decide this year.

According to Stein: ''The Supreme Court has decided to review certain elements in United States v. Texas.'' He goes further than that. He says: ''The most dramatic of these actions were two programs designed to grant de facto amnesty and work authorization to an estimated 4.7 million illegal aliens. The first of these amnesties was an expansion of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA—a 2012 executive action that has thus far benefited some 800,000 illegal aliens who arrived in the U.S. when they were under the age of 16''—or, at least I will add parenthetically, based on what I have observed at the border who said they were under 16. I have been there all hours of the day and night on the border and have been astonished beyond mildly, being amused that people who clearly could grow full beards would claim to be under 16. I have seen them in the middle of the night when a group of them would have to go through being processed by the Border Patrol reading their little pieces of paper they had and exchanging, and then each of them showing, this is what I have for identification purposes. I was amused how their identities seemed to be interchangeable because they could pass them among each other and decide which identity each wanted to take.

But this article points out that ''U.S. District Judge Andrew Hanen issued a temporary injunction halting implementation. That injunction was subsequently upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The Obama administration appealed that decision to the Supreme Court,'' and they will hear arguments. That will be on Monday. ''While Hanen's injunction was based on the government's failure to comply with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, the High Court has indicated that it will also consider whether the executive amnesty programs violate the Take Care Clause of the Constitution.''

I also want to insert here, since I know the intellectual integrity and brilliance of Judge Andrew Hanen—I have not talked to him in a number of years, but when I read the order that he drafted, he could have just had a one-page, one-paragraph order implementing in the injunction, but it was lengthy and thorough, and I knew what Judge Hanen was doing, having been a judge and chief justice. I understood exactly.

There are times when you don't want the lawyers, as smart as they may be, to misinterpret the actions you have taken, and you know that you are capable of writing a good law review article, as Judge Hanen was more than capable and by himself has won an award for a law review article. I knew, as a judge, what I suspected Judge Hanen felt in this case, this could end up before the Supreme Court, and I don't want any misunderstanding or some court coming back down the way that says, oh, I probably meant this or I intended to do that when that was not my meaning and it was not my intent.

So Judge Hanen issued a very eloquent and lengthy order so that even some of the normal majority of the U.S. Supreme Court would have to really twist and abuse his words in order to get the wrong meaning of what he was doing. He laid out his legal basis. He laid out the facts, and he made very clear that both the law and the facts supported what he did and the reasons for which he did them.

So it should be a lesson. I know, as a judge, often it is easier when a litigant, prevailing litigant—the way it usually goes, they supply an order with their motion, with their petition for injunction. Here is the order. And it is a lot easier for a judge just to sign that and go on.

But on important matters, I hope other judges who truly appreciate the Constitution the way Judge Hanen does, will take the time to write their own order, as he did, and scrupulously so. And I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that come Monday, during and after oral arguments in this case, the Justices on the Supreme Court, some of whom may not be quite as smart as Judge Hanen intellectually, will at least give credence to the trouble that he endured in order to write his own order and make sure his legal reasoning was as clear as Judge Hanen made it.

Well done, good and faithful Judge Hanen.

□ 1230

This article says: ''Under these two newly announced programs''—talking about DAPA and DACA—''nearly 40 percent of the Nation's estimated 12 million illegal aliens would be granted legal presence and permission to work in the U.S. According to an analysis by the Migration Policy Institute, an organization that is generally supportive of President Obama's immigration policies, combined with the 40 percent of illegal aliens covered by DACA, DACA+, and DAPA, the other policy directives issued by Secretary Johnson would have exempted 87 percent of all illegal aliens from enforcement actions.''

That is extraordinary. If the President doesn't like the law, he says: I have the power to exclude certain people from prosecution and, hey, I can issue pardons in specific cases. So I am specifically making 87 percent of those illegally in the country legal.

We might as well pronounce the next President king or queen if they are going to have this kind of power.

Further down in the article, Mr. Stein says: ''To the contrary, Congress has taken explicit actions to limit the discretionary authority of the executive in the area of immigration enforcement. In the Illegal Immigration Reform and Relief Act of 1996, which Congress passed and President Clinton signed, Congress indisputably intended 'to prevent delay in the removal of illegal aliens.'

''Under the INA, Congress has enumerated two mandatory statutory responsibilities to the Secretary of Homeland Security: the 'power and duty,' to administer and enforce all laws relating to immigration, and the mandatory duty to guard against the illegal entry of aliens.

''Under the Obama administration, neither Secretary Johnson nor his predecessor, Janet Napolitano, have faithfully complied with these statutory responsibilities. In fact, through his acts of November 20, 2014, the Secretary has affirmatively shirked those responsibilities and blatantly attempted to substitute Presidential policies in the place of a comprehensive system of constitutionally enacted Federal laws that define who may enter and remain in the United States and under what conditions.

''Needless to say, when the Supreme Court delivers its ruling in June, the implications for U.S. immigration policy will be profound. What is at stake is nothing less than the entire premise of more than a century of immigration policy: namely, the legitimacy of laws that restrict immigration in order to protect the social, economic, and security interests of the American people.''

Let me insert here. Let's look at who is most harmed by these vast amnesty programs of millions of millions of people to compete with people legally in America for the jobs. You have got over 94 million Americans that are so tired of looking for work and being turned down for jobs, they quit looking. Perhaps some of those 94 million should be given the chance to have those jobs.

And, of course, knowing the way free markets are supposed to work, labor is paid what the free market would require. But you convolute the free market by bringing people in. And I do say bringing them in, because Homeland Security, as Border Patrolmen have told me, are called logistics by the drug cartels because they get them across the river, and then Homeland Security becomes logistics and ships them wherever they want to go in the United States. Or they may be so callous as to just give them a notice, whether they are a killer, as has happened here lately, and say: By the way, come back to court some time in the future, for which they, of course, do not return.

But in any event, the article concludes: ''Even those Justices of the court who might agree with the President's views on immigration policy generally should appreciate the precedent-setting decision they would be making by allowing the President to run roughshod over the constitutional separation-of-powers doctrine.

''Those who support granting amnesty to illegal aliens should recognize that a ruling in favor of his vast new claims to power to change the law would be a Pyrrhic victory. It would emasculate the abilities of Congress to set immigration limits and standards, and it would render the courts irrelevant in ensuring the enforcement of the very same.''

So this is a big case coming up. The Supreme Court also has heard oral arguments on whether or not the President can order the violation of deeply held religious Christian convictions and order folks like the Little Sisters of the Poor, who have dedicated their lives to poverty and helping those less fortunate.

If they want them to violate their religious convictions, as was made clear during oral argument, then the administration ought to be able to order any American, including churches, according to them, to violate their Christian beliefs. Because after all, they are the government. They work for the President.

Sure, they can order people to violate their Christian beliefs. For heaven's sake, these people have no sense of history. They don't even know that one of the things that just infuriated Americans and caused a revolution was a king believing that he could just order people to violate their religious convictions. That is why religion is the first thing mentioned in our Bill of Rights.

It has been so misconstrued, but the government was to never do what the King of England did when he ordered a new church. The Church of England is the official church. They never saw it as a problem to have different denominations agree to pray in the name of Jesus and to have the same type of prayers begin each day in the Congress and then, again, when we started our first congresses under the Constitution. That was never a problem. They knew they were not violating the First Amendment, because many of them helped craft it. We are not establishing a religion and we are not going to prohibit the free exercise thereof.

So the Court has this before it, with eight Justices sitting, after the untimely death of a real American hero, who has no doubt already heard, as John Quincy Adams said when he stood downstairs before the Supreme Court and prayed that the Justices of the Supreme Court that have already deceased would have already heard those words: Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter now into the joy of the Lord.

That is what John Quincy Adams said specifically before the Supreme Court in the hearing on the Amistad case downstairs when the Supreme Court was here in this building. I have no doubt Justice Scalia has already heard that. He has been a very faithful servant, standing up for religious liberty.

So we will see what the other eight Justices, do, and then we will see whether or not politics has become so extraordinarily the purpose of the Supreme Court rather than the Constitution. Because, clearly, there is information that is passed and gotten to the Supreme Court. Apparently it occurred during the decision on whether or not to extend the 24-hour hold on the bankruptcy order that violated the Constitution.

And God bless Justice Ginsburg when she put that 24-hour hold on an unconstitutional, illegal order. According to what one of the Justices told me—without going into detail—the White House submitted information ex parte, behind the scenes, that if they left that 24-hour hold in place, everybody that had any kind of job that related to the automobile industry would lose their job. And it would all be the Supreme Court's fault if they left the 24-hour hold in place.

It certainly appears they got information that affected Chief Justice Roberts. It looked like he changed a dissenting opinion into a majority opinion in the ObamaCare case. This is

serious. And this will determine whether or not we are going to follow the Constitution.

I am so pleased to be here on the House floor with my friend from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), the former Governor.

Mr. SANFORD. I just want to borrow maybe 5 minutes worth of your time just to talk about this issue of Puerto Rico. You have touched on it in different ways. You were talking about constitutional issues just a moment ago, and I want to follow up on that thought because I think that what is occurring here has far bigger consequences than we may realize.

I would say that at a couple different levels. One is, Charles Dickens once talked about Christmas past, Christmas present, Christmas still to come. I think that this is a snapshot of Christmas to come if we don't watch out here in the United States.

As my colleague from Texas well knows, we are at a financial tipping point, the likes of which our civilization has never seen before. We have never before been at this level of indebtedness in a peacetime situation. We are, again, about to find ourselves between a rock and a hard place, which is very much the story of Puerto Rico, as it relates to their financial situation.

So you think about the number of 2025. In basically less than 10 years, we are only going to have enough money to pay for interest and entitlements and nothing else. You think about the way in which interest payments—by congressional budget numbers—are expected to balloon from around $200 billion a year to $800 billion a year and the fact that we are going to spend more on interest payments than we will on defense.

You can walk through a lot of different numbers that say that we are about to be at a profound, bad spot, which is, again, the way in which Puerto Rico, I think, is foretelling. It really talks about the fact that they went out, spent too much, obligated themselves too much, made promises they couldn't deliver on. And so we find ourselves in this pickle.

I would also say this. This is an exercise in free markets. If you think about the notion of free markets and what that means, what we would agree on as conservatives is that there are certain absolutes. On the rule of law and private property rights and market-based principles, Thomas Friedman talks about a flat world and how a kid in Texas or in South Carolina competes with kids in Shanghai or New Delhi in ways that they never did before.

So if you have a corporate rate that is too high, not surprisingly, corporations aren't going to come to your island. If you have a minimum wage that doesn't fit with the prevailing wage rate of that area, corporations or businesses, local and small, may not be able to start up and compete. If you think about so many of the different building blocks that make for a vibrant economy, this is, again, a reminder of how important those things are.

And so I look at this and I am perplexed. I am really struggling with this issue.

I looked just a little while ago. Puerto Rican bonds are still trading between 65 and 70 cents on the dollar, even though we have a pure math trap, which is to say financial markets are still betting that, in some form or another, those bondholders are going to get bailed out.

So that is on the one hand. On the other hand, you look at the plight of the people in Puerto Rico, you look at what might come next. I empathize with leadership of how do you deal with this issue. But I want to go back to one thing that I think is central to both of us, and that is the rule of law.

I actually pulled up a general obligation bond. This was a 2012 issue, Public Improvement Refunding Bonds, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, $400 million in size. It says on the first page: ''The bonds are general obligations of the Commonwealth. The good faith, credit, and taxing power of the Commonwealth are irrevocably pledged for the prompt payment of the principal and interest on the bonds. The Constitution of Puerto Rico provides that public debt of the Commonwealth, which includes bonds,'' whatnot, whatnot, whatnot. This on the front page.

□ 1245

The issue of what is occurring in Puerto Rico has everything to do with the sanctity of the rule of law in this country. It has far-reaching implications well beyond the 3½ million people that make up the Island of Puerto Rico but, really, the whole of the United States.

We have a municipal market in this country of about $2.7 trillion in size. What comes next? Because, if they can change it in the front page of what was a $400 million issue for Puerto Rico, can they change it for Illinois? Can they change it for California?

Obviously, territories and States are very different, but I do worry about the degree of precedent it sets, because what we are worried about is a public exodus from Puerto Rico. We are worried about a lot of different ramifications. Is that not true if Illinois was to end up in a real problem spot financially, in terms of what comes next?

So I think it has real implications there. I think it is a reminder of how important it is that we look at the ingredients of growth.

One of my problems with this bill is it is asymmetrical. The cram-down provision, section 3, is absolute and certain. The certainty of economic reforms on that island are not certain. It is asymmetrical in that form.

So I look at the Jones Act. I was in a transportation hearing yesterday, and it was pointed out that the cost of delivering a 20-foot container from the East Coast of the United States is double the cost of what it would be to deliver that same container to the Dominican Republic or to Haiti.

I look at the corporate tax there. They used to have a very competitive corporate tax rate on the island of Puerto Rico. That Federal clause lapsed, and now they are not so competitive.

But why don't we have it in this bill? In other words, if we are going to have a cram-down provision, which really deals with the sanctity of law, general obligation bonds, what they do or don't mean, why wouldn't we have incorporated, as well, other provisions that could make the island more competitive, whether that deals with the Jones Act corporate tax—or, for instance, we have a bill on the minimum wage.

If you look at what has happened in American Samoa, or if you look in the Northern Mariana Islands, other territories of the United States, what we did as a Congress is to say: You know what? The prevailing wage of that region of the Pacific is not the same as what you would see in the domestic United States. Therefore, let's give them discretion in how they set their minimum wage.

Our bill says that same thing. The prevailing wage of the Caribbean Basin is not the same as you would see in the domestic United States. Why not give them that same option so that they can become more competitive as they compete with Haiti and the Dominican Republic and other neighboring islands down that way?

So I am going to continue to study this issue, but I am genuinely concerned about what it could mean.

I just want to take one second—can I take one more second?—to read the cram-down provision because, in the bill, under title III, it incorporates 1129(b) of the Federal Code. Let me just read that so it is on the record.

''Notwithstanding section 510(a) of this title, if all of the applicable requirements of subsection (a) of this section other than the paragraph (8) are met with respect to a plan, the court, on request of the proponent of the plan, shall confirm the plan notwithstanding the requirements of such paragraph if the plan does not discriminate unfairly, and is fair and equitable, with respect to each class of claims or interests that is impaired under . . . the plan.''

I could go on. It is Greek. It is written in legalese. But the point is this bill has an absolute cram-down provision, which is to open up new territory with regard to how territories handle debt, and I think we need to be very, very, very wary of that provision; and, at minimum, if we are going to include something like that, include wholescale changes that would make the island more competitive so that they can, in fact, pay off their debts because, if you don't do anything to improve the economy, we are going to end up back in this same problem, whether it is 12 months from now or 12 years from now.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman is exactly right. It seems like the big push is to resolve the issue of what is owed to the bondholders who invested money; and, apparently, they are the ones running commercials in some people's districts about, oh, don't do a bailout, because they want to get their full money on what they invested. I sure understand that.

But as my friend has pointed out, we can't be sure that there will be any reforms. I know some of our friends, we think, well, there is such massive unemployment. Well, one cure in some places to help with massive unemployment is to lower the minimum wage and get more people to work, and that is being suggested; but in Puerto Rico, I was reading that, for a typical family of three, if someone works a 40-hour-per-week minimum wage job, at the current minimum wage before it is lowered like some people are advocating, the take-home is under $1,200. However, the welfare payments they would be entitled to, typically, on average, would be about $1,800 a month; so sometimes lowering the minimum wage would be a solution.

In Puerto Rico, where—and of course I think it is totally appropriate and fair, as the Founders said: If they don't elect one representative to the body that makes taxes, then they have no right to make taxes on us. So, in Puerto Rico, which is also true of Guam, Samoa, the Mariana Islands, any territory where they elect a delegate or they don't elect a full voting Representative, because those come from the several States, they don't pay any Federal income tax.

So I had in my mind that, wow, Puerto Rico could be the American Hong Kong. They have all the Federal benefits. I read one estimate that 20 percent of all of the income made by people in Puerto Rico is actually welfare benefits, paid by people of the 50 States.

But some of the towns—I saw a chart—I think the highest was right at 46 percent of the local community work for government. And, you know, you have got communities, 28,000, 35,000, where 40 percent of the whole population works for the government. Something has to be done about that.

Our friend, fellow Republican Luis Fortuño, got elected Governor, and he could see the handwriting on the wall. We have got to get our government down and under control because, if we are going to expect anybody to help us at all, we have got to show we are able to take care of our own problems. He was promptly fired at the next election for trying to get the massive government bureaucracy under control. That hasn't been dealt with. There is no indication it will actually be dealt with.

President Obama will make all the appointments of the board we are talking about that will have oversight, but those will come from recommendations from Minority Leader PELOSI, Speaker RYAN, Majority Leader MCCONNELL, and Minority Leader REID; and the President will make what will be the deciding vote on close calls. So there are no assurances that there is going to be reform in these areas.

As my friend, Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma, has pointed out, Puerto Rico had the only area, he was telling me, in the world where all of our military branches could come together and do tactical exercises, you know, storm the beach type of things. And that was taken away; and that land, 17,000 or so acres, is owned by the Department of the Interior.

Puerto Rico, apparently, is part of this deal. They don't want to sell any Puerto Rican land, but they are willing to let the Department of the Interior sell their land and give that money to Puerto Rico. So we are not giving them direct payments, but the Department of the Interior, part of this deal is going to be selling things.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman would yield, and then I will leave it to you.

You hit on Luis Fortuño, and I do want to shout out, I worked with him in a former role in government, and you are absolutely correct. What he tried to do, I think, was brave in political terms, courageous, and he paid a price for it in the political world; but I think that the record will show that he was trying to do the right thing on that front.

I think also, what has happened here is a reminder of how, if everybody is in charge, nobody is in charge. And too much of what we see, again, I absolutely empathize with the plight that leadership finds themselves in in terms of: How do you manage these competitive interests of the need to have financial stability on an island like Puerto Rico, and how do you manage that with the precedent that it might set for other States and other territories and the overall notion of financial responsibility?

I see your time is about to wind up, so I am going to stop for you since it was your time. Thank you for letting me borrow a few minutes of it.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 18, 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:

5045. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acequinocyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0382; FRL-9944-34] received April 13, 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 Energy and Commerce.

5046. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R02-2015-NY2; FRL-9935-51-Region 2] received April 13, 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 Energy and Commerce.

5047. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Findings of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for Attainment of the 2010 1-Hour Primary Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0098; FRL-9944-88-OAR] received April 13, 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 Energy and Commerce.

5048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-088, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-148, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-107, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5051. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-061, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5052. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification, pursuant to Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Secs. 614(a)(3) and 652; Public Law 111-117, div. F, Sec. 7009(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5053. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-133, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-32 9, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5054. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-099, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-32 329, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5055. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hizballah Financial Sanctions Regulations received April 13, 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.

5056. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List the Tanzanian DPS of African Coelacanth (Latimeria chalumnae) as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No.: 141219999-6207-02] (RIN: 0648-XD681) received April 13, 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4240. A bill to require an independent review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and subsets of the TSDB, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 4678. A bill to prohibit modification, abrogation, abandonment, or other related actions with respect to United States jurisdiction and control over United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without congressional action (Rept. 114–496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4974. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to exclude the receipts and disbursements of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation from the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 4956. A bill to provide that no Federal funds, fees, or resources may be used to implement certain executive orders, to suspend rule making authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 4957. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 99 New York Avenue, N.E., in the District of Columbia as the ''Ariel Rios Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 4958. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to review and update a report on the energy and environmental benefits of the refining of used lubricating oil; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 4959. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the designation of surgical health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4960. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to protect individuals and businesses from unforeseen consequences that may result from Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. ESTY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 4962. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit the extent to which States may tax the compensation earned by nonresident telecommuters and other multi-State workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 4963. A bill to better protect, serve, and advance the rights of victims of elder abuse and exploitation by establishing a program to encourage States and other qualified entities to create jobs designed to hold offenders accountable, enhance the capacity of the justice system to investigate, pursue, and prosecute elder abuse cases, identify existing resources to leverage to the extent possible, and assure data collection, research, and evaluation to promote the efficacy and efficiency of the activities described in this Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4964. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rapid acquisition of directed energy weapons systems by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4965. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance medical device communications and ensure device cleanliness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 4966. A bill to establish requirements for reusable medical devices relating to cleaning instructions and validation data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4967. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 relating to the distribution of food; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4968. A bill to require executive agencies to notify the public and consider public comment before relocating an office of the agency that has regular contact with the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 4969. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide for informational materials to educate and prevent addiction in teenagers and adolescents who are injured playing youth sports and subsequently prescribed an opioid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the use of prepaid debit cards in the issuance of tax refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 4971. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a criminal penalty for recklessly damaging or destroying certain pipeline facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the availability of penalty-free distributions to unemployed individuals from retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a work opportunity tax credit for the older long-term unemployed recipient, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. PALMER):

H.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to ''Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to exercise its veto in the United Nations Security Council on resolutions regarding the Israeli-Palestinian peace process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Res. 684. A resolution recognizing the achievements of America's high school valedictorians of the graduating class of 2016, encouraging civic engagement, and commending academic excellence of all American high school students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H. Res. 685. A resolution recognizing Linemen, the profession of Linemen, and the contributions of these brave men and women to protect public safety, and expressing support of designation of April 18, 2016, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4954.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 4955.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

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. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 4956.

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

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

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4957.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 4958.

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

Article I, Section 8.: ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carryin 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. BUCSHON:

H.R. 4959.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4960.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads''

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4961.

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

The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 4962.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4963.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 4964.

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

Art. 1, Sec. 8:

''The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defence . . .

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4965.

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

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4966.

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

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4967.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4968.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4969.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to: Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4970.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4971.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4972.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4973.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4974.

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

Pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 87.

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

Article I, section 8 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. BUCK and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 379: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 624: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 711: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 789: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 793: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 846: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 923: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1192: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1206: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1221: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1336: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1342: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1431: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1432: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1457: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1542: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1550: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1594: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1611: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1733: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1769: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1969: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1988: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2121: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2124: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VELA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2215: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2237: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2283: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2368: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2460: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2461: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2513: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2571: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2589: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2590: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2658: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 2726: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2737: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 2759: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2799: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2811: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2844: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2894: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2901: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2903: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2939: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2980: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3007: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3012: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3095: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3110: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3119: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3209: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3222: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3227: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3235: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 3308: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3310: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3323: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3326: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3381: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3412: Mr. VALADAO,

H.R. 3470: Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3520: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3604: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3706: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3722: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3724: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 3742: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. STEWART, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3846: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3865: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3886: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3917: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3929: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COLE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 3982: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 4019: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4073: Mr. SWALWELL of California

H.R. 4118: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 4144: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 4223: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 4229: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 4268: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4301: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4352: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4371: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4386: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4399: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 4447: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4488: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4498: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4514: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4523: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4524: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4537: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 4586: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4594: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4603: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4607: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4612: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4614: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4615: Ms. HAHN and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 4621: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4625: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 4626: Mr. MARINO and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 4640: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4651: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4653: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4667: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 4695: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 4701: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4712: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4715: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LONG, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4717: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4729: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4751: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4760: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4764: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4773: Mr. BRAT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARR, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 4775: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 4794: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4795: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YODER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4798: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4813: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 4828: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 4833: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 4835: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4840: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4848: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4880: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PALMER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4884: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 4885: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 4895: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 4897: Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4904: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 4922: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 4923: Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4924: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4926: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 4928: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 4932: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. KEATING.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COLE, and Mr. BARR.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. JOLLY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 343: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 402: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 451: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 487: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 494: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 540: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 590: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BLUM.

H. Res. 674: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. WALKER.