



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2013

No. 107

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER, to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

THE SEVENTH UNANSWERED QUESTION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I've come to the floor to raise the seventh in a series of critical but unanswered questions about the terrorist attacks on the U.S. consulate and annex in Benghazi last September 11.

Despite a year of investigation in a number of committees, the American people still do not know the answers to these questions, nor do they know if they have even been asked.

With only 5 legislative days remaining before the Congress departs for August recess, I'm increasingly concerned that none of these questions will be answered by the one-year anniversary of the Benghazi attack.

According to a recent excerpt in the forthcoming book, "Under Fire: The Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi," which was published in this month's Vanity Fair magazine, Ambassador Stevens made several calls for help after reaching what he believed was a safe room on the consulate compound.

As we well know now, one call was placed to his Deputy Chief of Mission, Gregory Hicks, who was at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli. In May, Hicks provided powerful testimony about that final conversation with Stevens.

He also called "local militia and public-security commanders in Benghazi, pleading for help."

What I found interesting in the Vanity Fair excerpt is that Stevens also made calls to "nearby consulates" on the BlackBerry of someone on his security detail. Assuming the authors are correct, the government must have the phone records from Stevens' calls to the militia and foreign consulates that night.

This raises the important question of what foreign consulates did he call, and how did these consulates respond?

If Stevens was calling foreign consulates, it also begs the question, did U.S. officials in Tripoli or Washington call any allies with assets in Libya to help respond to the attack?

Furthermore, did the Pentagon connect any NATO allies with military assets in the region that could have provided assistance that night?

Given how close many of the European allies are to the Mediterranean, wouldn't they have planes or response teams stationed in locations in or near by the region that could have mobilized upon a request from Washington?

After speaking of force posture, what have we done to ensure that if another incident were to happen this September 11 that we're prepared to respond?

We're less than 2 months away from the 9/11 anniversary, but the American people don't know whether we're any more capable of responding to an incident in North Africa or the Middle East.

The American people have lost confidence in this investigation. We can help restore it with a bipartisan select committee.

EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I've come to this floor nearly every week since the sequester took effect in March to highlight its dangerous consequences to our national security, its harmful impact on our economy, and the pain it is causing the most vulnerable people in our country.

Now, with the sequester in its 21st week, this Congress has still not achieved the big, balanced and bipartisan solution to deficits that we need to replace the sequester and put America back on a sound fiscal path.

Only such an agreement, Mr. Speaker, can provide a viable alternative to the irrational cuts this sequestration has imposed. Those cuts are already exacerbating the many challenges we face as a Nation.

Later this week, I will be delivering meals to seniors in my district with the Meals on Wheels program, which could be delivering 4 million fewer meals nationwide as a result of the sequester.

One small business owner from my district recently reached out to my staff to say that he was personally impacted by Meals on Wheels when the

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4981

grandmother who raised him was diagnosed with cancer and came to rely on Meals on Wheels during the final part of her life.

He couldn't believe that after all the good work the Prince George's County Meals on Wheels office had done, that they were being forced to reduce their operations significantly as a result of the sequester.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the richest country on the face of the Earth does not need to leave people, particularly seniors who can't get out, hungry.

Other harmful effects on the most vulnerable Americans include an 11 percent cut to emergency unemployment insurance payments and 125,000 fewer rental assistance vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, as many as 70,000 children could be kicked out of Head Start—they're only going to be 4 once—including approximately 800 children in my own State.

I read on Monday in The Washington Post about the Whitney Young Head Start Center in Yonkers, New York, Mr. Speaker, which has served primarily Hispanic families for more than 12 years, teaching kids English and providing them medical services and meals. It closed down on Friday, a victim of sequestration.

And on Monday, an article in the Huffington Post drew attention to an effect of the sequester that represents a dangerous undermining of justice, and that is the cut to public defenders who represent defendants in the Federal court system who cannot afford their own attorneys. This fulfills the Constitutional requirement that everyone is entitled to legal representation. It can't be waived.

That report in The Washington Post says, "The Public Defender system hasn't just been stripped bare by sequestration, its bones have been chiseled away as well."

Mr. Speaker, can we risk delaying justice for victims and their families because our country can't afford public defenders?

Do we want cases dismissed against people who have done wrong because the Constitution says they have to have a defense that we can't afford, apparently?

I met yesterday with Maryland District Court judges, about eight of them, and they raised this issue as one of critical importance. And one of the judges, a Reagan appointee, was obviously very animated at how we were undermining the very essence of the judicial system. Surely no one on this floor intends to do that.

At the Defense Department, 650,000 civilian workers are already being furloughed 2 days a month. That's an effective cut in pay of 20 percent for hardworking people on whom we rely to maintain the national security of our country.

On July 2, I visited with civilian defense workers from Pax River Naval Air Station in St. Mary's County, and I heard from my constituents there

who are being forced to stay home from work without pay. They were certainly concerned about their families' finances.

But Mr. Speaker, these hardworking and patriotic public servants were far more worried about furloughs' effect on our military readiness and support for our troops in the field on those Fridays when many are forced to stay home, and not at their post. Legally, they can't even come to work and volunteer their time.

The sequester is hurting morale and putting our security at risk, Mr. Speaker, at a moment when our troops are still in harm's way every single day, Fridays, otherwise known as furlough days, included.

I'll be going to another installation in Maryland's Fifth District on Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, to meet with civilian employees there. I will tell them that Congress has the ability to end the furloughs they are experiencing now.

We have the ability to keep those kids from losing Head Start, and our seniors from losing meals. We have that ability now. We can do so by coming together in a bipartisan way to replace the sequester with a balanced alternative that includes spending cuts and, yes, revenues.

This is what Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has put forward seven times, Mr. Speaker, only to see it prevented by the majority from receiving a vote.

The Speaker says, let the House work its will. Well, perhaps this is the will of the House. I hope not.

I urge my colleagues to work together across the aisle so we can end the sequester and restore fiscal discipline in a way that does not harm our security, our economy, the most vulnerable in our country, or America itself.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic in the well while another Member is under recognition.

FEAR OF MAN IS A SNARE

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to call for a change in the House calendar.

Mr. Speaker, leaders set priorities. They identify the challenges and opportunities that face their organization, then they assess them and put them in the right order, and then they align their organization's calendar to make sure that those top priorities get addressed. That's what the American people rightfully expect of each of us.

Overall, our calendar and the priorities of the House are right on track.

I'm so proud of the legislation that we've passed that would move America to energy independence and create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But in one very critical area we're seriously off track. Our calendar does not reflect the challenges and the top priorities of our country. Specifically, we're not on track to pass all 12 appropriations bills that fund the Federal Government for 2014.

The fact is, we're not even close to passing those bills. And with our current congressional calendar, I cannot possibly see a way that we can pass those bills by September 30, which is the end of the current fiscal year.

This is not without consequence. It damages our economy, job creation. It damages our military in a very real way. And ultimately, it hurts hardworking American families.

Now, let's look at the status of the 12 bills, and then look at the time that remains on the congressional calendar to debate and pass those bills in time to avoid what's referred to as a continuing resolution.

And make no mistake here. A continuing resolution is wholly inadequate as a financial vehicle to fund this government. It has serious adverse consequences, and that's why this topic merits the careful attention of this body, and that's why it merits a change in our congressional calendar.

Well, here are the 12 bills that must be passed. We've passed four of them. Well, that leaves eight. My math's pretty good—there are 12 bills, 4 have been completed.

Now, they're not past due right now, but they surely will be, at least some of them.

As I mentioned, this has serious repercussions. I've spent a tremendous amount of time in our district listening to the hardworking men and women who keep our country safe and those who support them.

Every time we pass a continuing resolution, our military reels with uncertainty. We have a deep obligation to the young men and women around the world who are keeping this country safe to use every dollar wisely to ensure that we get the very best equipment and support to each of them.

That's why I feel so strongly about this issue, and it burdens me when we fail the American people in this respect.

Well, let's look on at the calendar and see what we've got to work with here.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we have 15 calendar days. They're indicated right here in the teal green color. These areas here represent constituent work periods. I work really hard in our constituent work periods. I know that every Member here does. It's important that we're in our districts. There's value to that—to listen and to be accountable to the good folks who sent us here.

That said, a principle function and what the American people are expecting of us is that we pass these 12 appropriations bills. So if what is referred to as the August recess is brought to this body for a vote, I will vote "no." I'll encourage every Member of this body to vote "no," Democrat and Republican. When an organization is facing profound challenges, you do what you must do to set it on a better course. It may be House tradition to break, but I submit that it's not wise.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe we ought to be in session 6 days a week, starting at 8 a.m.—earlier, if it were up to me—and then end around 7 p.m. Six days a week. I'm convinced that just that pressure alone would help us to find some common ground that I know exists in this place. That's why I call for a change in the calendar.

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Virginia. I respect his opinion; but with all due respect, I think we've got a more fundamental problem than the calendar. The Republican leadership refuses to allow a conference committee on the budget between the House and the Senate to reconcile our differences. We can be here 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; but if the Republican leadership refuses to allow the process to work, we're not going to get anywhere. And that's where we are right now.

My friends on the Appropriations Committee refuse to deal with the budget level that was passed into law 2 years ago that fixed us on a course. They have a level of funding that is literally slashing and burning Federal spending. The latest manifestation of this battle is putting in jeopardy the very existence of public broadcasting.

I would have hoped that we were past that when the last Congress targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Luckily, the 170 million Americans who don't just listen or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it, unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked it back.

One good thing about that budget battle 2 years ago was that it called for a study to look for alternatives for the 14 percent of Federal money that supports public broadcasting. The study is in and it clearly shows there's no viable alternative to those 14 cents on the dollar.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money, overall, for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, we're told, is going to eliminate Corporation for Public Broadcasting funding.

Last summer, I had a fascinating conversation with my friend Ken Burns, who pointed out that his six projects in the pipeline would never have been made, let alone be seen, without funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. So I hope you enjoyed his show last fall about the Dust Bowl, because if the Republicans have their way, you will never see his programs about the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, or Hemingway.

Remember how well it worked for Governor Romney when he singled out broadcasting as one of the five projects that he would defund? The Republicans, sadly, pander to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep funding for public broadcasting where it is or increase it. What resonates with some Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes.

The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time when America needs public broadcasting the most. "NPR News," the object of the greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media. PBS shows like "Sesame Street" have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational program.

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America, as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There's no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small-town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to inform and serve, not just make money.

We must stop the attack on this critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It's time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen. The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, to terminate public broadcasting as we know it is a powerful signal of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they're supposed to represent.

There's no reason to make public broadcasting, which Republicans including Barry Goldwater, helped launch, into a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike. That's why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and an excellent use of tax dollars for 10 years in a row.

It's time for the people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to defend.

RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on Attorney General Eric Holder's blatant disregard for the rule of law. Mr. Holder's violations of the law are egregious, and he should not be immune from prosecution or given license to act without restraint.

An ordinary citizen would go to jail for selling guns to Mexican drug cartels. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for secretly obtaining phone records and emails. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for lying to Congress about an investigation. What would happen to an ordinary citizen for lying to a judge? This is just a small part of what Attorney General Eric Holder is responsible for.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you, has Attorney General Eric Holder invited anarchy?

I will continue to make this case here in the people's House at the people's pulpit. Folks, I will be back.

COAL ASH AND ENERGY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we can do better. When it comes to legislatively establishing a national energy policy to address climate change, we can and must do better. But we're not. As Members of this body, we're not doing anything. Why?

We are hamstrung by our inability to work together to do great, important, vital things here in this Chamber: things like addressing our national debt, tackling comprehensive immigration reform, and to ever, in the history of this Nation, establish a national energy plan. The only way forward is to establish a national energy plan to address climate change, something this great Nation has always lacked, and to work with public and private entities alike to get this done.

For the climate doubters out there who still question climate change, I remind them that over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have said that climate change is real and that man contributes significantly to it. And zero scientific peer-reviewed studies have said the opposite.

So we must craft a plan that focuses on working with the business community hand-in-hand to be competitive internationally. We must go toe-to-toe with India and China. We must craft a plan that focuses on public transportation and green infrastructure. We must pass a multiyear transportation bill. We must focus on conservation, as

demonstrated so adeptly by our own President's increase in Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and his call to action on climate just a few weeks ago. Above all, we must compromise and work together and be inventive and creative.

I'm not calling on the President for another executive order. I'm not calling on the Senate to move one more piecemeal energy bill that lies holed up in committee. I'm calling on this House.

I know what the critics will say, and my argument is the same as theirs: it's about jobs. Setting standards for carbon-pollution limits for coal plants under the Clean Air Act will not shutter all U.S. plants. On the contrary, it will set achievable standards for existing plants until we can use a patchwork solution to transition to cleaner sources.

Still others will say the Clean Air Act is a draconian doctrine that kills job, slows down American progress, and sets us back as a technology-advanced Nation. Right? Wrong. The Clean Air Act has been the impetus for the only existing technologies that currently exist for power plants, having been required to reduce emittance by 90 percent by 2015. Without such directives coming out of the EPA over the past 40 years, such advancements by polluting power plants would never have been voluntarily made.

We can transition with incentives and a patchwork approach—and compromise.

Several weeks ago, when the President made a major drive on combating climate change, it's too bad he had to bypass Congress to do it. But as a Member of this body, I don't blame him. I would love to say we here in this Chamber would be part of the solution, but I understand why he believes we cannot.

Since Congress has abdicated its desire to pass climate legislation, natural gas has become a panacea for fossil fuel. It's dirt cheap and "cleaner," they say. But it's brought about a renaissance of dirty extraction like hydrofracking or extracting gas from shale in an oftentimes negligent and toxic manner.

Also, our nuclear energy can't compete with China's solar energy. China provided over half the solar panel cells in the U.S. That's over \$3.1 billion within our domestic market—\$3.1 billion we could be capitalizing on, infusing small and mid-sized solar companies across the country, creating and retaining green jobs.

Our attempt to deregulate or fight rules promulgated from the EPA isn't working either. Take the bill we're considering this week, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, which would set up a separate management stream which would bypass the EPA. Per the Congressional Research Service, this standard, as established by the bill, pays no mind to public health. The CRS memo, written at the request of

the House and Energy and Commerce Committee states:

This bill fails to establish minimum national safeguards, fails to establish Federal backstop authority, fails to define what facility the bill applies to, fails to contain any minimum Federal requirement to protect health and the environment.

It's time this body became a relevant advocate and participant in solving the great questions that plague our Nation today before we lose a chance to have a tomorrow.

ENERGY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it's been a tough week for American consumers. Yesterday, it was reported that under the Federal Bureau of Land Management's new proposed onshore hydraulic fracturing regulations, businesses will suffer—as will the rate of production in developing our Nation's plentiful natural gas. Yes, a clean and affordable resource.

Reuters News reports:

The Obama administration hopes the rules on public lands will serve as a model for State oversight of drilling on private lands.

This plan is no secret. U.S. Interior Secretary Sally Jewell said as much in her testimony before the House Natural Resources Committee in July. Make no mistake: these Federal regulations are being developed as a model to be used across the country.

The development of our Nation's domestic energy resources has been one of the few bright spots in a struggling economy. It's very clear how and why this era of growth and innovation came to be. Take a look at the production rates on State and private lands versus Federal lands and you will see why. Production is up on the former and way down on the latter. Unfortunately, the administration wants to close this gap by putting the Federal Government in control and imposing costly new mandates everywhere that production is taking place.

□ 1030

It's bad for business, Mr. Speaker. What's worse, it's bad for consumers by making the cost of heating their homes that much more expensive.

And it doesn't stop with natural gas. Coal is also in the administration's crosshairs. Only with coal, the White House has a hair trigger, a scope, and a silencer. Case in point: a sweeping new coal regulation quietly being put forward by the administration known as the Stream Buffer Zone Rule.

Yesterday, Joseph Pizarchik, Director of the Federal Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement at the U.S. Department of the Interior, testified before the House Natural Resources Committee on the new rule. The Interior Department has largely stonewalled the Committee's investiga-

tion into the rewrite of the coal regulation and failed to comply with multiple subpoenas.

Similar to the Director's testimony, the entire rulemaking process for this new regulation has lacked transparency. What we do know is that the administration has failed to even consider the new rule's economic impact on local economies, such as those in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, the conduct of OSM is emblematic of the Obama administration's complete disregard for the health of our economy. As many as 220,000 jobs are at risk in the Appalachia region alone as a consequence of the proposed rule. Thousands more are at stake nationally.

DOI regulations require that OSM collaborate "to the fullest extent possible" with the States developing this rule. DOI regulations also require that OSM collaborate with States "at the earliest possible time" so that all stakeholders can evaluate the rule and consider possible alternatives.

Yesterday, when asked whether or not States have been provided with information regarding the new rule and related changes, the OSM Director stated he does not believe that there have been any contacts during the last year with the impacted States. When further pressed as to whether his office had made any contact with States and other cooperating agencies, the Director stated that he was unaware of any such communications.

Mr. Speaker, this White House will stop at no end to assault the fossil fuels industry along with the millions of jobs it supports and the low energy costs that it provides.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the environment and developing our abundant natural resources, such as coal and natural gas, are not mutually exclusive, but this is not something that this administration would like to admit.

This week, the administration continued to move ahead with policies that will cost more jobs and further harm family budgets through higher electricity rates. This week, the administration continued to grossly underestimate the cumulative impact of their regulatory actions. And this week was another tough week for the American consumer.

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to many of my good friends and to colleagues. We are, in fact, good friends and colleagues hoping to do what is right on behalf of the American people. I always appreciate and respect those individuals who have chosen to serve the Nation, so I take issue very briefly with my good friend and colleague about the criminal acts of one of the most honest and forthright Attorney Generals of the United States of America.

Attorney General Holder has not been charged with criminal activity, except for the aggressive and desperate actions of our Republican friends. He has been noted for his great leadership on civil rights and criminal justice issues. He's been a leader on the prohibiting and fighting against human trafficking. And certainly he has been one who has stood up for our children in this Nation, and also the many law enforcement officers who are on the front lines protecting us here in America. I hope that we can respect those who offer themselves to the service of this Nation for as long as Attorney General Eric Holder has done.

I have listened to friends as well speak about the devastation of the sequester. I again suggest to my colleagues that, through H.R. 900, a simple bill that eliminates the sequester and goes back to the budget reconciliation of 2011 and, as well, to force or to push this Republican majority to move to conference, would be the better approach.

I, too, have gone and delivered meals for Meals on Wheels, and I've seen the faces of seniors who will now face serious cuts in this effort. I see the loss of 750,000 jobs. I see the impact on the economy, where the unemployment has stayed somewhat static. But when you go into the business community and the hesitation, even though Wall Street is thriving, it all points to the fact of the sequester. It has become a dirty word. It has become one that has victimized the American public: it has victimized young families; it has victimized college students; it has victimized seniors; it has victimized those who are ill. And yet we continue to, piece by piece, fix the FAA problem but do not address the 70,000 children that are suffering and losing seats in Head Starts.

I remember, as the Head Start seats were being lost, fathers crying when they were told by their Head Start facility that their child would no longer have a seat. It seems sad that we would cut Head Start or disaster aid by \$1 billion because we have Head Start, or the Department of Transportation, \$1.9 billion, when many of us know that those are the basic reasons for job creation is building America's infrastructure.

As we plod along with sequester and we see good public workers not being able to work—and might I just say, let me thank our own staff, which gets condemned all the time. You work for a U.S. Member of Congress, and every day our staff fights to help some constituent keep their house from being foreclosed on or keep a Medicare recipient continuing to get their benefits or veterans, and yet we are furloughing them. We are cutting people that are mere workers, that are working for us. They can't make ends meet. They're getting second jobs. It's a disgrace. It's an absolute disgrace. I am not going to condemn our staff—committee staff, government staff. They are working for the American people.

Then I want to offer a disagreement, Mr. Speaker. I know the Senate is going to vote on a student loan program. They say it's a compromise. Well, I've got to tell my students, because I've held campus meetings, we've met, I've got to tell them and I've got to tell the parents, yes, they're going to get a low interest rate today, but watch out for tomorrow because it's a trigger. Before you know it, they may be paying 10 percent.

They say it's a cap, but I don't know what the cap is going to be as it relates to whether a student can pay 6 percent or 7 percent, when they can stay at 3.4 percent. As someone said, why should the Federal Government be making money on the backs of students? I'm concerned about that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say there has been a lot of discussion this week about issues of race, issues of the tragedy of Trayvon Martin. I intend to introduce the Justice Exists for All Act, a review, as Senator MCCAIN has suggested, of the Stand Your Ground legislation across America. It will increase public safety. It will reduce the incidence of gun violence, among other things, by providing incentives for any State with the Stand Your Ground law to amend it to require a duty to retreat. For States that do not require a duty to retreat, we will question their Federal funding and assess their Justice Department funding and reduce it by 20 percent.

We will also decrease the incidence of gun violence resulting from vigilantes by reducing by 20 percent the funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to any State that does not require local neighborhood watch programs be registered with a local enforcement agency, and require the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, to study Stand Your Ground laws.

Let's speak to the pain of the American people. Let's look at ways of fixing the law.

COMMENDING ERIC WOLF ON HIS ACCEPTANCE TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an extraordinary young man from Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District. Eric Wolf was accepted to and is now attending the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Since high school, Eric has been preparing for a career in the military. He follows the path of both his grandfathers—one who was a marine, and the other a World War II veteran.

Eric said that he felt the call to serve his country after reading the book "Lone Survivor," which led him to look at what he was doing to give back to our great Nation.

In addition to his appointment, Eric built a solid reputation in his home-

town of Cleveland, Tennessee. He graduated from McCallie High School with a 4.1 GPA and was a star athlete.

Eric's drive and unabashed patriotism exemplify the best of our country. I wish him the best of luck and know that he will make us all proud.

END HUNGER NOW #19—CHEFS FIGHTING HUNGER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the 19th time this year, I rise to talk about my effort to End Hunger Now. Nearly every week this year, I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America and how we can End Hunger Now.

Today, I want to talk about a group of people who are fighting hunger around this country. At first, they may seem like an unlikely group of antihunger advocates; but look deeper, and it's easy to see how their connection to good, healthy food makes them natural allies in our effort to End Hunger Now.

Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about America's chefs, the culinary artists who cook for all of us, whether we're eating at a neighborhood restaurant or fine dining establishments. America's chefs have recognized that hunger and obesity are problems in America, and they know how important access to healthy food is for proper development no matter what age a hungry or malnourished person is.

Chefs across this country, including White House Chef Sam Kass, have rallied behind First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move Campaign, and especially the healthy eating component of her campaign. They understand that healthy food is critical for healthy bodies and minds. But what's less well known is that these same chefs have also picked up the mantle of hunger in America. They realize that hunger and obesity are the opposite sides of the same coin—that it's possible to be hungry and obese simply because you lack money to buy healthy foods; and, in many cases, healthier options, including fresh fruits and vegetables, simply aren't available.

That's why these chefs have been working on eliminating food deserts, those areas, both urban and rural, where there isn't access to low-cost, healthy, and nutritious foods. And they've been working with food banks and other antihunger organizations on ways to provide food to poor and needy Americans. This includes vigorously defending SNAP and the child nutrition programs.

One of the great leaders on hunger from the culinary industry is Tom Colicchio, someone I'm proud to call a friend and ally. Tom wears several hats: he's a successful restaurateur with restaurants across this country from Los Angeles to New York, and

he's a television celebrity with his role as judge on "Top Chef"; but most recently, and more importantly to millions of Americans who may never have the opportunity to eat at one of his restaurants, Tom is an advocate for the hungry and for those who are trying to improve their lives.

He was a vocal supporter of the Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act that increased funding for school meals in order to improve the nutritional quality of food served at schools. But he's also a producer of the documentary "A Place at the Table," a beautifully filmed, heart-wrenching movie about hunger in America. His role in our fight to End Hunger Now cannot be understated, and his efforts are needed and appreciated.

Then there is my dear friend, Chef Jose Andres, who brings a passion and a commitment to ending hunger. He has dedicated himself to raising awareness, challenging policymakers, and giving back to the community in ways, both large and small, that have really made a difference to ending hunger in America and around the world.

And he's not alone. Chefs like Mark Murray, Rachael Ray, Bryan Voltaggio, and Charlie Palmer, just to name a few, all lend their names, their restaurants, and themselves to the fight to End Hunger Now. Working through antihunger organizations like Share Our Strength, founded and run by my good friend Billy Shore, these chefs are reducing hunger in so many different and unique ways.

But it's not just the famous celebrity chefs who are helping. Share Our Strength has a program called Cooking Matters, where chefs teach low-income families healthier ways to cook food. Together with their Shopping Matters program, where these same families can learn how to navigate their local markets to purchase the healthiest food they can afford, these programs are fighting hunger at local levels. And the chefs involved, from Arkansas to Colorado to Massachusetts, are using their expertise to teach these families the healthiest ways to cook food.

Chefs are just one of the nontraditional groups that are out in the real world fighting hunger. They are leading by example. And their actions need to be highlighted not just on the House floor, but at the White House, at a White House conference on food and nutrition. Chefs should absolutely be part of such a conference where they can talk about their efforts and ways they can help low-income families improve their cooking and eating habits.

These chefs and the organizations they partner with are a key part of our fight to End Hunger Now. I commend them for their dedication, and I look forward to working with them in this effort.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Lillian Kawasaki, who proudly served the Los Angeles community for more than three decades, working tirelessly to protect our environment.

Lillian was an inspiration and a trailblazer. In 1990, she was named general manager of the Department of Environmental Affairs for the City of Los Angeles, becoming the first Asian American in city history to be appointed a department chief.

It is because of Lillian's leadership and her vision that Los Angeles launched major initiatives in air and water quality protection and environmental cleanup. Local businesses began investing in renewable energy thanks to Lillian Kawasaki.

I had the privilege of working with Lillian when she served as board director for the Water Replenishment District. It would be hard to find a public official more involved in her community than Lillian was.

On a personal note, it was an honor for me to call her a close friend. Lillian was an extraordinarily giving person. She always remembered birthdays and anniversaries. She asked me often how my family and my son were doing because she truly cared.

□ 1045

I offer my condolences to Lillian's husband, to her family, and to her loved ones. She was a tremendous public servant, a shining example for others, and a generous and truly kind human being, and I will miss her greatly.

DETROIT BANKRUPTCY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the city of Detroit, Michigan, became the largest municipality in our Nation's history to file for bankruptcy. Without a doubt, the situation in Detroit is extreme. Their problems in part have been driven by local mismanagement. But it would be an oversimplification, and I think a dangerous oversimplification, for folks to continue to lay the entire responsibility for Detroit's situation on the failure of management.

Since last week, Detroit has been on the front page of America's newspapers and has become the recent, I guess, poster child of municipal decline and insolvency. But for the few cities like Detroit that have actually filed bankruptcy, there are many other legacy cities in this country that continue to struggle day in and day out to provide basic services for their residents.

Many municipalities are facing not just fiscal insolvency but service level challenges, perhaps not on the same scale as Detroit, but that does not

mean that they are immune to the problems that Detroit is facing. My own hometown of Flint, Michigan, is on that same path and is struggling every day to provide basic services in an increasing period of fiscal stress.

Detroit's bankruptcy should be a call to action to have a much bigger conversation in this country about how we support and fund our cities and our great metropolitan areas. Cities are where our creativity takes place and where much of our wealth has been generated in the past, and that can and should be the future for America's cities. Let me be clear: bankruptcy for Detroit will not be a solution to its problems or for any other city.

While it is arguable that this bankruptcy may be necessary, it will not be sufficient to solve the problem. It may bring order to an otherwise chaotic situation, but it will not solve the problem itself, and it will have real consequences for people in Detroit and southeastern Michigan and the entire State.

You can simply dissolve a corporation through bankruptcy, but you can't dissolve a city, which is a place where hundreds of thousands of people, in this case, live and raise their families.

Lots of factors have contributed to the decline of a whole subset of America's cities—population laws, trade policy that moves jobs out of those communities overseas or out of those cities into the metropolitan areas through land use practices, a municipal finance system that fails to recognize the realities of the 21st century. This is a big issue, and it is one that calls for a much larger national conversation about how we support our cities.

First, Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure to do no harm to these places that are struggling. The Republican budget that will come to this floor within the next few weeks proposes deep cuts to programs like the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME program—a 40 percent cut for programs that are intended to help communities reposition themselves in this challenged economy. Yet, at a time when cities are facing distress, like the city of Detroit, my hometown of Flint, and many others, when the Federal Government could provide some help that would be in our national interest, we see cuts proposed to these really important programs.

So whether at the State or Federal level, we all have a role to play. It is time that all levels of government start thinking about the long-term sustainability of our cities not because it is good for those places, but because it is in our national interest. Detroit's bankruptcy should be a day of reckoning for all of us, not just for the residents of the Motor City, but for everybody.

Rethinking the way we support our cities and our metropolitan areas is not an easy conversation for us to have. It will be tough. It will cause us to challenge conventional thinking and

challenge our own views of the importance of cities.

These may be tough conversations, but they are absolutely necessary that we have to take on as a Nation. We cannot sit idly by and pretend that Detroit won't matter and that it won't affect us and wait for the next Detroit to happen. It is important for our Nation, it is important for our people, it is important for our competitiveness, it is important for our economy, it is important that we be a competitive place. And the only way we do that is with vital and rich growing communities, and we have to get places like Detroit and Flint and Saginaw and Pontiac and other places that are important to this economy back on that trajectory.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the recent rising unacceptable unemployment numbers in some regions of our Nation. The fact is Republicans control this House, and they are not only doing nothing to create jobs in America, they are actually creating more unemployment.

In my home State of Ohio, the unemployment rate jumped up to 7.2 percent. In the city of Cleveland, the unemployment rate rose from 9 percent to 10.1 percent over the past month. In the city of Lorain, unemployment dramatically rose from 8.7 to 10.6 percent. In the city of Toledo, we saw an increase in unemployment from 8.7 to 9.3 percent.

Nationally, the unemployment rate remains stalled, stuck, at 7.6 percent. But in too many neighborhoods across our country unemployment is a daily reality.

When you incorporate labor underutilization, the real national unemployment rate is actually 14.3 percent. There are currently 11.8 million, nearly 12 million, unemployed people in this country—4.3 million people have been jobless for 27 weeks or more and are considered long-term unemployed.

New Federal Government employment has declined by 65,000 persons over the past 12 months—65,000 more people spit out.

The unemployment rate for the construction industry is 9.8 percent. Manufacturing employment has declined in the past 4 straight months.

Do those job numbers sound like an economic recovery to you? What is the Republican response to these dubious unemployment and jobs numbers? Block the President.

So what do they do? Let's repeal the Affordable Care Act 38 times. And they've tried again and again to do that.

Let's not appoint budget conferees so we can negotiate a budget deal that puts people to work and strengthens the middle class. No. Sequestration is

arguably the primary driver of these poor job numbers. So, let's ignore the harmful effects of sequestration. The Congressional Budget Office estimates just the unemployment resulting from sequestration costs our economy an additional 1.5 percent in lost economic growth.

Remember when the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that sequestration would reduce economic growth and cost about 750,000 jobs? Well, they were right. We are seeing the effect of that today. The sequester was the largest cause of the negative growth numbers in the fourth quarter of last year.

According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the economy is growing far slower than expected, despite the fact that personal consumption and business inventory spending has increased recently. You would think that if consumer and business spending is up, we would see strong GDP growth, given that our economy is based on consumer spending.

Unfortunately, this is where the sequester and the Republican policy of cut and run, cut and run, cut and run comes into play. Government spending has declined in 11 of the last 13 quarters since the first quarter of 2010.

We may have seen robust growth if we took a sensible, long-term approach to deficit reduction instead of using the Republican shortsighted sequester and steep unfair budget cuts. They are even kicking thousands of mentally ill citizens out of their assisted housing—thousands—over 27,000 people who can't make it on their own being kicked out of their humble shelters across this country.

With the Republicans refusing to replace their mindless sequester, 600,000 civilian defense workers are currently being furloughed. The economic impact of these defense furloughs will be the loss of over an estimated \$2 trillion for our economy; just in Ohio 22,000 furloughs in the civilian defense sector. The policies of this Republican House are hampering robust economic growth across our country.

The Federal Reserve agrees with what I am saying. In a recent hearing the chair of the Fed said, "the economic recovery has continued at a moderate pace in recent quarters despite the strong headwinds created by Federal fiscal policy."

Unfortunately, Republicans will likely continue to refuse to compromise and focus on slowing the economy even further. Congress has already cut spending by \$2.5 trillion. That has real impacts on job creation. Discretionary spending is at its lowest level in 45 years. The Federal deficit is projected to be at its lowest level in recent memory. And the Treasury has actually even recently made payments on the national debt.

We need a jobs bill here, not more reckless cuts. The President has a plan; the Republicans don't. I would urge my Republican colleagues, bring to the

floor the President's jobs agenda. Let's show America which party is committed to job creation in this country, not more stalling.

UPDATE ON PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the birthday of the late Dr. Jose Celso Barbosa, the father of the statehood movement in Puerto Rico, I rise to update my colleagues on the progress that has been made to resolve the territory's political status.

Last November, Puerto Rico held a referendum. As I described in a floor speech the following week, the results show that a majority of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico do not support the current territory status, a supermajority favor statehood among the three alternative options, and more voters want statehood than any other option, including the current status. These results are now part of the historical record, and they cannot be dismissed or diminished by those who find them inconvenient.

Now that American citizens living in an American territory have informed their national government, in a free and fair vote, that they do not consent to a political status that deprives them of the most basic democratic rights, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to take appropriate action in response. For the President and Congress to do otherwise would be to contravene the principles that have made this country a light to the world.

Today, I can report that positive steps have been taken. In April, the administration requested an appropriation of \$2.5 million, which would be provided to the Puerto Rico Elections Commission to conduct the first federally-funded status vote in the territory's history, with the specific purpose of resolving this issue. The administration's action was favorably received by Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, who rarely find common ground. Earlier this month, thanks to the leadership of Congressmen WOLF, FATTAH, and SERRANO, that funding was approved by the Appropriations Committee, confirming that the effort to secure fair treatment for Puerto Rico is not, and should never become, a partisan issue.

The committee's report endorses the conditions proposed by the administration stating that Federal funding will not be obligated until DOJ has certified that the ballot and voter education materials are compatible with U.S. laws and policies, thereby ensuring that the vote will deal with one or more status options that can actually be implemented and that would settle the issue.

I will continue to fight for the approval of this appropriation by the full

House and for its retention in any conference negotiation with the Senate.

There is additional progress to report on another front in this struggle. In May, I introduced stand-alone legislation that proceeds from the indisputable premise that statehood obtained more votes than any other option in the November referendum. The bill outlines the rights and responsibilities of statehood and asks voters in Puerto Rico whether they accept those terms.

□ 1100

If a majority says “yes,” the bill provides for the President to submit legislation to admit Puerto Rico as a State after a transition period.

Two months after its introduction, this bill already enjoys support from 100 Members of Congress from both parties and from every region of this country despite the predictable opposition of the status quo party in Puerto Rico and its allies in Congress. I always find it ironic when some of my colleagues from the States, who, along with their constituents, enjoy all the benefits of statehood, seek to prevent my constituents from exercising those same rights and responsibilities. I have concluded that these forces cannot be reasoned with. They must simply be defeated, and they will be.

Next week, I will appear as a witness at a Senate hearing on the November referendum and the Federal response to that vote. Just as I told a United Nations committee last month, I will testify that I have faith that the Federal Government will fulfill its obligation to facilitate Puerto Rico’s transition to a democratic and dignified status but that deeds, not words, are required.

Much work remains to be done, and like any civil rights struggle, it will not be easy; but through our sound and steady action, we are closer than ever to finally realizing Dr. Barbosa’s dream of equality for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend John Reynolds, Volusia County Baptist Church, Orange City, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Father, we are humbly grateful for Your blessings on our lives and on our

Nation. We ask Your forgiveness in every area where we have failed You.

I pray these honorable Representatives elected to serve You here in this House will seek, find, and follow Your wisdom. You can give simple solutions to complex problems. Our country needs a revival of solutions.

I pray, also, for the needs of all in the House today. Bless them, their families, and their constituents with Your loving care and protection.

Please bless and protect those serving in our military striving to maintain the peace and freedom we enjoy. May we not neglect nor abuse those blessings.

My Father, at Your instruction, I pray for all those in authority over me. I ask that You help Your people to be good citizens for Your glory and the good of this Nation.

In Jesus’ name I pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina 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 remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In light of the fact that I have been working with Alabama Governor Robert Bentley to find the earliest possible date for the special election which will occur following my resignation, so that my successor can be seated at the earliest possible time during the 113th Congress, I wish to inform you that I will resign my seat effective 11:59 p.m., August 2, 2013.

Sincerely,

JO BONNER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2013.

Hon. ROBERT BENTLEY,
Governor, State Capitol,
Montgomery, Alabama.

DEAR GOVERNOR BENTLEY: Pursuant to our conversations, I am notifying you that I will resign from Congress at 11:59 p.m. on August 2, 2013. I share your view that the seat should be vacant for as short a time as possible, and I am pleased the August 2nd date will allow the special election to be completed during 2013.

I remain grateful to the people of the First District of Alabama for allowing me the honor of representing them. Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JO BONNER,
Member of Congress.

WELCOMING PASTOR JOHN REYNOLDS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it’s a great honor today to introduce to the House our Guest Chaplain, Dr. John Reynolds of Orange City, Florida.

To our good fortune in Florida, he was invited by four families to found a church in Orange City, Florida, in 1996. It now has 1,500 members—one of the largest congregations in Volusia County in central Florida—and supports hundreds of missionaries worldwide. In addition to his pastoral work, Dr. Reynolds has preached at conferences across the Nation and foreign countries. His leadership and willingness to help others is an inspiration to us all.

Dr. Reynolds graduated in 1964 from Tennessee Temple College in Chattanooga and started his church ministry. He returned to Temple Baptist Seminary and graduated in 1968. His life experiences include many positions, which include president of a Christian recording company, vice-president of development at his alma mater, and minister of music.

Dr. Reynolds married his lovely wife, Becky, in 1964. They have four children, two of whom are preachers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Dr. Reynolds and

his wife, Becky. We thank him for offering this morning's opening prayer in the United States House of Representatives.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

**PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON THE
ECONOMY**

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I was interested today to hear that the President was going to give a speech about the economy. After all, Republicans have a plan for growth and jobs. We've been focused on that plan, and we certainly welcome the President's ideas.

But the White House says not to expect any new proposals in this speech. The President himself said it isn't going to change any minds. All right, so exactly what will change? What's the point? What's it going to accomplish? I've probably got the answer: nothing. It's a hollow shell. It's an Easter egg with no candy in it.

If the President wants to help, he ought to approve the Keystone pipeline that has bipartisan support here in the House. He ought to work with the bipartisan majority to delay the health care bill to give the American people, their families, and individuals the same break he wants to give to big businesses. And he ought to stop threatening to shut down the government unless we raise taxes. Because Americans aren't asking, Where are the speeches? They're asking, Where are the jobs?

**ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF
CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN
GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT**

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as Speaker BOEHNER has said, later today Members and staff from both parties will come together to remember the tragic shooting that occurred 15 years ago in this Capitol when a lone gunman tried to enter the building through what we now know as the Memorial Door. U.S. Capitol Police Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut—Gibson from Virginia and Chestnut from Maryland—courageously placed themselves between the gunman and not only all of us who serve here but all of us who visit here.

They gave their lives, Mr. Speaker, to protect this institution that is the foundation of our democracy. They died protecting the many people who

come here each day to serve our country, to see their government in action, and put so much of themselves into making America better and stronger and safer for us all.

On this day—and every day—let us remember the heroic sacrifice of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut and let us appreciate the dedicated and often unsung service of the United States Capitol Police personnel, who stand watch every hour over our safety, our lives, and our ability to perform our duties without fear of violence.

May God bless their families and keep us safe.

FOURTH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the run-up to the American Revolution, American colonialists were concerned over the English Government's use of general warrants—giving British authorities the right to enter into private homes or businesses without evidence of wrongdoing—to search for and seize anything they considered contraband under English laws and taxation. This led to the Founding Fathers including this in the United States Constitution:

Amendment IV. The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search and seizures, shall not be violated and no warrants shall be issued but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

That is why this debate over NSA programs is so important. Americans should be secure in their private papers—electronic or otherwise—against unreasonable searches and seizures.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the United States Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that brings each of our 50 States under the umbrella of a single, uniform immigration policy that is easy to understand, is fair, focuses on uniting families, protects new immigrants from exploitation, secures our borders, and creates a path to citizenship for new Americans. It's critical for us to seize this moment.

A group of Republicans and Democrats are working to craft a bipartisan House proposal that establishes a roadmap that is achievable and accompanied by a demonstration of the responsibilities of citizenship for the millions of men and women already living here today to aspire to become citizens of this great Nation. The American people deserve a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

According to the Center for American Progress, immigration reform would create 121,000 jobs each year for the next 10 years. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that fixing our broken immigration system will reduce the Federal deficit by about \$200 billion over the next 10 years and about \$700 billion in the decade after that.

For far too many years, Congress has failed the American people on this issue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right for our country and for families all across America and fix our broken immigration system.

SUPPORT CANCER RESEARCH

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the benefits of cancer research and the importance of the National Institutes of Health, or NIH.

In my home State of Ohio, over 66,000 people will be diagnosed with cancer this year and over 25,000 will lose their battle with this devastating disease. Like every State, Ohio receives essential funding from the NIH each year. The NIH funds lifesaving medical research leading to the development of innovative ways to prevent, diagnose, and treat cancer. This research takes place at universities, hospitals, cancer centers, and labs across my State, including the Case Comprehensive Cancer Center and the James Cancer Center at Ohio State University.

In addition to the benefits of combating cancer and so many other diseases, NIH funding also produces tens of billions of dollars in new economic activity across the country. According to the Ohio Council of Medical Deans, every dollar invested in biomedical research translates to a \$2.21 investment in the local economy. In 2012 alone, Ohio received almost \$800 million in NIH funding, which supported more than 13,000 jobs.

Cancer is a disease that does not discriminate against age or race. Many people have friends or loved ones who have been affected by this terrible disease. I urge my colleagues to support cancer research.

□ 1215

**DEVASTATING FUNDING CUTS TO
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, which is currently awaiting consideration on the House floor, has a devastating 50 percent cut to the Community Development Block Grant program. These

grants provide eligible communities with funding to increase economic activity and create jobs.

Many regions, including western New York, have benefited from the availability of Community Development Block Grants to support neighborhood reinvestment, affordable housing, and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, this program has a strong history of bipartisan support since its creation by President Gerald Ford in 1974. Shamefully, the amount funded this year is actually \$1 billion less than what was allocated to the program 39 years ago.

I'm proud to have joined over 100 of my House colleagues to express concern with this funding cut and urge Community Development Block Grant funding to be fully restored. These cuts, that come at the expense of our local communities, would have a negative impact on the national economy.

OBAMACARE EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, every week I hear from constituents who are being hurt by the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The law is imposing new costs on businesses and workers, reducing take-home pay, reducing the number of jobs available, and reducing the number of hours employees are working.

Survey after survey confirms that the anecdotes I hear from back home are true for Americans across the country. A survey of 300 accountants finds that employers are holding back on hiring workers and that some are even paring back their payrolls.

CNBC reports that doctors are skeptical and confused about the implementation of the law. Workers, doctors, and employers have every right to be confused since the Affordable Care Act is being implemented haphazardly and without regard to the law as it is written. Beneficiaries will sign up for subsidies without income verification.

We don't truly know what we'll get until October, but we can say with confidence that it won't be what the President promised years ago. Americans won't be saving \$2,500 a year, many will lose the coverage they have, and others will have to switch to a new doctor.

Many promises have already been broken, and more disappointment is bound to happen.

OFFENSIVE REMARKS ABOUT DREAMERS

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of our Republican colleagues made remarks about the Hispanic community and

children that have no place in our public discourse. These words offend DREAMers, who have been brought to this country through no fault of their own, and they offend our entire Nation.

In talking about DREAMers, Representative STEVE KING said:

For every one who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds, and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they are hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's more disappointing, that the most extreme voices in the Republican Conference continue to make appalling comments about the Hispanic community or that the rest of my Republican colleagues are silent on this kind of offensive and outrageous rhetoric.

At a time when we should be working together to address our broken immigration system, these hateful words only seek to divide rather than bring people together to find common ground.

It's no wonder that the American people continue to see House Republicans as out of touch when comments like these are made.

ENERGY VISION 2020

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Energy Vision 2020, it's an all-American, all-of-the-above energy vision that puts our Nation on the path to energy independence and security.

How? We don't take anything off the table. We harvest and explore all of our energy options, not stifle them. We do this through real regulatory reform, cutting red tape, and empowering private market innovation.

We work to keep our projects and technologies safe. If a venture is dangerous or environmentally unsafe, then say "no." But the key is, "no" can't be the final answer.

Regulatory agencies must become partners in progress with America's industries and businesses, striving to reach our full potential and finding the answers we need to get there.

There will be opponents to progress. Environmental extremists will throw their tired rhetoric around with no basis in scientific fact. But we can't sit idly by, letting America remain dependent on foreign energy sources and letting other countries seize our businesses and innovation opportunities.

Energy 2020 will get us focused. It's the next great horizon of American exceptionalism.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 934 days since I came to Congress and there has not been a sin-

gle vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

Amidst the distractions, amidst the scandals, amidst the tragedies, the single overriding focus of the American people remains the same: jobs and the economy. The polls speak volumes.

Mr. Speaker, today I'm taking an important step to end distractions and get the Congress back to work for the people, for the unemployed, for the suffering. Today, I am reintroducing President Obama's American Jobs Act, which expired last year without even reaching the House floor. The American Jobs Act is popular for a reason: independent analysts have shown it would create 1.9 million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, bring this bill to a vote and you will restore public trust in the Congress of the United States of America. The American Jobs Act deserves a vote. Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, more than 100,000 Arkansans work in retail, restaurant, lodging, and other service sectors. These service industries have helped keep the American economy afloat in recent years.

From restaurants like U.S. Cafe in Dardanelle, where I flipped burgers and fried fish as a teenager, to the convention hotels in Hot Springs, Arkansans rely on service industries every day as both employees and customers.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's many failed policies are imperiling our service sector. Nowhere is this more true than with ObamaCare. Service-oriented companies often have large and shifting workforces, they operate on extremely thin margins, and they cannot thrive on uncertainty. ObamaCare brings nothing but uncertainty.

The House took an important step last week by voting to delay both the employer and the individual mandates in ObamaCare, but the only real solution is to repeal this awful law. Otherwise, service-sector employees and businesses will suffer continued setbacks, which means our economy will suffer yet another blow.

DEFENDING FREEDOMS PROJECT: NABEEL RAJAB

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a Bahraini prisoner of conscience, Nabeel Rajab, a prominent human rights activist and the president of the Bahrain Center for Human Rights. Nabeel Rajab was sentenced to 3 years in jail simply for engaging in nonviolent political protests.

Nabeel Rajab is not alone. Scores of prisoners are incarcerated in Bahrain because they have called for meaningful reforms. Nabeel Rajab's abusive treatment by Bahraini security forces starkly contradicts Bahrain's pronouncements of full-fledged support for human rights.

I ask for the immediate release of Nabeel Rajab and seek the full support of Congress and the Obama administration.

Nabeel Rajab is a focus of the Defending Freedoms Project, a collaborative initiative spearheaded by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission that invites Members of Congress to stand up for prisoners of conscience around the world through various actions. Today, I invite my colleagues to take part in this important nonpartisan opportunity. Our voices can make a difference in the release of these prisoners.

DAINES SPEAKS IN SUPPORT OF AMASH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, after spending 12 years in the technology sector—more specifically, cloud computing—I know firsthand the power that data holds. I also understand the potential for abuse and the threats to Americans' civil liberties that come with mass collections of data.

Recent reports of the NSA blanket collection of Americans' phone records demonstrate the serious need for reforms to protect liberty and prevent abuse. That's why I'm proud to support Congressman AMASH's amendment to prevent the NSA from using the Patriot Act to collect the records of Americans who are not subject to a Patriot Act investigation.

This amendment helps protect law-abiding Americans from government overreach. The status quo is not unacceptable, and I hope this amendment will be a driving force for much-needed reforms and greater transparency and accountability.

We've seen what Big Government looks like. No one would have thought that the IRS would turn against the American people, and yet here we are. We must always be vigilant and guarded against the overreach of power.

I will continue fighting to defend liberty. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stand for Americans' Fourth Amendment protections.

SAINT ANNE CATHOLIC PARISH 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Saint Anne Catholic Parish in Union City is celebrating its 40th anniversary festival.

Saint Anne was founded in 1860 as a mission in the old Alvarado District before the city of Union City even existed. The current parish was established in 1973 and has been serving the surrounding community ever since.

Today, Saint Anne is one of the largest parishes in my congressional district, with over 5,000 parishioners, led by my friend, Father Geoffrey Baraan. With Father Geoffrey's guidance, Saint Anne helps serve the ethnically and culturally diverse community of Union City, and it helps ensure that the church lives up to its core mission, to "lead with compassion."

Through its parishioners, youth ministry, and hardworking staff, Saint Anne continues to help the homeless and the hungry of its community. This annual festival serves as a celebration and a reminder of the hard work and selfless service that went into building Saint Anne's. The funds raised during the festival will help the church continue to serve with collaboration, fellowship, and stewardship.

I wish Saint Anne all the best and hope they have a great 40th anniversary festival.

LACEY ACT

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, an American can be tried in a U.S. court and sent to an American prison for violating an obscure foreign law. Yes, you heard that right. That has already happened under a little-known provision in the Lacey Act.

The Lacey Act became the law in 1900 as a good protection against poachers, but it's been expanded since. Now, if you unknowingly import a product that violates a regulation from an exporting country, you can end up in a U.S. Federal courtroom and sent to a Federal prison.

One seafood importer spent 6 years in jail for importing lobsters that violated a regulation in Honduras. A few lobster tails were too small, and they were shipped in plastic instead of cardboard. Even the Honduran Government said these rules were obsolete.

Then Gibson Guitar had to pay \$350,000 to settle Federal charges that the company bought wood from Madagascar that was a sixth of an inch too thick.

It's time to end unreasonable and unconstitutional prosecutions of Americans on American soil for obscure foreign laws. The Lacey Act violates the rule of law and it needs to be changed.

DEROGATORY STATEMENTS REGARDING DREAMERS

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, America expects Members of Congress to exemplify what is great about our coun-

try. They expect us to represent virtues of tolerance, respect, and intelligence. Generalizations about children, about entire races of people are intolerant, disrespectful, and not very intelligent. Our country expects better from us. Recent comments made by one colleague across the aisle are far below those expectations.

Forget for a moment that the DREAM Act is the right thing to do and will help grow our economy. Forget that most DREAMers are the best and the brightest of our country, and that passing the DREAM Act will increase DREAMers' earnings by an aggregate of 19 percent, totaling \$148 billion in wages by 2030, triggering more spending on goods and services throughout our economy and generating \$181 billion in increased economic growth by 2030, creating millions of jobs for Americans. Forget that providing a strong incentive for DREAMers to further their education will add 223,000 college diplomas to the workforce and open doors to better paying jobs. Forget all that, and remember that these are children and young adults. These are human beings. They deserve better than the derogatory statements of my Republican colleague. The American people deserve better.

□ 1230

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is not the master puppeteer of higher education, though a litany of burdensome regulations suggest that's what it's angling for.

We all want college to be more affordable and we want to ensure students throughout the country who work hard have the opportunity to attend a high-quality school. But Federal attempts to regulate those goals into existence unilaterally are counterproductive and costly.

Restrictive regulations stifle pioneering institutions at a time when forward-thinking solutions are desperately needed to meet the changing demands of an increasingly diverse American student body.

With less punitive Federal intervention, Congress will be able to work carefully with students, families, educators, and higher learning institutions to address the issues of college affordability, accountability, and transparency during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

The administration should think outside the box with us so that education can be more accessible and affordable. We should start by reducing the size of the costly regulatory footprint in higher education.

CUTS TO EPA FUNDING

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was dismayed to see the Interior, Environment Appropriations Subcommittee approve a 2014 funding bill that cuts EPA funding by 34 percent. Such a drastic, unnecessary cut would prevent EPA from addressing critical air quality, water quality, and climate change issues that have direct impacts on human health.

As everyone knows by now, we are already feeling the impacts of climate change—stronger storms, more severe droughts, hotter heat waves. But it's our children and our grandchildren who will bear the brunt of these impacts in the future.

Children are especially vulnerable to the effects of climate change. We've already seen that there are higher rates of asthma and infectious diseases in children. These proposed cuts to EPA will only make things worse.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity and the responsibility to act now to protect our children and our grandchildren from the impacts of climate change.

I urge my colleagues, let's stop these shortsighted political games and start taking action to address climate change and protect the long-term health of future generations.

KILAH DAVENPORT CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask once more that my colleagues in Congress will help protect children by cosponsoring the Kilah Davenport Child Protection Act.

Until recent changes by the North Carolina legislature, the punishment for someone who caused permanent, severe, mental and physical injury to a child in our State was just 4 to 6 years. Sadly, inadequate, and ambiguous child abuse laws are not unique to North Carolina.

My little friend Kilah was severely abused by her caretaker, who smashed her head against a wall, leaving her with minimal function for the rest of her life. As a father and a grandfather, I was deeply moved by her situation, as I'm sure you are.

Now is the time to find an appropriate response to ensure the safety and the protection of our most precious treasures—America's children. This new legislation focuses on child abusers guilty of the most heinous acts of abuse. Those who destroy a child's future should receive much more than a slap on the wrist.

May God bless Kilah and her family and all whom we seek to protect.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING'S DISGRACEFUL REMARKS

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the disgraceful remarks recently made by another Member of this body.

My parents brought me to this country at the age of 11. They brought me here for the freedoms, they brought me here for the opportunities, and they never told me to strap 75 pounds of marijuana on my thighs so we can sell it in America.

It is disgraceful that a Member of this body would demean this House and what this country represents when you make remarks like that. I recognize that not all Members of this body feel the same way.

I represent Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty, two monuments that symbolize the history of America as a Nation of immigrants. So when you make remarks like one of the Members made, it's not only ignorant, but quite frankly stupid, not recognizing the history of this country.

CALLING ATTENTION TO PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE ZHU YUFU

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the plight of Zhu Yufu.

Today, Zhu Yufu has been in prison in China for 520 days. He is a prisoner of conscience, unable to enjoy the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

An advocate for democracy, Christian dissident and poet Zhu Yufu helped found the unrecognized Democracy Party of China. For this, he was arrested for "inciting subversion of state power."

Zhu Yufu cannot speak for himself, so others, including myself, must advocate on his behalf. My own efforts in support of Zhu Yufu are part of a project created by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission through which Members of Congress can bring attention to the plight of prisoners of conscience.

Through this work, we seek to pierce the darkness and shatter the silence that has enveloped Zhu Yufu and others like him.

Silence is not an option. Silence means Zhu Yufu likely will remain in prison and the Government of China will elude accountability for its deplorable human rights violations.

I call on all people of conscience to raise their voices in support of Zhu Yufu.

WE NEED A NEW AGENDA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I was shocked to hear the new standard for productivity, leadership, and good governance set here in the House of Representatives. Rather than looking at the success of the American people, the Speaker of the House said we should be judged by the number of laws we repeal.

This isn't a standard; this is an excuse for failure. Good governance is not measured by the 38 times that we voted to repeal health care. It is measured by the ability to compromise and create substantial solutions to the issues facing this country.

While House Republicans continue to obstruct, repeal, and repeat, 11 million undocumented immigrants remain in the shadows; 7 million students bear the burden of high student loan rates; 16.7 million children risk going to bed hungry; and every single woman in this country makes 77 cents to the dollar made by a man.

I say it is time that we need a new agenda and certainly a new standard for success.

RECOGNIZING HELEN SILLIMAN AND FLOSSIE BRAGG

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to recognize the contributions of two great women from New York's 27th Congressional District.

Tonight, Helen Silliman and the late Flossie Bragg will be honored in South Wales for becoming the first female firefighters in Erie County 50 years ago.

It was back in 1963 when Helen and Flossie decided to join the ranks of what was then an all-male department. In doing so, they made history in not only South Wales, but all of Erie County.

As a result, Helen and Flossie became pioneers for women in the fire service in western New York, leading the way for women to join the ranks of volunteer fire companies, which is now commonplace.

Today, it is estimated there are 35- to 40,000 women involved in volunteer fire services across this great country.

I want to thank and acknowledge Helen and Flossie for helping to lead the way.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERS' "TO DON'T" LIST

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, a new NBC poll says that 83 percent of Americans disapprove of the job Congress is doing. But that shouldn't be surprising when we are not doing any job at all.

House Republican leaders are working off of a "to don't" list: don't pass

gun violence legislation that could save lives; don't pass equal pay for women that could boost family incomes; don't help homeowners refinancing, which could save families money; don't pass immigration reform that could grow our economy; don't create a national infrastructure bank that could create new jobs; and don't pass a green energy bill that could finally tackle climate change.

It doesn't have to be this way, but when your agenda is to do nothing, it's easy to get nothing done when you operate off of a "to don't" list. Solving problems and reaching compromise may be hard work, but it's the work the American people sent us here to do.

FIGHTING FOR AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, later today, the President will once again refocus his efforts on jobs. Well, House Republicans never lost our focus on jobs.

We have a plan to create jobs, grow our economy, and to secure our future for all Americans by expanding opportunity, not expanding government.

Our plan holds government accountable to hardworking taxpayers; our plan reins in runaway government spending; our plan combats waste and abuse in government; our plan promotes an all-of-the-above all-American energy strategy that will create jobs, lower energy costs, and strengthen our national security.

These are commonsense solutions that the American people deserve. It is not fair that Washington liberals keep offering up only more spending and political games. Real solutions to real problems, that's the American commitment.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, did you know that last Sunday marked the anniversary of the day in 1917 when 16 women demanded the right to vote in front of the White House? They were sentenced to 60 days in the workhouse for demanding universal suffrage for women.

Did you know that tomorrow is the day when in 1892 Doris Fleischman Bernays was born? She was to become the first married woman to get a passport in her own name and to get her name on her daughter's birth certificate.

Or did you know that the famous Ginger Rogers-Fred Astaire partnership ended in part because she was angry over gender pay standards? She grew tired of being paid half of what her male colleagues were paid in films in which she was starring.

These are the sorts of things that one day visitors will learn about at the National Women's History Museum when it opens its doors—with a goal of educating, inspiring, and empowering women.

After all, American history is her story too. That is why I have introduced with MARSHA BLACKBURN H.R. 863, a bill to create such a museum. Join it and make your mother proud.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING'S IGNORANT COMMENTS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, Representative KING's recent comments about children of immigrants are a disgrace to this institution. These comments are unacceptable and just plain wrong on so many levels.

We may not all agree on the best way to fix our Nation's broken immigration system, but we can all agree that it's broken.

Comments like Representative KING's don't do anything to solve problems or bring us closer to a true bipartisan solution on immigration. They only exacerbate the problem of extreme partisanship and inject needless divisiveness into the conversation on how to best reform our immigration system.

This sort of ideologically driven and hateful rhetoric has no place in this institution, and it must stop. It is time for both parties to put down the partisan talking points and make a good faith effort to work together to have a conversation and not a confrontation.

We need to act, and we need to act now. We don't have time for this partisan gamesmanship. We must reduce our deficit by passing this comprehensive immigration reform.

CREATE JOBS AND GROW THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on the floor today we've heard some of our colleagues in the majority, starting with the Speaker of the House, demand the President work with Congress to create jobs and grow the economy. If Republicans were willing to spend time on these issues, that would really be good news.

I think it is necessary for us to have a reality check. In the 6 months of this Congress, with the Republicans in the majority, there has been no jobs bill brought to the floor; there has been no budget bill brought to the floor. The budget is the blueprint for job creation, for deficit reduction, for growing the economy, for creating jobs, for keeping America competitive, for making sure that America is number one.

At the beginning of the year, the Republicans said, we want regular order,

we want to pass a budget bill—and we did—and then the Senate will pass a budget that is not a good budget and not a statement of our values, but nonetheless, a bill passed the House. They said, we want regular order, we want the Senate to pass a budget bill before we can proceed with any jobs legislation.

□ 1245

Over 3 months ago—I think nearly 4 months ago—the Senate passed a budget bill—again, a blueprint for job creation, deficit reduction, growth in the economy. The minute the Senate passed the bill, the Republicans said, Never mind.

Never mind? No. It is our business to mind, to mind this Congress to make sure that we create solutions, that we get results, that we are in the business of job creation in the public and private sectors with public and private partnerships. With no budget and with no jobs bill, that cannot happen.

So when the Speaker of the House comes to the floor and makes demands on the President—and the President has made offer, after offer, after offer. He has extended the hand of cooperation so many times that I want to count his fingers to see how intact his hand is because of the reaction from the Republicans. The Republicans' response to the President's offer of cooperation? Nothing.

"Nothing" is our agenda.

Does "nothing" work for you, Mr. President?

Our timetable: "Never."

Does "never" work for you? Because that's the only time that we are going to work together with you to pass a jobs bill.

Previous speakers talked about jobs being created. Why? By giving tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country?

I am so glad that the President is out there today, saying that we are going to build jobs and build our economy from the middle class out. It's really important that the prosperity of our country is enjoyed by many more people and, in fact, is inspired by their ingenuity, by their creativity, by their entrepreneurship; and we have to have policies that incentivize that.

Today, the President will put more ideas on the table to grow our economy. He recognizes—and I think we on the Democratic side all agree—that the economy best works when it grows from the middle out, not by the trickle down, top down.

Our friends on the Republican side said, Trickle down, what's wrong with that? If it trickles down, it could create jobs. If that happens, that's great. If it doesn't, that's the free market. If it doesn't create jobs, in their words, so be it.

So be it? No, I don't think so.

Our country has come a long way since the depths of the Great Recession, which was caused by these very same trickle-down policies. Tax cuts

for the rich, that is the Republican jobs program.

Do you know what is interesting to me? Coming up in September is the 5-year anniversary of the meltdown, of the announcement of the meltdown during the Bush administration. Under the trickle-down policies and the laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez-faire attitudes of the Republicans in Congress and in the White House, we were facing a great meltdown of our financial institutions, a great recklessness by some—not all—on Wall Street, causing joblessness on Main Street.

And what's interesting about it is, when we were notified finally—when we asked, what's going on here? and they finally told us what was happening—no less a person than the Chairman of the Fed said, in response to a description given by the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary Paulson, about the seriousness of the meltdown that was occurring—and this was Thursday night—that we could, by Monday, have no economy.

Have no economy? That is the place that these trickle-down policies—this laissez-faire attitude toward no regulation and no supervision—took us in our economy coming up 5 years ago in September.

That's why it's really important for the President to be out there and for the public to understand, not so that we can create divisions between Democrats and Republicans, but so that we can come together as a people and make the decisions here about a budget that does grow the economy by creating jobs while reducing the deficit at the same time, keeping America number one—that we build the infrastructure of America, that we make it in America by giving incentives for jobs to stay here rather than, as the Republicans suggest, to give tax breaks to businesses that send jobs overseas. Building the infrastructure of America. Make It In America. Have our communities suggest how they would like to grow with the proper education of our children, with the safety of our neighborhoods, with the security of our people.

So, really, it's almost like another universe to listen to the Republicans talk about the economy when they have had a complete “never, nothing” agenda and timetable for bringing a jobs bill to the floor that really does address the challenges that working families in our country face.

On the positive side, I am very pleased that the President's strategy for growth, of course, which is centered around the middle class, ensures that every American has the opportunity to have a good job that pays enough to support a middle-income life, a strong education that equips our youth for the job market, a home that is not at risk of being taken away as it was 5 years ago, a retirement free of financial anxiety, secure health care with decent benefits, a higher minimum wage.

And when I talk about what happened 5 years ago, what's interesting to me is that the Republicans still have the nerve to be asking the question: Are you better off now than you were 5 years ago?

Five years ago, we weren't going to have an economy by Monday. We weren't going to have an economy by Monday under their policies. The President has led us out of that Great Recession. He did so in the first 2 years with a Democratic Congress that had a recovery package and initiatives to grow the economy. Since then, it has been, again, the “never, nothing” timetable and agenda of the Republicans. How much faster our economy could be growing if the Republicans would cooperate with their ideas and the President's, working together in a bipartisan way to get the job done for the American people.

While I'm at it, I want to put in a word for our agenda for America's women and families.

When women succeed, America succeeds. It's an agenda that recognizes and values the work of women in the workplace by having pay equity, by raising the minimum wage, by rewarding work. It's an agenda that helps women balance home and work by saying—and we will be celebrating the 20-year anniversary of the implementation of family medical leave—that we need some paid sick leave as well and paid maternity leave as well. Third is the need—and a bigger issue that will take a longer time in facing the challenge—for affordable quality child care for all of America's families so that our children can be learning while their parents are earning. An important component of it is the entrepreneurship of women in the workplace. Women's business ownership is the fastest growing rate of small business growth in our country, minority women-owned businesses as well.

So we do believe that our economy will grow, that our families will prosper, that our Nation will continue to be number one to the extent that we invest in the middle class and in those aspiring to it, and that we should place a special emphasis on women in the workplace, because, again, when American women succeed, America succeeds.

That's how we want to ignite the American Dream—to build ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility.

We have work to do. Let's do it instead of living in a world of illusion in which the leadership won't bring a real jobs bill to the floor that can be enacted into law. The Speaker has said that it isn't a measure of success as to how many bills you can enact; it's about how much law you can repeal.

You haven't even succeeded in that. You haven't repealed anything. So let's get to work on the positive side to create jobs. That's the best thing that we can do for the American people, and let's do it soon.

“Never” doesn't work for us.

REVISIONIST HISTORY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I will be happy to address some of the revisionist history.

If we want to talk about reality testing, how about the fact that, in September of 2008, Democrats had controlled every level of power in the United States Congress for some 20 months, but we didn't hear a peep out of them until Lehman Brothers failed?

And, oh, by the way, who was on watch at the New York Fed when that happened? Timothy Geithner. He was rewarded by becoming President Obama's Treasury Secretary.

For the first 2 years of the Obama administration, it was so anti-employer that no wonder the recovery was, indeed, a jobless recovery and that it has continued in that mode until today.

And don't get me started about the Affordable Care Act. That has been a wet blanket on job creation in this economy. The President knows it, which is why he revised things last week.

And, oh, by the way, if he wants to reach out his hand to us, how about sending people from the agencies to our committees who at least will stop the propensity for prevarication when they will not admit to the fact that they have contingency plans in place for delaying and downsizing the implementation of the Affordable Care Act as they were, in fact, planning that very measure when those people came to the committee and spoke under oath.

WE MUST ACT NOW ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to extend some thanks to Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member LOFGREN, not only for giving me the privilege and the honor to speak before their Subcommittee on Immigration yesterday, but as well to have conversations in my district and to have conversations in my State with a number of constituents that are affected by our immigration policy.

This is something we have to act on now. This is something for which we need to make sure we've got a top-to-bottom approach. It is an issue on which Republicans and Democrats can actually come together that is vitally important to our economy and to the greatness of our country: making sure that our border security is actually secure, not only with a fence and greater law enforcement, but by actually redeveloping the security technology and surveillance equipment from Afghanistan; making sure that we've got the

internal security as we move forward—an E-Verify system—making sure that we can actually verify the jobs within our communities so we can address not only jobs, but the high unemployment in so many areas; making sure that we actually have a temporary worker program so that we can address our ag economy.

Let's make sure that we have a top-to-bottom approach. So I ask that this body address this in a bipartisan fashion.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2218, COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1582, ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee

amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

□ 1300

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 315 provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation passed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The first, H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013 introduced by my friend on the committee, Mr. MCKINLEY from West Virginia, passed out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote with 54 bipartisan cosponsors. The second piece of legislation, H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013, was introduced by my friend Mr. CASSIDY from Louisiana.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of general debate on each of the bills included in the rule. A total of nine amendments were made in order between the two bills, six on the Democratic side and three on the Republican side. Further, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend each piece of legislation before it's final vote.

H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, is a product of hours of work over the course of the past few years that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) has put in to perfect this legislation. Indeed, the legislation includes numerous provisions offered by Democrats and even reflects input by President Obama's own Environmental Protection Agency.

This legislation was prompted by a move in June of 2010 by the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate coal combustion residuals. In this rule, the Environmental Protection Agency set out three proposals for coal residuals, commonly referred to as coal ash. Coal residuals are often recycled in an environmentally sound fashion and repurposed for use in roads, parks, golf courses, and any other number of safe manners. Unfortunately, many in the industry viewed these proposed Environmental Protection Agency regulations as placing barriers to the continued use or recycling of coal ash.

In response to these concerns, Mr. MCKINLEY's bill would provide for minimum Federal standards but allow States to craft a permitting program that could be tailored to the needs in each individual State. The bill makes clear that it does not provide the Environmental Protection Agency with new rulemaking authority. Further, it requires the Environmental Protection Agency to defer to the States with respect to the regulation of coal ash. This would allow States to protect human health and the environment by adapting an existing solid waste regulatory program for coal ash. To ensure adequate safety measures for human health, the bill requires installation of groundwater monitoring at all structures that receive coal ash.

The second bill included in today's rule has been carefully designed to protect consumers from a runaway Environmental Protection Agency which, in my experience as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, constantly uses some pretty strange figures and some funny math in depicting the so-called benefits of its rules and rarely fully admits to the full cost of the rules it promulgates.

Since the beginning of President Obama's, Lisa Jackson's, and Gina McCarthy's tenure with the Federal Government, the Environmental Protection Agency has promulgated regulations imposing billions of dollars in costs on our critical power infrastructure. Famously, the Environmental Protection Agency has been so out of control that the President himself was required to intervene and pull the ozone rule in August of 2011, knowing that the cost to the country far outweighed the benefits that the Environmental Protection Agency was claiming.

In response to this out-of-control agency, Dr. CASSIDY has carefully crafted H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, which would add another measure of protection for consumers legitimately frightened of whether or not they will be able to afford their air-conditioning this summer or their heating this fall, or even to turn on their lights at nighttime.

The bill is straightforward. It requires that, before promulgating a final rule that would impose an aggregate cost of \$1 billion on the American people, the Environmental Protection Agency must consult with the Secretary of Energy, a Cabinet member who will be working for the very same President as the Administrator at the Environmental Protection Agency. The Energy Secretary must then determine that the rule before him would not cause significant adverse effects to the economy or to electric reliability, as is his job. That's what his mission statement is as the top energy official for our country.

For too long, the Environmental Protection Agency has dictated our energy policy rather than simply our environmental policy. Former Energy Secretary Steven Chu seemed to have no problem passively delegating his job to Lisa Jackson. I suppose he was too busy losing America's money to solar companies. The era of the Environmental Protection Agency dictating energy policy must end, and this bill is a solid step toward that goal.

Mr. Speaker, American consumers are struggling. They watch the cost of food as it rises right before their eyes. They watch the gas prices. Where are they going? Nowhere but up. They watch their electricity bills. They are also going up. There is no relief in sight on the horizon under this President and this administration.

House Republicans have not abandoned their promises to protect consumers from an out-of-control bureauc-

racy imposing cost after cost on the American people. Today's legislation is yet another few arrows in the quiver to stop the Federal Government from taking more money out of Americans' pockets.

As I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the two underlying bills, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin my remarks by correcting my friend from Texas with reference to his 1-minute statement previous to the time that we began the rule.

As I understood him, he said that for the last 20 months, Democrats have controlled every level of power. Somewhere along the line, I think my friend must be very confused about what the responsibilities of the United States House of Representatives is and are.

That said, my recollection is that in this Congress, which has consumed 6 months, and in the previous one, which took 2 years, that my friends in the Republican Party have controlled the House of Representatives. Unless there is no longer one level of power in Washington, something is misunderstood by me.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that have bipartisan support and that we could be addressing in our limited time before the August recess. For example, we could be reforming in a comprehensive manner our Nation's immigration system. We could be ending the sequester. I have not met a Democrat or a Republican that did not say that the sequester was a bad idea. We could be addressing the doubling of student loan interest rates. We could be having a conference on a farm bill, or we could be appointing—something that I still find very strange—we could be appointing budget conferees.

It used to be that having a conference around this place was a real opportunity for Members, and Members sought to be on the conference. I know my first experience I was fascinated by the fact that I'm on a conference with the other body, the United States Senate. Little did I know that their rules provided for them to vote by proxy, but I came to learn that perhaps it wasn't as important as I thought it was, but it is important to the process.

But for any of these important issues to be addressed, Members would have to work together to resolve their differences. Instead, we're spending our time on two bills that my friends across the aisle know will never become law. I don't have to be a betting person to bet anybody in this institution that what we are discussing here today will not become the law of the land. The reason that I know that is we've already done it four times, this same measure, and it didn't see the

light of day in the other body. This one ain't going to either.

These bills today show what I've been saying for quite some time now, and it's that my Republican colleagues really are not manifesting interest in actually fixing our country's problems. In fact, it seems that they're more happy to simply bring Congress to a standstill and call that success.

Mr. Speaker, political victories are not victories for struggling families. In case these bills are not clear enough evidence, my friends recently released their messaging plan for the August work period in our respective districts. That plan is called "Fighting Washington for All Americans." Wow. Despite the irony, I would almost want to call it hypocrisy of sitting Members of Congress trying to paint themselves as outsiders and reformers while ignoring their key role in creating the gridlock. Fighting Washington for All Americans urges Members to consider Washington as a place where nothing good happens, so the less governing that gets done, the better. Yet these two bills today completely contradict those ideas.

H.R. 1582 gives the Department of Energy unprecedented authority to veto Environmental Protection Agency-related regulations. Not only does the bill prevent the EPA from finalizing critical public health and environmental rules, it instructs the Department of Energy to conduct a duplicative and convoluted analysis without any new resources. These are the people that say bureaucracy is a problem, and yet they're creating additional bureaucracy within the framework of these two measures.

□ 1315

I said yesterday in the Rules Committee I would be astounded at how much time it's going to take the Energy Department and the EPA to coordinate their efforts. Evidently, these people haven't been trying to talk to these bureaucrats the way that I have over the course of time, and it requires, this measure does, extra examination, despite the Office of Management and Budget's interagency review of all regulations, which includes the Department of Energy, in the review of EPA rules.

I did a little research, Mr. Speaker, on how many times over the course of the time that I've been here that Members on the other side have offered measures, that did not become law, to abolish the Department of Energy. Hear me loud and clear: to abolish the Department of Energy.

Now we come today, after that having been done numerous times, we come today and the Energy Department is the answer. These same people wanted to, I guess everything with an "E" that's in the Cabinet, they wanted the Department of EPA to be abolished at one time, the Department of Education. They need to change their acronyms over there or else they'll find themselves abolished, if they don't get past A, B, C, D—E.

Not only does the bill prevent the EPA from finalizing critical public health and environmental rules, it instructs the Department of Energy to do, as I said, duplicative measures.

As for H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, the second bill being considered under this rule today, it encourages, in my view, a race to the bottom, where the State willing to have the least protections will become the dumping ground for the entire country.

I said last night that I would be mad today. I tempered myself with my passion over my reflections of my comments in the Rules Committee, but I cannot but return to them when I think of the community that I live in, and have lived in for now coming up on 51 years, where every one of the Superfund Brownfields was in the minority community. Every dump that ever dumped anything in Broward County was in minority communities—treatment waste across the street from where I live, and I guess perhaps these people have not had those experiences.

While there are certainly inefficiencies within the Federal Government—and they are numerous—the 2008 coal ash spill in Kingston, Tennessee, is evidence that the Environmental Protection Agency has an important role to play in protecting our Nation's public health.

This bill would allow States to undertake permitting programs for the management of coal ash; and let me talk about what's in coal ash. People seem to think that coal ash is all of this great stuff. Coal ash has in it mercury, lead, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, if you can say that. These are things that are poisonous. And yes, it is true that we have managed under the regulations to constrain ourselves with many of these products that have been utilized for benefit, but do not mistake arsenic and cadmium and lead for anything other than harmful products.

The Federal environmental standards that are put forward here do not take into contemplation how important it is to establish uniform protections for our Nation's health and environment.

Let me return to the Kingston, Tennessee, situation. The Tennessee Valley Authority is still paying in excess of \$1 billion, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.2 billion for taking this stuff and dumping it in Uniontown, Alabama, 100 feet from where people live; and, I suggest, as is the case in the community that I am privileged to serve, where people that are friends of mine have died as a result of not coal ash but dumps being in their communities and incinerators burning it, and it's the same in many respects.

I compliment Florida Power & Light, the largest utility in my State, for destroying their two coal ash plants in Fort Lauderdale, and we still find that Florida Power & Light still manages their business well enough to make handsome profits.

As far as electric rates going up, I would suggest to my friend, it's sort of

like health care measures. And I continue to ask everybody, tell me the day, before there was anything called ObamaCare, tell me the day when your insurance rates for health went down. Tell me the day that your utilities went down. I don't recall any period where that happened; and somewhere along the line, we need to address these things in meaningful ways.

Different standards in each State provide an economic incentive to send coal ash to the State with the lowest level of regulation. This bill will not ensure the safe disposal of coal ash or make current law any stronger.

Fighting Washington—that's what you're getting ready to say in August—does not keep our air and water clean. Fighting Washington does not provide the sick with medical treatment. Fighting Washington does not keep Wall Street from preying on the American people. Fighting Washington does not provide student loans for children who aren't going to be able to return to school this year because of the prohibitive costs.

Fighting Washington does not provide immigration reform in a comprehensive manner. And somewhere along the line we have to understand there are more than 11 million people in this country that are here illegally. And I can point to you people that work right around this Capitol—and a few that are in it—that we rely upon, that we need to straighten this law out about. But we prefer to fight Washington.

Fighting Washington doesn't help the Centers for Disease Control prevent us from having diseases. At Robert E. Lee High School in Fairfax County, one of the best counties for education in this country, they've had a recall of students for tuberculosis, something I thought we had pretty much abolished. But when we can't find the necessary research money and we can't find the necessary provisions—largely because we're fighting Washington—then we're going to have other outbreaks like that that we have to contend with.

Fighting Washington doesn't provide the National Institutes of Health the things to do to provide women's health and male research in order for us to better the health of the United States of America.

Fighting Washington makes for great talking points, and might even make for a good bumper sticker, but it is far from a serious strategy to actually make this country better. A better title than "Fighting Washington for Americans" would be "Washington Fighting for Americans."

Now this do-nothing Congress, and I've been here 21 years, is giving new meaning to do nothing. And all of this repealing things didn't just start this year. Next week, we'll be back here on the floor talking more repeal. We're going to have something called the REINS Act. We're real good up here at naming things—R-E-I-N-S. We're going to be doing some more repealing.

But in the 112th Congress—I looked back—we had 137 votes to block actions

to prevent pollution. We had 55 votes targeted at the Department of Energy. We had 57 votes to defund or repeal clean energy initiatives. We had 47 votes to promote offshore drilling. We had 81 votes targeted at the Department of the Interior. We had 87 votes to undermine protections for public lands and wilderness. We had 53 votes to block actions that address climate change. We had 38 votes to dismantle the Clean Water Act. So 317 repealed votes. I've changed you-all's name. It's no longer the Republicans; it's the "Repealicans." You must be people that just repeal.

And over in the other body, they're "Republstructionists" because their whole objective—and that gets ignored here when we start talking about who's responsible for what. It gets ignored that the minority in the other body has arcane rules that permit them to block everything, and that's what they've done, everything you haven't blocked or sought to repeal. Here we have been trying to get health care for people, and you-all are voting to repeal health care 39 different times.

I'm tired of voting on that kind of stuff. I want to vote on something that's going to provide some jobs for America. I want to vote on something that's going to help some students have some jobs when they get out of school. I want to vote on something that's going to allow for technology and innovation to catch up with what's going on in the world. I want to make sure that we exact our responsibilities, particularly with reference to education.

I just left a meeting with homeless providers and nonprofits. I want to make sure that there's Meals on Wheels. I want to vote on something to make sure that every child has an equal opportunity for a very good education in this country. I want to vote on something that's going to look 50 years down the road to what America looks like, and not 50 months from now, or not 1 month from now in August when you're going to be fighting Washington.

I'm going to be up here with you in Washington, and we are consummate insiders, and it's ridiculous for you to go home and try to tell somebody you're anything other than that. And you do control one-third of the legislative body. And you do have exacting responsibilities given to you under Article I that you're not exercising. You have the Ways and Means' ability. You have the numbers to undertake to do those things.

So, yeah, I'm mad. And I think many in America are mad, too, with a Congress that's doing nothing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for a couple of brief responses.

First off, I don't know whether the gentleman misheard or only caught me

in mid-sentence. I was responding to the minority leader's statement about this September is the 4-year anniversary of the crash in the economy, and the preceding 20 months, from September of 2008, in the Congress, all of the levers of power were handled by the Democrats.

Now, on this issue of fighting Washington, good strategy, bad strategy, I can't address that. But I do know what's going on out in this country—people are frightened of Washington. They're not fighting Washington; they are scared. Why are they scared? What are they seeing with the NSA? What do they see with the TSA when they go to the airport? What are they seeing with the IRS? Nobody likes the IRS to start with, but now people are concerned that their First Amendment rights are going to be trampled by an out-of-control Federal agency. And I have to tell you what, Mr. Speaker, it all devolves back to the administration. Yeah, the Congress has its own problems, but the administration is actually what is driving the frightening of America, not the fighting of America.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule.

For over 33 years, Congress has wrestled unproductively on how to deal with coal ash, which is an unavoidable by-product of burning coal.

The bill before us today provides a resolution, finally, to this issue and avoids kicking the can down the road.

H.R. 2218 has two parts. The first part codifies the previous EPA studies that were conducted in 1993 and 2000 under Bill Clinton, both of them. I have copies of it here. And perhaps those that need to read those reports would understand that in the 1993 and in the 2000 reports, they concluded that coal ash is a nonhazardous material and should be beneficially recycled for use in products such as concrete block, brick, wallboard, and used in our roads and bridges across America.

The second part, unfortunately they're not aware of it yet, but if they'd read the bill, they would find that it has been significantly rewritten since last year. We listened to what people were saying. We listened to the EPA, we listened to the administration, and incorporated those into this bill, so that this second part now provides for all new and existing landfills to be State run, using a Federal law known as RCRA, which in and of itself incorporates the Federal guidelines for protecting "human health and the environment."

Consequently, disposal requirements under H.R. 2218 will require composite liners, dust control, groundwater monitoring, financial assurances, emergency action plans, inspections, and structural stability, just to name a few. In fact, the EPA states that RCRA's primary goals are to:

Protect human health and the environment, to reduce the amount of waste gen-

erated, and to ensure that wastes are managed in an environmentally sound manner.

□ 1330

For the first time, there will be a uniform national standard for disposing of coal ash. However, as you just heard, you hear opponents of this legislation state this legislation does not protect human health and the environment. But quite frankly, that's not the case.

H.R. 2218 not only includes nine different references and sections of RCRA which protect human health and environment, but also incorporates the existing RCRA part 258 regulation.

To use the words of the EPA, "EPA believes that part 258 criteria represents a reasonable balance ensuring the protection of human health and the environment."

The opponents of this measure seem to lack a fundamental understanding, Mr. Speaker. There are jobs at stake here, 316,000 jobs across America. It's really that simple.

A compromise is available. Anyone who opposes this rule will continue to support the status quo. If we do nothing, coal ash, which is generated every day in 48 of the 50 States, will continue to be disposed of. The status the way it's been since the 1950s and '60s and the unwarranted stigma that's associated with recycled materials will continue.

Fortunately, finally, today, after listening and compromising and working together, there appears to be an emerging consensus to allow for the beneficial recycle of coal ash, and the concerns raised by a previous Congress have been addressed.

Mr. Speaker, after 33 years of fussing with this issue, it's time to put it to rest.

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

And would the Speaker be kind enough to tell both sides how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 17½ minutes remaining.

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

Several of our colleagues, including the previous speaker, are suggesting that this bill is better than previous versions. But this is actually the worst version yet from a public health and environmental perspective.

All you have to do is look at the Statement of Administration Policy to see how this bill has gotten worse. The administration is concerned that there's no clear and appropriate authority for taking corrective action on unlimited or leaking impoundments or units.

Unlike H.R. 2273, from the last Congress, this says that an unlined impoundment that is found to be contaminating groundwater only has to

close after alternative disposal capacity is available at the same site. Well, many of these facilities don't have the space for additional capacity at the same site. That means that the pollution can go on for years, or even indefinitely.

This bill is the worst version of coal ash legislation yet. That's why all the environmental groups oppose this legislation. They even sent a letter to the House today that states, "This bill is more dangerous to human health and environment than previous versions of this legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I'm very sad today. One of my college classmates is being funeralized, or has been funeralized as we are speaking. Her funeral was at 11 o'clock. She lives in a community called Golden Heights. In Golden Heights, in a 2-square mile radius from a dump that dumped into that community for a considerable period of time, the incidence of cancer of dear friends of mine, male and female, is inordinately high by comparison to any other place in the State of Florida.

Something is wrong with the picture of continuing to pollute and to not be mindful of who are the victims of that pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I make the distinction that I was not talking about coal ash, and I'm glad I don't live near one of those places where they are dumping like in Uniontown, Alabama.

If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2070, Representative TIM BISHOP's bill to protect consumers from price gouging at the gas pump.

To discuss his bill, I would like now to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule, and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can consider pro-consumer, job-protecting legislation, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act, which would deter the sale of gasoline at excessive prices.

I introduced this legislation so that my constituents and Long Island businesses are not harmed by unscrupulous business practices designed solely to increase profit margins.

My constituents are facing rising prices at nearly every turn, on top of stagnated wage growth. They're worried about paying for college, paying the mortgage, saving for retirement, or just paying for groceries. They're also wondering what Congress is doing for them to create jobs and to raise their standard of living.

AAA estimates gas prices are expected to increase as the summer continues. In fact, AAA reports that the average price per gallon is up to \$4 on Long Island from \$3.87 a week ago. This comes as Americans are heading to Long Island's beaches, historic villages, and open spaces. Excessive gas

prices will cost Long Island businesses and jobs, and that's something that we cannot let happen on Long Island or anywhere else in this country.

The east coast is also in the midst of hurricane season, which can bring out the unscrupulous who would take advantage of hardworking families, as we witnessed in the aftermath of Sandy. In fact, just this week a New York State judge fined one Long Island gas station, and two others have reached settlements with the New York Attorney General's Office for price gouging.

This Congress should protect those harmed by natural disasters so they don't have to worry about price gouging while they rebuild their homes, communities, businesses, and livelihoods. Let's do it now before the next crisis erupts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, support consumers and jobs, and support the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds for response, pending which I'm going to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia.

In the brief 7 months that I have spent on the Rules Committee in this Congress, there's only one time where the administration has not issued a veto threat to legislation we were considering under the Rules Committee. This is H.R. 2218, Mr. MCKINLEY's bill. They voiced problems, but they did not issue a veto threat. That is a red letter day in this institution.

Every other piece of legislation that's come to the floor has done so under a threat of a veto by the administration.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the two underlying energy bills that the House will consider today. I'm a proud cosponsor of both of these bills because they will protect West Virginia jobs and prevent increases in electricity costs for many of those millions of folks across this country that cannot afford it.

My colleague, Mr. MCKINLEY, has worked tirelessly to see that H.R. 2218 has met the demands and answered the questions.

And to my colleague from Florida, when he stated that he's glad he doesn't live in these areas, guess what? We do. So it's exceedingly important to us that we do this the right way. And that's why I'm supporting the framework for state regulation that will ensure that coal ash will be used productively.

I visited the Sutton Dam in my district for its 50-year anniversary. And I can tell you, I was there when it was built, and I was there 50 years later. As they were describing the Sutton Dam and how successful it's been—and it's still a fortress of strength, holding the water back—they started talking about the construction materials used 50 years ago.

And guess what?

Coal ash was one of those construction materials that was used to strengthen this dam, and to also have it stand the test of time.

So, I think the regulatory uncertainty that's been around for years about what to do about coal ash has really cut the use of coal ash by millions of tons. But also, wouldn't we rather be recycling and reusing this in a productive measure, rather than increasing the impoundments and increasing any kind of risk to the environment?

This bill just makes perfect sense.

And the second bill addresses the growing number of billion-dollar EPA rules. In my view, billion-dollar EPA rules have two major costs: costs of jobs, and the cost to seniors and those on fixed incomes and the folks who are trying to heat their homes or cool their homes to be able to meet the high cost of electricity. So these make great sense to me.

I'm very proud of my colleague from West Virginia for bringing this to the floor for the fifth time, and it will pass again.

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

The previous speaker is a person that, there are few in Congress that I have greater respect for. I certainly understand the dynamics of living in communities. In my judgment, she's absolutely correct that what we should be doing is everything we can to constructively make sure that we are about the business of ensuring the health of the communities that we live in.

So, to that degree, while I stand by my position that I'm glad I don't live next to these facilities, unfortunately, I live close to, and have for some time, facilities that have been harmful that claimed that they were protecting the health and the environment of people.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, my friend from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) said something that I would like to correct. He'll be down here, I'm sure, later today or whenever this measure comes up. He noted that the Environmental Protection Agency testified "that they do not oppose" this coal ash bill.

I want to make sure that everyone knows that the Environmental Protection Agency said that because they are not permitted to take a position on legislation, only the administration is allowed to say they support or oppose legislation. And in the administration position last night, they did not say that they don't support the coal ash bill, nor was it a veto threat.

I would urge my colleague from Texas to point me to the time that Barack Obama has vetoed something.

One of the things, I've been on that committee—he's been there 7 months. I've been there years, and I've been there with other Presidents, and it is not uncommon for Congress to propose

and to have the administration oppose and vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills before us today are so tilted toward commercial operations that they reflect a warped sense of what is important to the people in this great country of ours. These bills undermine environmental laws that have been proven to protect communities and provide for the development of energy to run America.

While we need to develop laws that promote energy and commerce, snide commentary regarding failed policies at the Department of Energy ignores the number of successes through the years under different administrations and this one that the Department of Energy has put forward.

We cannot, in many respects, develop laws that promote energy and commerce and ignore the consequences of those activities. Pollution is not equivalent to progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bills, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment to the rule in the RECORD, along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to stop being "Repealicans" and be about the business of trying to do something constructive in this House of Representatives.

I would ask them to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we all know, in order for this economy to flourish, energy has to be available and energy has to be affordable. Unfortunately, the situation we've seen in recent years is anything but that.

The Department of Energy was created back in the 1970s in response to the Arab oil embargo. The Department of Energy was created to deal with the situation of scarcity.

□ 1345

Unfortunately, the Department of Energy has not evolved since that time. And where do we find ourselves today? We find ourselves right on the threshold, right on the horizon of America being an energy exporter, again, for the first time in a couple of decades. That's a huge change.

Has the Department of Energy changed and kept pace with the reality that is going on in development of energy in State lands, private lands, and, yes, some Federal lands? Have they kept pace with the development within the industry? I submit they have not. I submit that they have been an impediment.

Yes, I'd be happy to work on improving where the Department of Energy could be, in fact, a facilitator rather than an obstruction for developing energy for our economy. Because we know without available and affordable energy, the promise that the economy can create the number of jobs that it needs to create—not just to replace those jobs that have been lost, but all of those people who are getting to the age where they expect a job to be there for them—and without that energy production, it's not going happen.

Now, I do want to talk about the other bill that's before us today, Dr. CASSIDY's bill, H.R. 1582. Let's think about this for a minute. The Congress works its will on a bill. It becomes law. That law then goes to the regulatory agency. They work their will on the bill. And we all know the story. A thousand-page bill here on the floor of the House can generate 10,000 pages of regulation in the Federal Register.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but it's hard to discipline myself to wake up every morning and read what was written in the Federal Register the day before. The American people who are out there creating and producing certainly don't have time to do that.

But when these rules are then visited upon the people, what happens then? Well, they just simply have to accept the effect of those rules. Congress did that a couple of years ago. They are not playing in that arena any longer.

Here's what Dr. CASSIDY says. He says that before promulgating a final rule that would impose an aggregate cost of \$1 billion on the American people, the Administrator of the EPA has to consult with the Secretary of Energy. This seems like a logical and straightforward maneuver. In fact, we will talk about the REINS Act in the weeks to come. And they have to come back to Congress and get us to either say "yes" or "no" on that regulation that is going to have such a profound effect on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I've been in business before. I've made investments before. I know very well if someone comes to investors with a cash call and says you're going to have to pony up a lot more money here, the very least that the investor expects at that point is a pro forma, a profit and loss sheet, or some reasonable expectation that there can be a return on investment.

You say, Wait a minute, nobody's coming to the American people with a cash call. Well, it's called April 15. And it is a cash call. And we owe them that scrutiny; the Department of Energy owes them that scrutiny. I would assert we owe them an up-or-down vote on those regulations that are going to have such a profound effect on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two critical bills ensuring that the American people are not further penalized by out-of-control policies coming out of the Environmental Protection Agency. Consumers need relief, it is clear.

For that reason, I urge an "aye" vote on the previous question, an "aye" vote on the rule, and an "aye" vote on the two underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 315 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2070) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2070.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what

they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 191, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Alexander	Brooks (IN)	Cotton
Amash	Broun (GA)	Cramer
Amodei	Buchanan	Crawford
Bachmann	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Bachus	Burgess	Culberson
Barr	Calvert	Daines
Barton	Camp	Davis, Rodney
Benishek	Cantor	Denham
Bentivolio	Capito	Dent
Bilirakis	Cassidy	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Black	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Coffman	Duffy
Bonner	Cole	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Elmiers
Bridenstine	Conaway	Farenthold

Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

NAYS—191

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberti
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carter
Coble
Cohen
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Pallone

□ 1413

Messrs. MCINTYRE and LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri and CULBERSON changed their votes from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote 399, if present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney

Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Guzar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis

NOES—188

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore

Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Grimm

Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Owens
Pallone

Rokita
Simpson
Tipton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1422

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote from “present” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2397.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1425

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 113-170 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. LAMALFA of California.

Amendment No. 55 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. STOCKMAN of Texas.

Amendment No. 62 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 65 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) 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 177, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—177

Alexander	Gibbs	Mica
Amash	Gibson	Michaud
Amodei	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Bass	Gosar	Miller, George
Becerra	Graves (GA)	Moore
Bilirakis	Grayson	Mulvaney
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Nadler
Blumenauer	Griffith (VA)	Napolitano
Bonamici	Grijalva	Neal
Boustany	Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Neugebauer
Braley (IA)	Hall	Nolan
Broun (GA)	Hanna	Nugent
Buchanan	Harris	O'Rourke
Burgess	Hensarling	Pastor (AZ)
Camp	Higgins	Paulsen
Capuano	Himes	Payne
Cassidy	Hinojosa	Perry
Chabot	Holt	Peterson
Chaffetz	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Chu	Huelskamp	Pitts
Ciilline	Hultgren	Pocan
Clarke	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Cleaver	Jones	Posey
Coffman	Jordan	Price (GA)
Cohen	Keating	Quigley
Cole	Kennedy	Radel
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Conyers	Kuster	Ribble
Courtney	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Ross
Daines	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Rush
DeFazio	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)
DeGette	Loeb sack	Salmon
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sánchez, Linda
DesJarlais	Lowenthal	T.
Dingell	Lucas	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lummis	Sanford
Doyle	Lynch	Sarbanes
Duffy	Maffei	Scalise
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Schakowsky
Edwards	Matsui	Schrader
Ellison	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Esty	McGovern	Serrano
Farenthold	McIntyre	Sessions
Farr	McKinley	Sherman
Gabbard	Meadows	Shimkus
Garamendi	Meng	Sinema
Garrett	Messer	
		Sires
		Slaughter
		Smith (NJ)
		Southerland
		Speier
		Stockman
		Stutzman
		Thompson (CA)
		Tierney
		Tonko
		Tsongas
		Upton
		Walden
		Walz
		Waters
		Waxman
		Welch
		Westmoreland
		Yarmuth
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		NOES—246
		Gowdy
		Granger
		Graves (MO)
		Green, Al
		Griffin (AR)
		Guthrie
		Hanabusa
		Harper
		Hartzler
		Hastings (FL)
		Hastings (WA)
		Heck (NV)
		Heck (WA)
		Holding
		Hoyer
		Hudson
		Huffman
		Huizenga (MI)
		Hunter
		Hurt
		Israel
		Issa
		Jackson Lee
		Jeffries
		Jenkins
		Johnson (GA)
		Johnson, Sam
		Joyce
		Kaptur
		Kelly (IL)
		Kelly (PA)
		Kildee
		Kilmer
		Kind
		King (IA)
		King (NY)
		Kingston
		Kinzinger (IL)
		Kline
		LaMalfa
		Lamborn
		Lance
		Langevin
		Lankford
		Larsen (WA)
		Latham
		Latta
		Levin
		LoBiondo
		Long
		Lowe
		Luetkemeyer
		Lujan Grisham
		(NM)
		Lujan, Ben Ray
		(NM)
		Maloney,
		Carolyn
		Maloney, Sean
		Marchant
		Marino
		Matheson
		McCarthy (CA)
		McCaull
		McCollum
		McHenry
		McKeon
		McMorris
		Rodgers
		McNerney
		Meehan
		Meeks
		Miller (FL)
		Miller, Gary
		Moran
		Mullin
		Murphy (FL)
		Murphy (PA)
		Noem
		Nunes
		Nunnelee
		Gardner
		Gerlach
		Gingrey (GA)
		Goodlatte
		Pascrell
		Pearce
		Pelosi
		Perlmutter
		Peters (CA)
		Peters (MI)
		Pittenger
		Pompeo
		Price (NC)
		Rahall
		Reed
		Reichert
		Renacci
		Rice (SC)
		Richmond
		Rigell
		Roby
		Roe (TN)
		Rogers (AL)
		Rogers (KY)
		Rogers (MI)
		Rooney
		Ros-Lehtinen
		Roskam
		Rothfus
		Royce
		Ruiz
		Runyan
		Ruppersberger
		Ryan (OH)
		Schiff
		Schneider
		Schock
		Schwartz
		Schweikert
		Scott, Austin
		Scott, David
		Sewell (AL)
		Shea-Porter
		Shuster
		Simpson
		Smith (MO)
		Smith (NE)
		Smith (TX)
		Smith (WA)
		Stewart
		Stivers
		Swalwell (CA)
		Takano
		Terry
		Thompson (MS)
		Thompson (PA)
		Thornberry
		Tiberi
		Tipton
		Titus
		Turner
		Valadao
		Van Hollen
		Vargas
		Veasey
		Vela
		Velázquez
		Visclosky
		Wagner
		Walberg
		Walorski
		Wasserman
		Schultz
		Watt
		Weber (TX)
		Webster (FL)
		Wenstrup
		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (FL)
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Olson
		Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta Grimm Pallone
Bustos Herrera Beutler Rokita
Campbell Horsford
Coble McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1429

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 235, noes 188,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—235

Aderholt Duckworth Jones
Alexander Duffy Jordan
Amodei Duncan (SC) Joyce
Bachmann Duncan (TN) Kelly (PA)
Bachus Ellmers King (IA)
Barr Farenthold King (NY)
Barrow (GA) Fincher Kingston
Barton Fleischmann Kinzinger (IL)
Benishek Fleming Kline
Bilirakis Flores Labrador
Bishop (UT) Forbes LaMalfa
Black Fortenberry Lamborn
Blackburn Foxx Lance
Bonner Franks (AZ) Lankford
Boustany Frelinghuysen Latham
Brady (TX) Garamendi Latta
Bridenstine Gardner LoBiondo
Brooks (AL) Garrett Long
Brooks (IN) Gerlach Lucas
Broun (GA) Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Buchanan Gibson Lummis
Bucshon Gingrey (GA) Maloney, Sean
Burgess Gohmert Marchant
Calvert Goodlatte Marino
Camp Gosar Massie
Cantor Gowdy Matheson
Capito Granger McCarthy (CA)
Carter Graves (GA) McCaul
Cassidy Graves (MO) McClintock
Chabot Griffin (AR) McHenry
Chaffetz Griffith (VA) McIntyre
Coffman Guthrie McKeon
Cole Hall McKinley
Collins (GA) Hanna McMorris
Collins (NY) Harper Rodgers
Conaway Harris Meadows
Cook Hartzler Meehan
Cotton Hastings (WA) Messer
Cramer Hensarling Mica
Crawford Holding Miller (FL)
Crenshaw Hudson Miller (MI)
Culberson Huelskamp Miller, Gary
Daines Huizenga (MI) Mullin
Davis, Danny Hultgren Mulvaney
Davis, Rodney Hunter Murphy (PA)
Denham Hurt Neugebauer
Dent Issa Noem
DeSantis Jenkins Nugent
DesJarlais Johnson (OH) Nunes
Diaz-Balart Johnson, Sam Nunnelee

Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry

NOES—188

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Clay
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta Grimm Pallone
Bustos Herrera Beutler Rokita
Campbell Horsford
Coble McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1433

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.
MULVANEY) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 206,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—215

Amash Deutch Kaptur
Andrews Dingell Keating
Barton Doggett Kelly (IL)
Bass Doyle Kennedy
Beatty Duckworth Kildee
Becerra Duncan (SC) Kilmer
Bera (CA) Edwards Kind
Bishop (GA) Ellison Kirkpatrick
Bishop (NY) Engel Kuster
Blumenauer Enyart Labrador
Bonamici Eshoo Lance
Braley (IA) Esty Langevin
Broun (GA) Farr Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL) Foster Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA) Frankel (FL) Lee (CA)
Buchanan Fudge Levin
Butterfield Garamendi Lewis
Capps Garcia Lipinski
Capuano Garrett Loebsack
Cárdenas Goodlatte Lofgren
Carney Gosar Lowenthal
Carson (IN) Gowdy Lowe y
Castor (FL) Grayson Lujan Grisham
Castro (TX) Green, Al (NM)
Chabot Green, Gene Lujan, Ben Ray
Chaffetz Griffith (VA) (NM)
Chu Grijalva Lummis
Cicilline Gutiérrez Lynch
Clarke Hahn Maffei
Clay Hanabusa Maloney,
Cleaver Harris Carolyne
Clyburn Hastings (FL) Massie
Coffman Heck (WA) Matheson
Cohen Higgins Matsui
Collins (GA) Himes McClintock
Connolly Hinojosa McCollum
Conyers Holt McDermott
Cooper Honda McGovern
Costa Hoyer McNerney
Courtney Huelskamp Meeks
Crowley Huffman Meng
Cuellar Huizenga (MI) Mica
Cummings Israel Michaud
Davis (CA) Issa Miller, George
Davis, Danny Jackson Lee Moore
DeFazio Jeffries Moran
DeGette Johnson (GA) Mulvaney
Delaney Johnson, E. B. Murphy (FL)
DeLauro Jones Nadler
DelBene Jordan Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

NOES—206

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchson
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Granger

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Bustos

Campbell
Coble

Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo

Gohmert
Grimm

Herrera Beutler
Horsford

McCarthy (NY)
Pallone

Rokita
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1438

Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia and POSEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) 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 137, noes 286, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—137

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchson
Burgess
Capito
Chabot
Chobert
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harris
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huijenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer

NOES—286

Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Bachus

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke

Mica
Mullin
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Pearce
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souterland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Wagner
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Williams
Wolf
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Fortenberry
Sessions
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)

Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)

NOT VOTING—10

Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stewart
Stevens
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Pallone
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1443

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 238, noes 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—238

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Amodi	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barber	Fleming	Lamborn
Barr	Flores	Lance
Barrow (GA)	Forbes	Lankford
Barton	Fortenberry	Latham
Benishek	Fox	Latta
Bentivolio	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Long
Black	Garrett	Lucas
Blackburn	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Gibbs	Lummis
Boustany	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bridenstine	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCaul
Buchanan	Granger	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Cantor	Guthrie	McMorris
Capito	Hall	Rodgers
Carter	Hanna	Meadows
Cassidy	Harper	Meehan
Chabot	Harris	Messer
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mica
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Collins (GA)	Holding	Miller, Gary
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Mullin
Conaway	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cotton	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurt	Nugent
Crenshaw	Issa	Nunes
Culberson	Jenkins	Nunnelee
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Denham	Jones	Palazzo
Dent	Jordan	Paulsen
DeSantis	Joyce	Pearce
DesJarlais	Keating	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)
Duffy	King (IA)	Peterson
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Petri
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Pittenger

Pitts	Ryan (WI)
Poe (TX)	Salmon
Pompeo	Sanford
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schock
Radel	Schweikert
Reed	Scott, Austin
Reichert	Sensenbrenner
Renacci	Sessions
Ribble	Shimkus
Rice (SC)	Shuster
Rigell	Simpson
Roby	Sinema
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher	Southerland
Rooney	Stewart
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers
Roskam	Stockman
Ross	Stutzman
Rothfus	Takano
Royce	Terry
Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Runyana	Thornberry

NOES—185

Amash	Garcia	Negrete McLeod
Andrews	Grayson	Nolan
Bass	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pascarella
Becerra	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Heck (NV)	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Polis
Brown (FL)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Holt	Rahall
Capps	Honda	Rangel
Capuano	Hoyer	Richmond
Cárdenas	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schneider
Clyburn	Kind	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Schwartz
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lewis	Sherman
Cuellar	Loeb	Sires
Cummings	Loeb	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeLay	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tierney
DeBene	(NM)	Titus
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Maffei	Tsongas
Doggett	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Doyle	Carolyn	Vargas
Duckworth	Massie	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Visclosky
Enyart	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Esty	Meeks	Schultz
Farr	Meng	Waters
Fattah	Michaud	Watt
Foster	Miller, George	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Welch
Fudge	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Gabard	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gallego	Nadler	
Garamendi	Napolitano	
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Grimm
Bustos	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Horsford
Coble	McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1447

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 405, I inadvertently voted “aye.” I intended to vote “no.”

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

WASHINGTON KASTLES CHARITY CLASSIC

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, do you see this trophy before us? We've been on this House floor many times to celebrate baseball victories, football victories, or, I should say, baseball debacles in our case. But we celebrate a lot of things, also golf.

I want to point out that we had a wonderful experience last week, Thursday night, with the Washington Kastles, who are seated up in the Members' gallery. We had a wonderful bipartisan game of tennis between, obviously, the Members, Republican and Democrat intermixed, as well as members of the media.

I'm pleased to report to you that there were two teams, the Stars and the Stripes. My colleagues here, Mr. WATT, Ms. EDWARDS, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, were on the Stripes, and I'll introduce the Stars team in a moment. Mr. BISHOP will do that. We had a wonderful game.

We should also let you know, too, that members of the media played. I should let you know that part of Stripes' team included David Gregory of “Meet the Press.” He's a bigger problem on the tennis court than he is in an interview on “Meet the Press.” I also want you to know he's got a big serve. You've got to watch him. Our coach was Leander Paes, who's seated in the gallery, a professional. Our team also included former Senator John Breaux; SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Division I player from Duke. Did I say, “Go Lehigh”? That's basketball. Sorry. There was also Peter Cook from Bloomberg; myself; DONNA EDWARDS, who received the Good Sportsmanship Award; MEL WATT, who I must say was one of the most feisty players I've seen; Mark Ein, the owner of the Washington Kastles, who's also here; David Gregory; Jonathan Karl from ABC News; and Hans Nichols from Bloomberg—a very competitive individual, I might add. It was a great time had by all.

I know it's never appropriate to gloat when you win, but we'll do it anyway since we're Members of Congress. Here's our trophy. Stripes beat the Stars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Thank you very much. I appreciate my friend for yielding, although I must point out I don't remember Coach DOYLE gloating like that when we won the baseball game.

We had a great night, and I was pleased to play with my fellow Members: JIM COSTA, MIKE MCINTYRE, and CHERI BUSTOS. We had two members of the press from Fox News: Ed Henry and Bret Baier. We had two people from the White House: Gene Sperling and Alan Krueger. We had Ben Olsen from D.C. United. We had Ambassador Dino Djalal, and we were joined by three members of the Kastles: Murphy Jensen, Martina Hingis, and Anastasia Rodionova.

Mr. DENT. Now I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much.

I, too, want to thank my colleagues who participated with the Stars and Stripes. Fun was had by all. We raised a good amount of money for charity. I want to thank the Kastles for their wonderful hospitality. I got a tennis lesson from my partner, Martina Hingis.

But I do have, from a reliable source, that the Stripes, our opposition, pulled in two ringers from the Main Street media with NBC's David Gregory and Bloomberg's Hans Nichols. These two failed to disclose their professional tennis status in an amateur charitable tournament. So much for press ethics under full disclosure.

Mr. DENT. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, when you talk about helping with education, when you talk about helping food banks, and when you talk about helping our military families, it really was worth raising a racket about. That's what happened down at the Kastle stadium. We want to thank them for their hospitality.

Tennis is a lifetime sport, but this offers a lifeline to those in need in our schools, those who are hungry, and also to our military families. We appreciate the great opportunity. It truly was a great time to have the ball in our court to do something in a positive way.

Mr. DENT. Reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say, in conclusion, it was a wonderful cause. Many charities were supported.

I should also let you know the Washington Kastles are playing tonight down at the waterfront. Get down there and watch them. It's not tennis anyone; it's tennis everyone. So get out there and do it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members that the rules do not allow references to occupants of the gallery.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

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 gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) 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 264, noes 154, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—264

Aderholt	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	McIntyre
Andrews	Fudge	McKinley
Bachmann	Gabbard	McMorris
Barr	Gallego	Rodgers
Barton	Garamendi	McNerney
Bass	Garcia	Meadows
Beatty	Gerlach	Messer
Becerra	Gibson	Mica
Bera (CA)	Gohmert	Michaud
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Blackburn	Granger	Miller, George
Blumenauer	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Bonamici	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bonner	Griffith (VA)	Neal
Boustany	Guthrie	Negrete McLeod
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Noem
Bridenstine	Hall	Nolan
Brooks (IN)	Hanabusa	Nugent
Broun (GA)	Harper	Nunes
Brown (FL)	Harris	Nunnelee
Brownley (CA)	Hartzler	Owens
Bucshon	Hastings (FL)	Palazzo
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Pascarell
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Calvert	Hensarling	Pelosi
Camp	Higgins	Perry
Capito	Himes	Peters (CA)
Capps	Hinojosa	Peterson
Capuano	Hoyer	Petri
Cárdenas	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Huffman	Pocan
Carter	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Cartwright	Israel	Posey
Cassidy	Issa	Price (GA)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cleaver	Jones	Reichert
Clyburn	Jordan	Richmond
Cohen	Kaptur	Roe (TN)
Cole	Keating	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Kennedy	Rogers (MI)
Costa	Kildee	Rooney
Courtney	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kind	Ross
Crowley	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Labrador	Ruiz
Daines	LaMalfa	Runyan
Davis, Danny	Lance	Ruppersberger
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Rush
DeFazio	Lankford	Salmon
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Delaney	Larson (CT)	T.
DeLauro	Latham	Sánchez, Loretta
DelBene	Latta	Sanford
Denham	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Dent	Lewis	Scalise
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Deutch	LoBiondo	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Loebsack	Schneider
Dingell	Lofgren	Schrader
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Ellison	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lucas	Scott, David
Enyart	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	Lynch	Serrano
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Farenthold	Massie	Shea-Porter
Farr	Matsui	Sherman
Fattah	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fincher	McCaul	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Sires
Fox	McDermott	Smith (MO)

Smith (TX)	Tsongas	Waters
Southerland	Valadao	Webster (FL)
Speier	Van Hollen	Welch
Stewart	Vargas	Westmoreland
Stivers	Veasey	Whitfield
Stutzman	Vela	Williams
Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Wagner	Woodall
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Walorski	Yoho
Tiberi	Walz	Young (AK)
Tierney	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Titus	Schultz	Young (IN)

NOES—154

Amash	Graves (MO)	Olson
Amodeli	Grayson	Paulsen
Bachus	Green, Gene	Payne
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Benishek	Hanna	Peters (MI)
Bentivolio	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (NY)	Holding	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Holt	Polis
Black	Honda	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Radel
Bralley (IA)	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurt	Ribble
Cantor	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (NY)	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Conyers	Kline	Schweikert
Cooper	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cotton	Levin	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Culberson	(NM)	Slaughter
Cummins	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Stockman
Duffy	Marchant	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Thornberry
Edwards	McClintock	Tipton
Ellmers	McHenry	Tonko
Fleischmann	McKeon	Turner
Fleming	Meehan	Upton
Flores	Meng	Velázquez
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fortenberry	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibbs	Nadler	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Womack
Gowdy	O'Rourke	Yoder

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Grimm	Meeks
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita
Coble	Luján, Ben Ray	Waxman
Doyle	(NM)	
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1457

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. KILMER. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue to a civilian employee of the Department of Defense a denial of a security clearance pursuant to Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 that lists in the notice of specific reasons of the clearance decision (as defined in section 3.2 of such Directive) financial hardships because of a "furlough caused by sequestration".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to protect the continued employment of needed and trusted Department of Defense civilian employees. DOD civilian employees who are critical to our national security mission may be in danger of losing their security clearances and their jobs if financial hardships from being furloughed result in financial delinquencies.

Right now, the DOD has issued vague guidance that they will take into account the impact that sequestration is having on servicemembers' financial situation.

While I appreciate those efforts, I believe that Congress should strengthen our commitment to our servicemembers by ensuring no funds are used to deny the renewal of security clearances to workers who are only experiencing financial hardship as a result of sequestration.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment, and it is my hope that it will receive strong support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's intense interest in trying to protect these folks who would be affected by sequestration, but awarding or granting or giving a national security clearance is not a simple thing and it should not be taken lightly. If the Department of Defense or government agency decides that a person doesn't really qualify, they feel that they don't deserve a national security clearance, if the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration" is included in the denial, then the denial is null and void. You can't deny it if it is claimed that it's due to sequestration, and that's not fair. That's not fair to our national security. It's not fair, actually, to the Defense Department, and I just think this is not a good idea.

But I know what the gentleman wants to accomplish and would like to work with him to figure out how to do this without denying the Defense Department the right to deny a security clearance to someone that they think

is not a good risk for a security clearance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman KILMER for offering this amendment today and, frankly, for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our men and women in our civil service who support our servicemembers and veterans every day. Without this amendment, hard-working men and women who live in the district I represent and who work at Joint Base Lewis-McChord risk losing their security clearance through furloughs that are no fault of their own, thus complicating their employment situation. We should not let that happen.

The issue this amendment aims to resolve is yet another in a long series of issues that show why budgeting by sequestration is bad policy. I don't think anyone in this Chamber actually thinks civilian employees should lose their security clearance because they were furloughed, but the way sequestration was designed makes that a very real possibility.

This is a good amendment to fix a bad policy. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks on the specific language of the amendment, and I do hope that we will continue to work through the conference process to address any concerns about the language because we can all agree that this is a serious issue. It is extremely important that the DOD continues to grant security clearances to employees who are charged with doing critical and sensitive work.

There are many factors that DOD considers when determining if an individual can do these important jobs and to ensure that an employee is trustworthy. Sequestration-related furloughs and any financial hardships that come from sequestration are not an employee's fault. No civilian employee should be denied a security clearance because of Congress' inability to undo sequestration.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support DOD civilians and the work they do for our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, again I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do. It's just the problem in the denial, if they use the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration," they can't deny that request for a security clearance, and there may be a lot of good reasons why that person should be denied.

And so it's a question of do we protect the national security by giving the Defense Department the authority to deny regardless of what the furlough language is, or do we allow this amend-

ment, which is probably poorly written; and we would like to work with the gentleman to write it in such a way that it doesn't cause us great distress. But I just don't want to see someone who should be denied a security clearance given one because of a technicality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILMER. 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. NADLER. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the continued detention of any individual who is detained, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, by the United States at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds from being used to detain cleared individuals held at Guantanamo. Of the 166 people currently being held there, 86 have been cleared for release; that is, they have not been charged with any offense. They have been found guilty of nothing, and they have been judged by our military to pose no threat to the United States if released. We should release them now. Holding these 86 people who have been cleared for release is against everything we claim to stand for.

In response to this very situation, President Obama asked: Is this who we are?

I hope today we will answer: No, we are better than that.

I hope we support this amendment and move expeditiously to support the release of these detainees. It is truly astonishing that in 2013 the United States continues to hold people indefinitely who have not been charged, let alone convicted of any crime, who admittedly do not pose any threat to the United States. They should be released.

Guantanamo is an affront to America and to the founding principle of the United States that no person should be deprived of liberty without due process of law. Our continuing to hold prisoners indefinitely, without charge and without trial, is a rebuke to our professed support of liberty.

If they've been judged not to pose a threat and we hold them anyway, what kind of message are we sending? By what claim of right do we hold people in jail who have been charged with nothing, whom we're not bringing to trial, and who we have decided pose no threat to us? What are we saying about the United States and our values? We must change course and we ought to support this amendment.

Now, I know some will say these are dangerous terrorists. No, they're not. They're people who were captured in some way who have been judged by our military not to pose a threat to the United States, who have not been charged as terrorists, who have not been judged as terrorists. Some of them may be simply victims to the fact that we paid bounties to people in Afghanistan to turn in people who they said were terrorists. The Hatfields turned in the McCoys because—why not?—we were giving them a couple of thousand dollars.

So anyone who has not been charged with a crime, who has not been convicted, and who we have already decided poses no threat ought to be released. And, therefore, this amendment says no funds may be used to continue their confinement. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would allow, and probably require, that a very large number of detainees from Guantanamo are sent back home to their home country or a country that they might have come to. They're detainees for a reason. They are detainees because they inflicted harm or danger or threats or death to our American interests, our American soldiers. They came from the battlefield.

Now, we know that two of the former detainees who have been sent back to their country established a group that's run by those two former Gitmo detainees, and so I don't think it's a good idea. I think we should keep the detainees that are dangerous. Until such time as they meet the requirements of the law, they should stay at Guantanamo. They would have to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees, whom most judge as the most dangerous, will not be released or otherwise brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, the present law ensures that, prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country, a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities.

What's wrong with that? There's nothing wrong with that, so why change it? Why turn these people loose to go back to the battlefield, which many of them that have been released have already done, causing additional harm to our troops. So I'm strongly opposed to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. NADLER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from our Judiciary Committee for yielding.

And I want to say to my very good friend from Florida, the chair of the Defense Appropriations Committee, whom I greatly respect, I'm afraid there's a misunderstanding. This amendment is only about those detainees who have been cleared for release or transfer. This is not about the entire 166 people who are there.

These are the people who, after a very careful review, have been cleared for release by the intelligence community and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So we're holding these people without cause. We're holding them because we've let our rhetoric get ahead of ourselves.

The fact is that they would be released to their countries of origin. Their countries of origin are going to watch them. But these are people who we have found we have nothing to charge them with, and we have determined that they are not a threat to the United States or to anyone else. They shouldn't have been rounded up. They shouldn't have been detained. And they've been detained for 12 years.

46 detainees are now having to be tube-fed. They're strapped down and a tube is forced down their nose and into their stomach. They're strapped down for 2 hours so the liquid gets digested.

People that have been cleared for release, how can we justify doing this to them?

And what's the end game of our current policy?

Are we going to keep them until they die in prison? People who have been cleared for release and transfer, and we're just going to keep detaining them until they die?

Because that's the only result of the current policy.

Once they get cleaned, they should be released.

Who are we, as a Nation to detain people indefinitely, without legal cause?

It doesn't make sense. It's not American. It's a complete violation of our Constitution, of our most fundamental principle of equal justice under the law.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left? How much time does the gentleman have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it would serve a purpose if people actually read the amendment. The amendment says none of the funds made available may be used to detain an individual who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

We hear from the gentleman from Florida, these people are there for a reason. Yes, when we arrest somebody, a murder is committed, a rape is committed, we arrest somebody. But then, the grand jury says, no, we're not going to indict this person; there's not enough evidence.

Do we hold them in jail indefinitely, forever, even though there's no charge, even though the District Attorney says we made a mistake; it's somebody else; they didn't do it? No.

Because maybe they'll commit a crime? That's antithetical to every notion of what the United States is about. These are 86 people who are not charged as terrorists, who we have no evidence are terrorists, and who have been judged by the military and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence community to pose no threat to us.

By what claim of right do we hold them in jail? The United States, at this point, is no better than a kidnapper if it holds in jail people whom it charges with no crime and judges safe for release.

Approve the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I don't think it can be said any stronger or needed to be said any more often. These detainees are bad, bad people. They hate America. They've sworn to kill Americans, and, in fact, they have done so on the battlefield, and that's why, when they were captured, they were sent to Guantanamo. That's where they should stay unless the current law is abided by, and that is, to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are most judged as the most dangerous will not be released or brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, they ensure that prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities and the foreign government can maintain control over the individual. What's wrong with that law?

It protects Americans. It protects America, and it keeps the bad guys where they need to be kept. And in this particular case, it's at Guantanamo.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. NADLER. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to construct any new Department of Defense facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, or to expand any existing Department of Defense facility at such Naval Station.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any funds in the bill from being used to construct or expand detention facilities at Guantanamo.

The bill contains \$249 million to convert temporary detention facilities into more permanent structures. But the administration wants to close Guantanamo and to release or transfer the detainees. So why waste \$429 million to construct facilities that will not be used? Because many in Congress want to keep the detainees in Guantanamo forever.

Now, we have, we know, 166 detainees in Guantanamo; 86 should be released immediately. The gentleman from Florida says that they're bad people; they are terrorists; they're there for a reason. No, they're not. They're there for different reasons. Some because they were handed over for bounties by rival militias or rival clans. Some because a mistake was made. Some because they're terrorists. But we make distinctions.

The gentleman says we shouldn't release them until a careful assessment has been made. Well, a careful assessment has been made: 86 of them, half of those in Guantanamo, have been cleared for release. That is to say, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence agencies have determined that these 86 people were not terrorists and were not likely to pose a threat to the United States if released. So they're guilty of nothing. They have been tried for nothing. We don't say that people are bad people, we ought to hold them in jail indefinitely without a trial normally, except here. So we ought to release the 86 who have been cleared for release immediately, and the others we ought to try, put on trial.

There's a separate dispute whether that should be an Article III court or a military tribunal. I prefer an Article III court, but either way, put them on trial in front of a court or in front of a military tribunal and let them be tried. Perhaps most of them will be guilty and put them in jail for long periods of time. Maybe some will be innocent. That's what the justice system is about.

Are we really going to say that Guantanamo is separate? Anyone who is unlucky enough to be sent there because at one time we thought maybe they were dangerous should stay there indefinitely until they die without a trial?

The assessment has been made for 86 of them. They have been judged not to be guilty, not to be a terrorist, and not to be a threat. That assessment has been made according to law, and these people ought to be released. The other 80 ought to be tried and, if convicted, ought to be put in prison in the United States. We have hundreds of terrorists in maximum security prisons in the United States. There's no reason a few more couldn't be put there, and we could save \$249 million.

Guantanamo was originally set up because it was thought by the Bush administration that if we held people in Guantanamo they could be tried or handled without having the constitutional rights of someone in the United States, but the Supreme Court said no. The people in Guantanamo have the same rights as if they were held in the United States. So it doesn't change what will happen to them, whether they're kept in prison in the United States or in Guantanamo.

So let's release the 86 who ought to be released because they've been adjudged that they should be released by the Joint Chiefs and by the intelligence agencies. Let's try the others, and let's keep them in jail if they're adjudged guilty. Let's proceed with American justice notions and do ourselves proud, and let's stop wasting billions of dollars on Guantanamo.

So this amendment says don't permanentize what should be and will be temporary, however temporary it is. Don't waste \$249 million on making these facilities permanent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment, I'm assuming that the gentleman is trying to prevent any further construction or money of that type for the Guantanamo detainees. And I can understand that because we have just recently spent a lot of money building two brand new prisons, air-conditioned, comfortable, and we've already spent that money, so maybe we don't need to spend any money there.

But what the amendment doesn't recognize is that since 1903, we have had a

presence at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for our own military purposes. The 4th Fleet is headquartered there and has been there for many years. Allied shipping, allied Navy facilities, allied forces move through Guantanamo Bay on a fairly regular basis. I don't know that they have any specific requests right now for any kind of construction, but I don't think we want to deny it in the event that the Defense Department finds it important to do a construction project there.

So, understand, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has been part of the United States military facility since 1903, and so I don't think this amendment is a good amendment because it would deny our troops, our forces not even involved with Guantanamo detainees the right for military construction, or the right for whatever needs to be spent.

So, again, I just have to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1¼ minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we just approved \$260 million in the defense authorization bill for Guantanamo. In addition, we approved another \$186 billion to construct a new temporary facility, almost half a billion dollars, in addition to what we're now spending. We've spent this year alone \$2,670,000 per Guantanamo detainee. Eighty-six of them have been cleared for release. We have no reason to keep them. And yet, we spend that much money on each of them.

In U.S. prisons we spend \$34,000 per year per maximum security prisoner. Imagine the discrepancy. We have now convicted 300 terrorists in U.S. prisons. They're being held at 98 Federal prisons for a fraction of the money. And we have no convictions at Guantanamo that haven't been overturned.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman just made my case. We don't really need a lot more money for construction for Guantanamo detainees. We've already spent a lot of money there.

The point is, we don't want to deny the ability of the Defense Department to provide whatever is needed for our own military forces at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, not part of the Guantanamo detainees.

I think we've talked this one to death. We're repeating ourselves now. So, in the interest of time, I'm going to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the \$249 million in the budget is for expansion and making permanent detention facilities. I have

no objection to construction of other military facilities at Guantanamo Bay. I don't know whether that makes sense or not. But the \$249 million we're talking about here is for more detention facilities. That's a pure waste of money. And I'll be happy to clarify, if this amendment passes, that it should apply only to detention facilities.

So if you're opposed to wasting \$249 million more on detention facilities so we can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year per prisoner instead of \$34,000 per year per prisoner in the United States, if you think that's a good idea to waste all this money, then vote against this amendment. I hope rational people who don't want to waste a quarter of a billion dollars for permanent detention facilities will vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. PIERLUISI. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce—

(1) the first sentence of section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93-166; 87 Stat. 668);

(2) the first sentence of section 9 of the quitclaim deed of December 20, 1982 (transferring property on the Northwest Peninsula of Culebra to the government of Puerto Rico), or, with respect to such sentence, section 10 of the quitclaim deed; or

(3) with respect to a response action required under section 2701(c)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to property transferred by the quitclaim deed described in paragraph (2)—

(A) section 2(d)(15) of the enclosure 3 accompanying Department of Defense Manual No. 4715.20, dated March 9, 2012 (relating to "DERP Eligibility—Ineligible Activities"); or

(B) section 8074 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, this budget-neutral amendment, which I offer with Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, would

enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance from land in Culebra, Puerto Rico, which was used as a military training range for seven decades.

In 1974, Congress enacted legislation directing the Navy to cease operations in Culebra. A provision stated that the present bombardment area shall not be utilized for any purpose that would require decontamination at the expense of the United States.

In 1982, the Federal Government conveyed land in Culebra to the Government of Puerto Rico, including a 400-acre parcel within the former bombardment area. The deed provided that, in accordance with the 1974 act, the Government of Puerto Rico would not hold the Federal Government liable for decontamination of the land.

Four years later, in 1986, Congress enacted SARA, which amended the 1980 CERCLA law. SARA states that DOD is responsible for cleaning up contamination it caused on current and former military sites and established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for DOD to carry out these responsibilities. That program is funded by the bill under consideration today.

SARA directed DOD to clean up former defense sites conveyed to third parties prior to 1986. These sites are eligible for Federal funding, even though there were no specific authorities enabling their cleanup at the time they were decommissioned and conveyed. Nevertheless, DOD contends that the 1974 law and the 1982 deed that tracks it prohibits the use of Federal funds to decontaminate the 400-acre parcel on Culebra, and these prohibitions were not superceded by SARA. As a result of this restrictive interpretation, Culebra is the only former defense site in the Nation that DOD contends it is barred by statute from decontaminating.

This makes no sense. The 1974 act and the 1982 deed may have been consistent with Federal policy at that time since there was no legal framework in place that would have enabled the Federal Government to pay for the cleanup of the conveyed property. However, they're now squarely at odds with Federal policy that has been in place for more than 25 years under SARA. Accordingly, there's no principled basis to treat Culebra differently from thousands of other former defense sites conveyed out of Federal hands prior to 1986 which the Federal Government is obligated to decontaminate.

The status quo poses a threat to human safety since this parcel contains beaches, walkways, and campgrounds visited by over 300,000 people a year. A recent DOD report found that since 1995, there have been 70 incidents in which members of the public encountered unexploded munitions that could have caused great harm. In fact, in March of this year, a young girl visiting a Culebra beach suffered burns after she picked up an artillery shell containing white phosphorous. The FBI responded and found six other munitions which it detonated and removed.

This potentially tragic incident underscores the need for congressional action.

This amendment would ensure that the 1974 act ceases to function as an obstacle to implementation of current Federal policy, as reflected in CERCLA and SARA. The amendment simply ensures that Culebra will receive the same treatment as other former defense sites in the FUDS program. The citizens in Culebra sacrificed so our military could receive the training it needed. Congress, in turn, should take this small step to remove the barrier that is preventing DOD from addressing safety hazards that remain on the island.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly I appreciate the gentleman's passion on this issue and agree that is an important issue that needs to be addressed. As he is aware, Mr. Chairman, the Department estimates it will take multiple years and a significant investment to properly address these contaminated sites in Puerto Rico.

We look forward to working with the gentleman. We understand that he may be considering withdrawing his amendment so we can continue to work with him to address this problem, which significantly has impacted the Commonwealth.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I look forward to working with the majority.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate my friend yielding to me.

I simply want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The agreement that was reached—and I think some people used the agreement as an excuse to do nothing—is 40 years old. It was entered into in 1973. Well, they agreed to it. I graduated from law school in 1973. The world is a much different place today. People have changed. I certainly think our environmental consciousness has improved and our consciousness of our responsibility in this has improved. And I do think this is an opportunity to rectify that.

I serve on the Energy and Water Subcommittee of this great committee. The chairman chairs that Energy and Water Subcommittee. Unfortunately, in the Formerly Used Defense Sites that were cited by the gentleman, we have over 10,000 properties, which is one of the problems I think the gentleman alludes to as far as the costs we have to deal with. All the more reason, I believe, that we ought to be very assiduous and active in beginning to address these sites.

So I appreciate the gentleman raising it, and I certainly support his position.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, it was my understanding with

Mr. YOUNG that the gentleman would consider withdrawing the amendment if we gave a commitment to continue to work with him on this very important issue, which he has dedicated so much time and effort to.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. That's absolutely right. So I will withdraw my amendment. But let me just say that, again, this is one property. It's only one property out of thousands of properties facing these circumstances. So I hope we can work it out. It's not going to be costly. It makes sense to clean it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Defense—

(1) to implement or execute any agreement with the Russian Federation pertaining to missile defense other than a treaty; or

(2) to provide the Government of the Russian Federation with any information about the ballistic missile defense systems of the United States that is classified or unclassified by the Department or component thereof.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to implement or execute any non-treaty executive agreement with Russia regarding missile defense or to provide Russia with information about America's ballistic missile defense systems, both classified and unclassified. The reason the amendment says classified and unclassified is to prohibit the administration from declassifying missile defense technology to skirt the law. A similar amendment was passed last year, with bipartisan support, and is included in the current continuing resolution that is funding our government during this fiscal year.

Multiple news sources over the years have reported that the Obama adminis-

tration may seek to share our missile defense secrets with the Russians. I am concerned these reports may be accurate. While the danger to national security is a serious concern, so is the loss of billions of dollars we have sunk into creating these exceptional technologies.

The Congressional Research Service estimates the United States has spent approximately \$153 billion on missile defense. Roughly 90 percent of that \$153 billion, or \$140 billion, has been spent on hit-to-kill technology.

I ask the House to support this amendment to preserve America's lead in missile defense technologies, protect America's investment of billions of dollars, and ensure the viability of current and future missile defense technologies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I had my breath taken away with the assertion that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia, and that we are debating an amendment to Defense appropriations, with all of the other problems we face and all the threats we face in this country, based on the assumption that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia.

I would simply ask my colleagues to think about the underlying assumptions based in the gentleman's amendment and vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. There have been numerous occasions in which the media has reported that the administration is considering, as a part of negotiations or other things, divulgence of our sensitive hit-to-kill technology to the Russian federation.

□ 1545

I am thankful that my colleague across the aisle says that it takes away his breath, and I hope with that that he will support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We support your amendment. As you said, it is similar to what the bill carried last year and what was a provision in the armed services bill, so we are supportive of it. We're obviously mindful and respectful of the ranking member's position, but the majority of Congress felt the way you and I do and the committee did as well.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman responds to my concern by

suggesting that he has discovered the possibility that the President of the United States is going to give away the most intimate secrets this country holds to Russia through the media. I'm wondering—and I ask this question simply rhetorically, not necessarily of my colleague—I wonder if that was FOX News. I wonder if he saw that on the Colbert Report recently. I wonder if that was on the John Stewart program.

I was watching CNN, and I didn't see any report of that yesterday; although, I saw that a baby was born in another country. Despite the world coming apart, that was the headline news. I didn't see MSNBC, and I don't know if that was it. Perhaps it was even on a BBC telecast. But I'm wondering what media outlets are providing this inside information as to the deliberations of the President of the United States to give away these cherished secrets.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the appropriate way to gather the requested information is simply for the gentleman to Google what I have just stated.

This issue arose in 2011 with numerous comments by the White House that were reported in numerous outlets. By way of background, my source is not FOX News in this particular instance, but all he has to do is Google it and he can find it.

Also, there were numerous reports in 2012 where the President indicated—in what turned out to be an open mic—that once the elections were over with, he could more freely negotiate or give away information to the Russians. Those aren't the exact words used by the President. Unfortunately, I don't have perfect recall, but it was words to that effect.

I would emphasize that this House has visited this issue previously. This has passed with bipartisan support. So I would urge this body to again, as a precautionary measure, adopt this amendment to prevent the sharing of our hit-to-kill technology with the Russian Federation to the extent that risk becomes a reality.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time, and I understand I have the right to close.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman indicated, in query to my rhetorical question, that all I have to do is Google and I will discover the information that will lead to our knowledge that the President of the United States is considering giving away this very sensitive information.

It comes to mind, when the gentleman suggests I should Google it, how many different encounters I have had with members of the public who said, "I saw it on the Internet; it must be true." For example, Members of Congress, after serving one term, receive a full salary pension for the rest

of their lives; and Members of Congress receive free health care for the rest of their lives; and Members of Congress, for the last 4 years in a row, have received significant pay increases because they Googled it on the Internet, and so they secured very specific, accurate information. Perhaps we should go to Facebook or LinkedIn or reddit, or maybe we should tweet each other.

Again, in very serious concern, I would suggest my colleagues absolutely reject this amendment. I would ask for their vote against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. SCHIFF. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available under this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funding the use of force pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, or AUMF, effective on December 31, 2014, when the last American combat troops will rotate out of Afghanistan and the responsibility for security will have passed to the Afghan people after more than 13 years of war in that country.

New Year's Day 2015 should not only bring about a new relationship between the United States and Afghanistan, it should also mark the end of a conflict that was begun in our skies on that September morning and which was formalized days later when the Congress passed the AUMF.

That legislation provided the President with the authority to use "force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

The 2001 AUMF was never intended to authorize a war without end, and it now poorly defines those who pose a threat to our country. That authority and the funding that goes along with it

should expire concurrent with the end of our combat role in Afghanistan.

In addition to this amendment, I have introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2324, which sunsets the AUMF effective the same date, December 31, 2014, and calls on the administration to work with Congress together to determine what new authority, if any, is necessary to protect the country after that time.

The Constitution vests the Congress with the power to declare war and the responsibility of appropriating funds to pay for it. It is our most awesome responsibility and central to our military efforts overseas. We owe it to the men and women we send into combat to properly define and authorize their mission, and my amendment will effectively give Congress the next 16 months to do so.

In his recent speech at National Defense University, President Obama specifically called on Congress to work with him:

I look forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine, and ultimately repeal, the AUMF's mandate, and I will not sign any laws designed to expand this mandate further. Our systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue, but this war, like all wars, must end.

This amendment is a prudent first step towards meeting the President's challenge, a call that we must embrace, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Members of Congress sworn to defend the Constitution.

I urge a "yes" vote and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in some ways I'm somewhat sympathetic to the hopes that underlie this amendment. I hope that terrorism has gone away by December 31, 2014. I hope that Zawahiri and the others responsible for 9/11 and those who authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attack or harbored them are all brought to justice in the next 14 months. I hope that our country and other countries around the world no longer have to worry about terrorists hiding bombs inside their clothing or inside their bodies, trying to kill as many innocent people as possible. And I hope that military and civilians who serve our Nation all around the world, and others in the private sector, are no longer the target for suicide bombings and assassinations and the other sorts of things that we've seen since 9/11.

But, Mr. Chairman, what if my hopes don't come to pass? What if the world has something else in store? What if terrorism still exists by December 31, 2014? Well, then it seems to me that this amendment doesn't make a lot of sense. Because this amendment says no matter what—not just in Afghanistan, but anywhere around the world—we're

not going to fund anything through the Department of Defense pursuant to that AUMF.

Now, I've got to say, I have been and continue to be for updating that AUMF to better reflect the way that al Qaeda has evolved over the last decade or so. Unfortunately, that has been resisted by the administration, as the gentleman just pointed out.

Of course we all want this war against terrorists and other wars to end, but, unfortunately, the enemy gets a vote. So for us to unilaterally say, because of the calendar, we're done, and, oh, maybe we'll pass some new authority—but maybe not—in order to protect this country, I think, is dangerous. It's shortsighted. It is putting hopes above reality.

So I hope my colleagues reject this. We can do better in fighting terrorists in a variety of ways. But to bury our head in the sand and say it's all going to be over on a certain date is not the way to protect this country, and I believe it forfeits our most essential responsibilities under the Constitution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I want to yield to my colleague from Indiana. Before I do, two quick points.

No one is suggesting, of course, that terrorism is going to go away in 16 months or all of our problems will be over. But what we are saying with this amendment is that the authorization we passed that authorizes force against those who planned, authorized, and committed the 9/11 attacks shouldn't be used to go after groups like al Shabaab, which may not even have been in existence at the time of 9/11.

This AUMF is now outdated; and unless we have a sunset date, we're going to continue to rely on an AUMF that no longer describes the nature of the conflict we're in.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and rise in strong support of his amendment.

The gentleman who is in opposition mentions that the administration mentions the United States Constitution. The fact is we have a constitutional responsibility. With the passage of more than a decade and a changing world—and I would agree with the gentleman, something else may be in store—we ought to revisit that issue. We ought to exercise our constitutional, congressional prerogative and have a full debate.

Again, the gentleman is providing over 1½ years. In such a serious issue, I think even this Congress could come to grips with that type of fundamental issue and resolve the future.

So I strongly support what the gentleman is doing and appreciate his amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues, this

House has voted 2 years in a row to update the AUMF so it does better reflect the way that al Qaeda has changed. We have included the exact language used by the Obama administration and the Bush administration in court proceedings and just adopted that. The House has passed that. I don't remember how the particular gentleman voted on that, but the House has passed it. The Senate has not gone along. But there has been an effort to update the language to better reflect the way that the threat has changed, but that's a far different thing from saying, okay, we're just going to make this go away and hope that in the meantime we can do something better. I think that is terribly risky.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I would only say to my colleague, through the Chair, that this institution has proved that unless we have a deadline, we simply refuse to act.

What the President has said in terms of any new authorization for use of force—and it's something I agree wholeheartedly with the White House—is that he won't support a new authorization that is broader than the one that we seek to sunset. That, I think, is a problem with some of the drafts which the majority has proposed.

We don't want an expanded war. We do want an authorization that reflects the precise nature of the threat, and that threat has changed since 9/11. It no longer comes as much from the core of al Qaeda, which has been decimated; rather, it comes now from a group of franchises, loosely affiliated organizations that sometimes, as a product of convenience, will associate with al Qaeda for financing or legitimacy. But it is now a far-flung terrorist challenge, and any authorization ought to reflect the changing nature of threat.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is you have to read the amendment and the words that are in it. The amendment says we can spend no money for any part of the Department of Defense pursuant to the AUMF after December 31, 2014.

□ 1600

Now, we can have a very interesting discussion about how the AUMF should be updated, about different authority that could take its place, but none of that is before us. What is before us is that it basically says, no funding shall be used. It essentially repeals the AUMF.

Now, I realize the gentleman is trying to precipitate further debate, but the fact is terrorism is not going away. This prohibits any U.S. military action, not only in Afghanistan, but anywhere in the world that al Qaeda or its

affiliates may have traveled. This stops all of that.

My point is that there is too dangerous a risk in a world where there are too many people still trying to find new, innovative ways to attack us and kill as many Americans as possible. We can't take that risk.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 113-170.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$65,000,000) (increased by \$65,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, my amendment addresses a current issue that is undermining an already weakened system of justice in our military.

Any JAG will tell you that it is impossible to effectively prosecute a case if the investigation was improperly handled. That is why the DOD Inspector General report released last week was so troubling.

It uncovered that of the 501 investigations of sexual assault offenses they audited, all but 83 had some sort of deficiency. That means that less than 20 percent were completed without error. Fifty-six cases, 11 percent of the cases, had serious deficiencies. And 399 of these cases had interview and post-interview deficiencies. They also found weaknesses in collecting evidence, not developing leads, and photographing the scene. This in large part is a result of inadequate training in how to properly investigate these complex cases.

A February IG report found that criminal investigators want and need more training on conducting sexual assault investigations. For example, criminal investigators for the Air Force told the IG they wanted more training on the psychology of interviewing victims and evidence collec-

tion. One investigator said he would be "in trouble" if he only relied on the training he received.

That is why I'm offering this amendment that will provide an additional \$10 million in funds to train investigators on how to properly investigate sexual assault-related offenses.

My amendment realigns funds from the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account and shifts \$5 million to Army Operations and Maintenance, \$2.5 million to Air Force Operations and Maintenance, and \$2.5 million to Navy Operations and Maintenance, which are accounts that pay for training investigators.

Ensuring that assaults are investigated properly is the first step for holding perpetrators accountable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, this is an issue that we can't sweep under the rug any longer. We have got to face it square on. The gentlelady's amendment helps do that.

The subcommittee when preparing this legislation was extremely concerned about the issue, and we have included considerable amounts of money to deal with sexual predators and sexual assaults in the military, especially demanding that the military do a better job at enforcing the rules, the laws, to protect the rights of those who are sexually abused.

I thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, and we do support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I've got goose bumps that I actually have an amendment that my colleagues on the other side support.

I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding and the chairman's support.

Madam Chair, the amendment does seek to target an important part of the process when prosecuting a sexual assault—the investigation of the incident.

As the Congresswoman pointed out, the Inspector General found this particular part of the process lacking in terms of interviewing victims, investigating crime scenes, and notifying the sexual assault response coordinator. The funding proposed would provide the means to include special training for tactics and techniques when investigating crimes of these natures. I would join the chairman of the committee in thanking her for raising the issue and strongly support it.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, let me just say in closing, we all now recognize 26,000 cases a year of sexual assault and rape. This is not sexual harassment, I might point out; this is unwanted sexual contact. Of those cases, only 3,000 are actually reported. The fear of reporting, the fear of reprisal is so great, that very few of them, less than 20 percent, actually report them.

Then when you report these cases, to have them improperly or inadequately investigated, that then results in a handful of actual courts-martial, and then even smaller, some 250 convictions out of some 3,000 that are reported suggests that we have a lot of work to do.

I thank my colleagues for the support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. Frequently, sexual-assault victims in the military are referred to Uniformed mental-health experts. From there, they are all too often subsequently diagnosed with "personality disorders" and separated from the military. While the military is making some positive steps to correct the improper processes surrounding sexual assault cases, it is impossible to know how many veterans of the military have disputed their personality disorder discharges and it is even more difficult to know how many victims of sexual assault did not come forward in fear of being labeled or scapegoated. Instead of sweeping these crimes under the rug, this amendment will review these cases and identify individuals that were improperly separated from the military subsequent to reporting a sexual assault and correct their record. I urge support for this important way forward in addressing sexual crimes.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 113-170.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 8, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 8, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, since I began working on this issue of military sexual assault 3 years ago, I've had the opportunity to speak to over 100 courageous survivors of rape.

With each of their experiences, there is a unique nature to them. But many of these survivors that decided to report these crimes have had a very similar experience after they reported: they were retaliated against, ostracized, and involuntarily separated from the military on the grounds of a personality or adjustment disorder.

Mental health diagnoses are grossly misused to administratively discharge or retaliate against survivors of sexual assault and other servicemembers. Since 2001, the military has discharged more than 31,000 servicemembers on the grounds that they were subject to a personality disorder.

A GAO investigation found that 22 to 60 percent of the time personality disorders were either not diagnosed by a trained psychiatrist or psychologist, or there was undue command influence.

This pattern has become a potent lesson to servicemembers that are assaulted: report and get kicked out of the military with a personality disorder diagnosis. This designation amounts to a scarlet letter, pinned where their medals should be, and follows them for the rest of their lives. These servicemembers are re-victimized every time they apply for a job and submit their DD214s. It also makes it virtually impossible to retain a security clearance.

My amendment aims to address this clear pattern of retaliation against victims who report a crime of rape or sexual assault. The amendment provides funds to correct their service record and provide them with the benefits they have earned. My amendment realigns \$65 million within the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account to dedicate these funds to identifying and correct the service record of servicemembers who were summarily discharged from the military following reports of a sexual assault. This amendment requires the Department of Defense to review all separations of individuals that made an unrestricted report of sexual assault and determine if they were discharged, and on what grounds—including personality and adjustment disorders. My amendment will also direct the Secretary of Defense to correct their records of service—to right this wrong—and provide them with any compensation and services they weren't able to receive as a consequence of this error.

This is the very least we can do for these brave survivors. It is the first step in addressing the systemic re-victimization of courageous men and women who were brave enough to come forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Again, Madam Chairman, this is a good amendment. Those who are subject to sexual assaults, sexual attacks, and

who have been separated from the military on grounds of a disorder need to have their records corrected if information indicates that that should be done.

Sexual assault victims have already suffered a great deal. They deserve to have their military records accurately reflect their military service. Those victims who were improperly discharged on the grounds of a personality disorder deserve to have those records corrected.

We do support the amendment. This bill already provides substantial funding to provide these services.

I notice a very distinguished gentleman rising who would like me to yield, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would like to associate myself with his kind remarks, and appreciate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment and would like to indicate my support for the amendment as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, needless to say, we support this amendment. We have already robustly financed sexual assault programs. We fully fund the President's request for sexual assault prevention and response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I would like to emphasize "prevention." If we can prevent these sexual assaults, then the other problems go away. So it is important that we do pay attention to prevention.

In addition, our bill provides \$25 million to the Department and the services, including the Guard and Reserve, to implement a Sexual Assault Special Victims program, such as the Air Force Special Victims Counsel program, to provide all victims with specially trained legal assistance throughout the investigation and prosecution process—fair play. That's important.

We also support a number of policy changes that were including the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. I think our bill goes a long way on this issue, and this amendment goes even further, so we enthusiastically support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their unanimous support of this effort and of this particular amendment.

Madam Chair, let me just close by saying that the GAO says 20 to 60 percent of these personality disorder designations are either done improperly or are done with undue influence. Certainly, those who have been victimized deserve to be able to have that designation erased from their DD-214 forms so that they are not in a position of having to then in the civilian world explain why they have this designation on their discharge papers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. While many protections for victims of sexual violence have recently been put in place across our Armed Forces, a review by the IG of military sexual assault cases revealed that over three-quarters (83%) of the 501 investigations conducted, were not properly investigated, and had significant deficiencies, such as a failure to collect key evidence; incomplete interviews; and only partial crime scene investigations. As a former District Attorney, I was stunned by these findings. I have worked to protect victims of abuse and violence throughout my career and know that such sloppy investigative work will only cause further injury to victims and their families. To add insult to injury, these victims are the very men and women who have devoted their lives to the lives of others. With this amendment, we will be returning the favor of their commitment to our country's security and ensure additional funding and training to close the harmful loops that exist in the military's investigative processes related to sexual assaults. This amendment is a vital step towards ensuring an environment where there is justice for all victims. I urge support of our amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 113-170.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the Congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this amendment should serve as a reminder to the President that he does not have the authority to unilaterally send our children to war. In fact, it was Senator Obama who in 2007 said:

History has shown us time and again, however, that military action is most successful when it is authorized and supported by the legislative branch.

Here we are, again, seeing that Senator Obama and President Obama are

two very different people; and with the rhetoric heating up on Syria in particular and with word that we will now arm rebel factions, we must make a statement today. What we are saying is: Mr. President, if you want to go to war, you go through us.

Don't get me wrong. My heart goes out to the innocent families who have been victimized and caught up in this fierce civil war in Syria, but that's exactly what it is—a civil war—and we cannot be the police of the world. If you thought that the situations in Iraq and Afghanistan were complicated, the situation in Syria has history going back 1,000 years with deep and profound complexities. We cannot just go into Syria and pick and choose who to arm. Too many times we have seen those we arm often turn their own weapons against us, weapons that we have provided. We do not have to use military force around the world to be a leader for democracy.

This amendment is about Congress doing its job instead of following the President's cloudy, unclear foreign policy. This is about the House of the people making decisions for the people—for our young men and women in the military who are serving our country today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the additional 10 minutes on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Madam Chair, I would point out in my opening remarks that I think the fundamental responsibility of this body is to be engaged in these types of situations and to make determinations relative to our constitutional responsibility, particularly in dangerous situations when it involves military action. Syria, for example, is reported to have the fourth most sophisticated, integrated air defense of any nation on the planet Earth. Reports in the media indicate that Russia has kept these systems resupplied and up to date technologically.

It is but one of many things that we have to consider as far as the safety and well-being of those who are in our military forces, as well as, ultimately, what our national interests are.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, first of all, I want to congratulate our colleague from Florida for having a very successful first few months in the Congress. He has done a really good job.

I am happy to rise in support of this amendment. It is a responsible approach to a critical national security issue. We appreciate the gentleman

working closely with the committee to address this issue in a responsible manner that protects our national interests.

So I say, again, thank you for the initiative that you have offered here today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would make an additional observation on the gentleman's amendment.

There are political and diplomatic issues of Russia's relationship with the Assad regime. Altering this relationship over the long run may become an objective of U.S. foreign policy. Maybe. Maybe not. However, entering into an armed conflict with this relationship in mind is a dangerous step, among many other dangerous steps, and it renews the prospect of a more openly hostile relationship with a country that otherwise had ended the Cold War. So it's certainly an additional reason as to my appreciation for the gentleman offering the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to my neighbor up north, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. RADEL) for bringing this amendment to the floor today.

Madam Chair, I would have liked to have seen something that went specifically to not arming the so-called "rebels" in Syria, but I think it's important that we also address this issue of the President of the United States and what his obligations are to this Congress and to the American people under the War Powers Act.

The Founding Fathers didn't want one person to be able to take us to these wars in foreign lands. They wanted there to be debate, deliberation, and for the President to have to come and make the argument to the American people through their representation as to why something is such an important part of our national interests that he would send our men and women into harm's way to potentially die for us in that land.

In this case, we have Assad, who is a dangerous dictator in the Middle East. On the other hand, we have the rebels, who are infiltrated by al Qaeda and other bad actors—the same people we've been fighting, by the way, over the last 10 years.

So whose side are we on—Sunni? Shia? It's a civil war in the Middle East. What is our national interest?

Ladies and gentlemen, if you can't answer that question, if you're not absolutely sure—as the President needs to make us sure through the War Powers Act and through authorization, which this amendment requires—then you cannot support sending our men and women or getting involved in Syria or even sending weapons to the so-called "rebels" over there.

Support the Radel amendment. Make the President make the case for Syria. Come to Congress, and let the people decide.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. I thank my colleague for this extremely important amendment.

Madam Chair, we have a dire situation in Syria, and everyone's heart breaks for the suffering of the Syrian people. Over 100,000 people are getting slaughtered by the leader of their own government. It's absolutely unconscionable. So the questions for us are: What can we practically do? Whatever it is that we do do, does Congress have a say in the "yes" or "no" of military action?

I thank the gentleman for this amendment because there are two questions here.

One is as to the policy itself, the use of military force, arming the rebels. Is that a wise policy? Will it make things better or will it make things worse?

The second question is: Whatever the policy is, is it the responsibility of those of us who have been elected to represent Americans as Members of Congress—and we all do—to be accountable in making that enormously important and consequential decision that has the potential to send our troops into combat?

Let me talk briefly about the policy.

The military situation there is chaotic. The rebels are united loosely in an effort to bring down Assad, but distinguishing between the "good rebels" and the "bad rebels" is impossible. In fact, we are reading reports right now of how rebels who are having disputes with fellow rebels are settling them by beheading them. That's literally what's happening. So the notion that we can have a micromanaged approach and pick the good guys and arm them and not have any reasonable and, actually, inevitable expectation that the arms will get into bad hands, I think, is naive.

Also, General Dempsey, who is a hard-headed thinker about military matters, testified and laid out very clearly, if we just want to arm the rebels, that it's going to be like \$500 million, or it could be into the billions. If we want to do standoff attacks, which supposedly will be surgical, that could be in the \$1 billion-a-month range. If we want to actually have a no-fly zone, it will take hundreds of ships and aircraft in order to implement that—over \$1 billion a month. That's a consequential decision that we can't stumble into.

Then the second question, Madam Chair, is the congressional responsibility to act. One of the frustrations that, I think, Americans have with all of us is the sense that we are not accountable. Do you know what? If we allow an action to be taken that has the potential to send troops into combat and if we haven't actually stood up and voted "yes" or "no," then they are right. We have a job to do under the Constitution. This amendment is really saying to all of us here in Congress on

both sides of the aisle that, if the moment comes when that decision is going to be made by the President, he has to return to us for approval, and we have to stand and make our decision.

So with regard to that constitutional responsibility, what is more important?

We all talk about how much we admire the troops for their willingness to sacrifice—and all of us do—but do you know what? All Americans admire the troops, but 435 Americans in this Chamber have the responsibility to make certain that, when we take advantage of the willingness of these young men and women to serve and to sacrifice, including to give up their lives, we are the ones who must make the decision about the policy. Our responsibility—all of ours—is to make certain that whatever policy it is we are asking them to pursue be worthy of their willingness to sacrifice. That has to be done at the beginning.

Once our troops are in the field, yes, we have to support them. Then, once they're in the field, we find ourselves conflicted about having a discussion about how it is they got there. Do you know what? They got there because we sent them there. Sometimes we do it consciously. Sometimes we stumble into it. That's not right. There are 435 of us in this House who are united by a common responsibility to the soldiers and sailors who serve and to the citizens whom we represent.

So I thank the gentleman as I see this as an opportunity for Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who share a common admiration for the people who serve in the military and who share a common sense of duty to the people we represent, to be accountable for any policy that has the potential to send our soldiers into combat.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RADEL. I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont as well.

Madam Chair, it is times like these as we debate this that we realize the heavy weight we carry on our shoulders. We are talking about people's lives as we approach this. Once again, this re-asserts the fact that this is the people's House and that we want to have a say in our foreign policy.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

□ 1630

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for this important amendment. Madam Chair, not only should there be no American troops sent to Syria, there should be no American weapons sent to Syria.

Several weeks ago, a Catholic priest named Father Francois Murad was murdered in northern Syria. Who

killed him? The very people that we're considering arming. What was he guilty of? Serving the poor. We have no business shipping weapons to those who would raid convents and kill innocent civilians.

Madam Chair, there are now 100,000 people dead from this conflict. What began as a hopeful exercise of civic engagement by the Syrian people against the brutal Assad regime has now become a wanton slaughter. We don't know who is who among this Syrian rebel movement. No one there is safe, and no happy projections of democratic ideals will make this better. We do not have control over the Syrian battle space. Americans must not be complicit in this killing field.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, from my perspective, I would also make it clear that what we're talking about at this point is the use of military force. There is no question that there is a significant and tragic humanitarian crisis taking place.

It is estimated that about 6.8 million people are in need of various types of humanitarian assistance in Syria itself. There are about 4.25 million people displaced within that country. We have 1.78 million Syrians displaced to neighboring countries. There were 486,972, as of the latest count, that are refugees in Jordan; 607,908 are refugees in Lebanon; 412,789 are refugees in Turkey; 161,014 are refugees in Iraq, and 92,367 in Egypt. It's one reason why today it's estimated that about \$814 million of U.S. humanitarian aid has been expended for good purposes. That's certainly not what we're talking about here today, and I certainly would want to make our colleagues understand that as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this is excellent bipartisan discussion; whereas, this country tends to be a little war weary these days, but we see where the United States can have a role, most especially when it comes to humanitarian aid, with our allies in the region and how exactly we can help.

Once again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have highlighted just how deeply profound these complexities are in Syria. We're not only confused when it comes to who the rebels are—I don't even know if they're good or bad anymore. We simply don't know what rebel factions are playing a part in this. You've got Hezbollah, you've got al Qaeda, and then you have the state players in this; and we know that we have sensitive relationships with Russia, with China, who also potentially, at least diplomatically, are involved in this.

Again, I just want to commend our colleagues here. This is excellent discussion.

At this point, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I feel very strongly about this issue, Madam Chair. I believe without a shadow of a doubt this is one of the most insane policies that borders on madness. For the United States to give funding, training, and arms most likely to al Qaeda in Syria doesn't make any sense.

Can we realize what it is we're talking about right now? This is Islamic jihad, which has declared war on the United States and declared war on our ally Israel. And we're now in a position when we're authorizing arming, training, and funding for allies of al Qaeda, and al Qaeda themselves, in Syria? This is absolute madness.

You see, Madam Chair, the decision to arm the Syrian rebels by the Obama administration just this week will likely have catastrophic consequences for our United States national security and the national security of our ally Israel. The Syrian rebels that the President wants to arm consist mostly of al Qaeda members that we've spent the last decade fighting a war against. Have we forgotten the thousands of Americans that were killed on September 11 in the horrific Twin Towers attack and here in this city at the Pentagon? We lost over 3,000 Americans that day. Are we forgetting who we fought in Iraq and in Afghanistan? It's my opinion, Madam Chair, that this is insanity to aid those who've taken the lives of Americans with impunity and continue to do so.

Just take note that the leader of al Qaeda is an individual named Zawahiri. Zawahiri called on Muslims from around the world to make their way to Syria and support the rebels and, in fact, become the rebels who are seeking to overthrow Assad.

We don't have a great track record, Madam Chair, of putting arms into the hands of terrorists. Take a look at the Fast and Furious program in Mexico and the terrorists who received arms from the United States. Take a look at Benghazi and the tens of thousands of weapons, MANPADS, that went into the hands of al Qaeda after Benghazi. And now we're intentionally going to make a decision to send money, training, and arms to al Qaeda?

How about a referendum with the American people? I think this would be more than a 90 percent issue. Don't do it. That's why we're standing here today. Don't do it.

The top spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood is a man named Qaradawi. He has been outlawed from the United States because he's a terrorist. Also, he was outlawed from Egypt because he's a terrorist. He has called for jihad in Syria, and he has said:

Every Muslim trained to fight and capable of doing that must make himself available.

So you have the head of al Qaeda and the head of the terrorist organization the Muslim Brotherhood both calling on Islamic jihadists to go to Syria to fight and be the rebels. And we're going to arm them, and we're going to train

them, and we're going to provide material support to them? Not my vote.

Madam Chair, former President Morsi, who was formerly the head of the Muslim Brotherhood, which was outlawed under Mubarak in Egypt, he supported the call from hardline Egyptian clerics who called for Egyptians to go fight jihad in Syria. So you see, there's a common thread here. All the wrong guys on the wrong team are all calling for jihadists to go to Syria and fight. It was reported that over 2,500 Egyptians have already gone to Syria to fight jihad.

Pakistan Taliban fighters have left Pakistan to join the fight in Syria, and they're working with al Qaeda-affiliated groups in Syria.

On Monday, al Qaeda's Iraq-affiliated attack on the Abu Ghraib prison helped 500 inmates escape, most of whom were part of senior positions in al Qaeda. These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman as much time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my friend.

These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the top military officer in the United States, Martin Dempsey, has warned us that intervening in Syria could assist Islamist extremists, helping them gain access to chemical weapons and biological weapons and further erode United States military readiness already suffering from sharp defense budget cuts. He has said that using force is "no less than an act of war," and stated that some of the military options for Syria may not be feasible without compromising U.S. security elsewhere.

He made reference to the chaos in Iraq after the fall of Saddam Hussein and Libya after Qadhafi. He warned of the unintended consequences if Assad fell without having a viable opposition. He said "we could inadvertently empower extremists or unleash the very chemical weapons we seek to control."

This is a hub for jihadist activity. The American taxpayer has no obligation. In fact, I say this body must protect the American taxpayer from being involved in arming al Qaeda in Syria. We must defeat this effort, and that's why I'm in support of this today.

Again, we have the major general from the Israeli military intelligence, and he said that right before our eyes the center of global jihad is developing; let's not do it. I agree with him.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. No funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to fund military operations in Egypt, nor may funds made available by this Act be used by the Department of Defense to fund individuals, groups, or organizations engaged in paramilitary activity (as that term is used in section 401 of title 10, United States Code) in Egypt.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

There's been some misunderstanding about what my amendment does. I welcome the opportunity to clarify the intention of the amendment.

I realize that Members of the House have different views about the current U.S. relationship with the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian military. This amendment is not designed to affect the current military-to-military relationship with Egypt. It is not intended to prevent U.S. participation in the Multinational Forward Observer mission in the Sinai, in other words, the peacekeeping mission. It is not intended to curtail the activities of the Office of Military Cooperation. It is not intended to prevent U.S. military exercises with the Egyptian military. And it is certainly not intended to prevent U.S. marines from providing security at our diplomatic facilities in Egypt.

My amendment is quite simple. It's intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I'm so pleased to hear my friend from Kentucky further discuss the true intent of what his amendment does; and respectfully, I recognize that, in order for the amendment to be made in order, it has to be written broadly. And because it was written broadly, there were concerns expressed by a number of people on both sides of the aisle about what an amendment written this way might do that would negatively affect a lot of

the things that we presently do and have been doing for a long time in Egypt.

I can speak personally to it because it was right after 9/11, while commanding an infantry battalion in Arkansas with the Arkansas National Guard, that I was called to duty to lead a task force of infantry soldiers and other personnel of over 500 men and women to the Sinai in Egypt to become the U.S. battalion so that other forces of the 18th Airborne Corps could go prosecute missions elsewhere in support of the war on terror.

The gunslingers of Arkansas distinguished themselves by going to the Sinai in Egypt on very short notice and executed that mission, the U.S. battalion in the South Sinai Peninsula that does the observe-and-report mission, consistent with all of the protocols that were established with the Treaty of Peace in 1979. In fact, our unit was there during the 20th anniversary of the MFO. Since that time, other State National Guard units have followed this mission and have been doing it consistently—Oregon, Oklahoma, and others—until, because of sequestration, the active component has accepted responsibility for that mission once again. So we've had a lot of our men and women across the country into the Sinai to do the mission of the MFO.

On top of that, our country has had a number of exercises called Bright Star, which is, if not the largest, one of the largest military training exercises that takes place on a biennial basis.

□ 1645

Now it didn't happen in 2011 because of unrest in Egypt, but my understanding is that Bright Star is certainly going to occur again.

So it is our hope, and as I said, I'm glad that my friend from Kentucky has further clarified the intent of his amendment, that it is not designed to affect the Multinational Forward Observer, nor is it designed to affect the training exercises that would happen with a Bright Star operation, nor does it affect what goes on with the Office of Military Cooperation or the Defense Attache program or, as he has indicated, our marine security to outposts in that region.

So again, I am very, very pleased, and we can breathe a bit of a sigh of relief that there is no intent in here at all to abandon, Madam Chair, the Treaty of Peace that was famously signed in 1979, and everybody has the vivid reminder of that picture with Jimmy Carter in the middle and Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin signing over that peace treaty.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the words from my good colleague from Arkansas, and I certainly appreciate the service that he's provided to our country and the service that others have provided there in the mission of keeping the peace.

If we count the two chairmen of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, Egypt has been led by five different men in the past 2½ years. So five of them in 2½ years, only one of them democratically elected. I would say this is not a stable environment, and so my constituents have concerns that we don't escalate military activity in the region.

My good friend is correct about the intention of the amendment that I have offered. My amendment, again, is intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to the Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups. It's certainly not intended to prevent the peacekeeping missions or the current military missions there or, most of all, protecting our embassies. We want to make sure that we allow the service of our good marines over there in Egypt.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, situations in Egypt have been problematic, and we're all dealing with that and trying to come to terms. But I want to remind Members that one reason we have a relationship with Egypt is the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty. We helped forge peace between Egypt and Israel, a peace that has held for over 30 years.

Our military-to-military relationship has been a key component to keeping that peace. Since the signing of the treaty, the Egyptian military has been a reliable partner and ally. Throughout all the changes and turmoil, the Egyptian military has upheld our security arrangements, including the peace treaty. They've also maintained priority access for U.S. ships through the Suez Canal and allowed U.S. military planes to use their airspace. We cannot underestimate the importance of this.

Furthermore, since July 3, the Egyptian military has successfully closed nearly 80 percent of the tunnels used to smuggle goods and arms into the Gaza Strip. This is an important part of our partnership and how we've worked together. The relationship between the United States and Egypt has never been more critical than it is now. This amendment could jeopardize our ability to help Egypt and Israel secure the Sinai if the intent were other than it has been explained just a few minutes ago. It could harm our efforts to secure the Libyan border with Egypt, which is used to smuggle weapons to be used against Israel.

It's vital to the United States national security that we maintain our long-standing relationship with the Egyptian military. I'm not going to oppose this amendment as long as the intent is not to interfere with this 30-

year partnership and relationship. U.S. and Israeli security are simply too important to put at risk.

I appreciate the time and the effort.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Either to yourself or possibly for the author of the amendment, the question I have, because there has been a lot of talk, it is "not the intent of the amendment" to interfere with any intercooperation we have today with the Egyptians. It is not our intent not to be involved in the Sinai, but the amendment reads no funds, and then goes on to fund military operations in Egypt.

If I am an adviser, if I am a member of the uniformed services, how is the intent met under the particular restrictions of the amendment? That would be my question.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to put words in the mouth of the author of the amendment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to further clarify, as I understand it, his willingness to make sure that we make the appropriate adjustments to this amendment in a conference.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

To allay your concerns and the concerns of the gentlelady who spoke, the intentions are the intentions that have been mentioned here, and the verbiage that was allowed in the amendment process was very difficult to convey the intention. It would be our intention to work through the process going forward in conference or otherwise to ameliorate the language and to ameliorate your concerns.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If the gentleman will yield, as a Member of the House and the committee, I would want to participate in that to ensure we do not disrupt the very positive interchange that is taking place.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his further clarification of the intent going forward beyond this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WOMACK. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, it is in our interest that we have a strong, stable, moderate, and truly democratic Egypt. It's in the best interests of both our countries. We've had a 30-year relationship, and those interests would be damaged if we decide to in any way disengage from Egypt and its people in their quest for a true democracy or reduce current levels of support for the Egyptian military. This is a country of 80 million

people, a cornerstone of peace in the Middle East, despite its recent troubles, and we need to make sure that we keep the Egyptians close to us as a strong ally and work with their military operations.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, let me just say in conclusion, I do appreciate my friend from Kentucky for further clarifying this intent of his amendment. It is something that I believe we can work with so long as we can make the proper adjustments once we get to conference.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. KILMER of Washington.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) 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 277, noes 142, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—277

Andrews	Brooks (IN)	Cohen
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barber	Brown (FL)	Connolly
Barr	Brownley (CA)	Conyers
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Cooper
Bass	Camp	Costa
Beatty	Capito	Courtney
Becerra	Capps	Cramer
Benishek	Capuano	Crowley
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Bilirakis	Carney	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Blackburn	Chu	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cielline	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clay	DelBene
Brale (IA)	Cleaver	Dent
Bridenstine	Clyburn	Deutch
Brooks (AL)	Coffman	Dingell

Doggett	Kuster
Doyle	Lamborn
Duckworth	Langevin
Duncan (SC)	Lankford
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)
Edwards	Larson (CT)
Ellison	Latham
Engel	Lee (CA)
Enyart	Levin
Eshoo	Lewis
Esty	Lipinski
Farenthold	Loeb
Farr	Lofgren
Fattah	Long
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal
Fleming	Lowey
Flores	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Forbes	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Fortenberry	Lynch
Foster	Maffei
Fox	Maloney
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Fudge	Marino
Gabbard	Massie
Gallego	Matheson
Garamendi	Matsui
Garcia	McCollum
Gibbs	McDermott
Gibson	McGovern
Gohmert	McIntyre
Goodlatte	McKeon
Grayson	McKinley
Green, Al	McMorris
Green, Gene	Rodgers
Griffin (AR)	McNerney
Griffith (VA)	McNulty
Grijalva	Meadows
Grimm	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	Smith (WA)
Gutiérrez	Speier
Hahn	Stivers
Hall	Swalwell (CA)
Hanabusa	Takano
Hanna	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Tierney
Higgins	Titus
Himes	Tonko
Hinojosa	Tsongas
Holt	Turner
Honda	Upton
Hoyer	Van Hollen
Hudson	Vargas
Huelskamp	Veasey
Huelskamp	Velázquez
Huffman	Visclosky
Huizenga (MI)	Walz
Hurt	Wasserman
Israel	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Waters
Jeffries	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter
Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)
Jones	Peters (MI)
Kaptur	Peterson
Keating	Pingree (ME)
Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Kennedy	Poe (TX)
Kildee	Polis
Kilmer	Price (NC)
Kind	Quigley
King (NY)	
Kirkpatrick	

NOES—142

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Alexander	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Daines	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Denham	Hensarling
Bachmann	DeSantis	Holding
Barton	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Boustany	Duffy	Issa
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Jenkins
Buchanan	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Jordan
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Cantor	Gardner	Kingston
Cartwright	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter	Gerlach	Kline
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Chabot	Gosar	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Lance
Collins (GA)	Granger	Latta
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cook	Harper	Luetkemeyer
Cotton	Harris	Lummis
Crawford		

Marchant	Reichert	Stockman
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Stutzman
McCaul	Roby	Terry
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Mica	Rooney	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Valadao
Miller, Gary	Ross	Wagner
Mullin	Royce	Walberg
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Walden
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Walorski
Neugebauer	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Schock	Webster (FL)
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Perry	Sessions	Womack
Petri	Shimkus	Yoder
Pittenger	Simpson	Yoho
Pitts	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Posey	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Price (GA)	Southerland	
Radel	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Bonner	Horsford	Reed
Bustos	Joyce	Rokita
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Vela
Coble	Olson	

□ 1722

Messrs. PERRY and YOHO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ELLISON and STIVERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. UPTON, PEARCE, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, MESSER, LEWIS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, BROOKS of Alabama, GIBBS, DENT, GUTHRIE, BISHOP of Utah, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 242, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—176

Amash	Cárdenas	Crowley
Andrews	Carney	Cummings
Bass	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cielline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DelBene
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Brale (IA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Doyle
Butterfield	Conyers	Duckworth
Capps	Cooper	Duncan (TN)
Capuano	Costa	Edwards

Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)

Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott (VA)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus
Royce
Ryunan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
Johnson (GA)
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Waters
Wittman

□ 1727

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 408, Nadler (NY) amendment No. 69, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—187

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownfield (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens

Palazzo Rothfus Thornberry
 Paulsen Royce Tiberi
 Pearce Runyan Tipton
 Perry Ryan (WI) Turner
 Pittenger Salmon Upton
 Pitts Sanchez, Loretta Valadao
 Poe (TX) Scalise Wagner
 Pompeo Schock Walberg
 Posey Schrader Walden
 Price (GA) Schweikert Walorski
 Radel Scott, Austin Weber (TX)
 Rahall Scott, David Weber (TX)
 Reed Sessions Webster (FL)
 Reichert Shimkus Wenstrup
 Renacci Shuster Westmoreland
 Ribble Simpson Whitfield
 Rice (SC) Sinema Williams
 Rigell Smith (MO) Wilson (SC)
 Roby Smith (NE) Wittman
 Roe (TN) Smith (NJ) Wolf
 Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Womack
 Rogers (KY) Southerland Woodall
 Rogers (MI) Stewart Yoder
 Rohrabacher Stivers Yoho
 Rooney Stockman Young (AK)
 Ros-Lehtinen Stutzman Young (FL)
 Roskam Terry Young (IN)
 Ross Thompson (PA)

Kind Murphy (FL) Sarbanes
 Kuster Nadler Schakowsky
 Labrador Napolitano Schiff
 Larsen (WA) Negrete McLeod Schrader
 Larson (CT) Nolan Schweikert
 Lee (CA) Nugent Scott (VA)
 Levin O'Rourke Sensenbrenner
 Lewis Pascrell Serrano
 Loeb sack Pastor (AZ)
 Lofgren Payne
 Lowenthal Pelosi
 Lowey Perlmutter
 Lujan Grisham Peters (MI)
 Lujan, Ben Ray Peterson
 (NM) Petri
 Lynch Pingree (ME)
 Maffei Pocaan
 Maloney, Poe (TX)
 Carolyn Polis
 Maloney, Sean Posey
 Massie Price (GA)
 Matsui Price (NC)
 McClintock Quigley
 McCollum Rahall
 McDermott Rangel
 McGovern Rooney Rohrabacher
 McIntyre Roybal-Allard
 McNerney Ruiz
 Meeks Rush
 Michaud Ryan (OH)
 Miller, George Sanchez, Linda
 Moore T.
 Moran Sanchez, Loretta
 Mulvaney Sanford

Schneider Smith (WA) Walden
 Schock Southerland Walorski
 Schwartz Stewart Walz
 Scott, Austin Stivers Weber (TX)
 Scott, David Stutzman Webster (FL)
 Sessions Terry Wenstrup
 Sewell (AL) Thompson (PA) Westmoreland
 Shea-Porter Thornberry Whitfield
 Sherman Tiberi Williams
 Shimkus Tipton Wilson (SC)
 Shuster Turner Wittman
 Simpson Upton Wolf
 Sinema Valadao Womack
 Smith (MO) Vargas Yoder
 Smith (NE) Vela Yoho
 Smith (NJ) Wagner Young (FL)
 Smith (TX) Walberg Young (IN)

Barletta
 Bustos
 Campbell
 Coble

NOT VOTING—12

Herrera Beutler
 Horsford
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meng
 Neal
 Pallone
 Rokita
 Young (AK)

□ 1737

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO
 The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. NUGENT to offer the Nugent amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this bill?

The Acting CHAIR. Would the gentleman please restate the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this rule?

The Acting CHAIR. Under the terms of House Report 113-170, the named sponsor of an amendment may name a designee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, point of further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Kansas have a formal designation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT)?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair has been made aware that the gentleman from Kansas is the designee of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Chair.
 The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States

NOT VOTING—9

Coble
 Herrera Beutler
 Horsford
 McCarthy (NY)
 Pallone
 Rokita

□ 1732

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—185

Amash Cohen Grayson
 Bachmann Connolly Green, Al
 Bass Conyers Green, Gene
 Beatty Cooper Griffith (VA)
 Becerra Courtney Grijalva
 Benishek Crowley Gutiérrez
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Hahn
 Blumener Davis, Danny Hanabusa
 Bonamici DeFazio Hastings (FL)
 Brady (PA) DeGette Heck (WA)
 Braley (IA) DeLauro Higgins
 Broun (GA) DelBene Himes
 Brown (FL) Deutch Hinojosa
 Buchanan Doggett Holt
 Burgess Doyle Honda
 Capps Duncan (TN) Huelskamp
 Capuano Edwards Huffman
 Cárdenas Ellison Israel
 Carney Enyart Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Eshoo Jeffries
 Castor (FL) Esty Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Farr Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Fattah Jones
 Cicilline Frankel (FL) Kaptur
 Clarke Gabbard Keating
 Clay Garamendi Kelly (IL)
 Cleaver Gibson Kennedy
 Clyburn Gohmert Kildee
 Coffman Graves (GA) Kilmer

NOES—236

Aderholt Fincher Lipinski
 Alexander Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
 Amodei Fleischmann Long
 Andrews Fleming Lucas
 Bachus Flores Luetkemeyer
 Barber Forbes Lummis
 Barr Fortenberry Marchant
 Barrow (GA) Foster Marino
 Barton Foxx Matheson
 Bentivolio Franks (AZ) McCarthy (CA)
 Bera (CA) Frelinghuysen McCaul
 Bilirakis Fudge McHenry
 Bishop (GA) Gallego McKee
 Bishop (UT) Garcia McKinley
 Black Gardner McMorris
 Blackburn Garrett Rodgers
 Bonner Gerlach Meadows
 Boustany Gibbs Meehan
 Brady (TX) Gingrey (GA) Messer
 Bridenstine Goodlatte Mica
 Brooks (AL) Gosar Miller (FL)
 Brooks (IN) Gowdy Miller (MI)
 Brownley (CA) Granger Miller, Gary
 Bucshon Graves (MO) Mullin
 Butterfield Griffin (AR) Murphy (PA)
 Calvert Grimm Neugebauer
 Camp Guthrie Noem
 Cantor Hall Nunes
 Capito Hanna Nunnelee
 Carter Harper Olson
 Cartwright Harris Owens
 Cassidy Hartzler Palazzio
 Chabot Hastings (WA) Paulsen
 Chaffetz Heck (NV) Pearce
 Cole Hensarling Perry
 Collins (GA) Holding Peters (CA)
 Collins (NY) Hoyer Pittenger
 Conway Hudson Pitts
 Cook Huizenga (MI) Pompeo
 Costa Hultgren Radel
 Cotton Hunter Reed
 Cramer Hurt Reichert
 Crawford Issa Renacci
 Crenshaw Jenkins Ribble
 Cuellar Johnson (OH) Rice (SC)
 Culberson Johnson, Sam Richmond
 Daines Jordan Rigell
 Davis (CA) Joyce Roby
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA) Roe (TN)
 Delaney King (IA) Rogers (AL)
 Denham King (NY) Rogers (KY)
 Dent Kingston Rogers (MI)
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 DesJarlais Kirkpatrick Roskam
 Diaz-Balart Kline Ross
 Dingell LaMalfa Rothfus
 Duckworth Lamborn Royce
 Duffy Lance Runyan
 Duncan (SC) Langaney Ruppberger
 Eilmers Lankford Ryan (WI)
 Engel Latham Salmon
 Farenthold Latta Scalise

person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer this evening clarifies and confirms the scope of two programs that Mr. Snowden illegally exposed while sitting in a hotel room in Communist China.

First, the amendment clarifies that under section 702 no U.S. citizen or person in the U.S. can be targeted, period. I say again, no U.S. person under section 702 may be targeted in any way by the United States Government. While there are other specific authorities the U.S. person may be subject to an investigation, the U.S. Government may not do so under section 702. That's what this amendment intends to clarify.

The second part of the amendment clarifies section 215, also known as section 501 of FISA. The amendment clarifies that no content of communications can be stored or collected by the National Security Agency—that's no emails, no video clips, no Skype. No record of the actual conversation or the contents thereof may be recorded or collected by the National Security Agency. I can't repeat that enough. That's the intent of this amendment.

I want to make clear to everyone that, contrary to the suggestions of some, the NSA has not been acting outside of the scope of its authorities. The Meta-Data program is carefully designed with program layers of oversight by all three branches of government. This is precisely the way our government ought to operate, with input from Article I and Article II and Article III of the United States Constitution.

It is, of course, our duty to ensure that the NSA stays within these legal bounds here in Congress, and this amendment makes those boundaries perfectly clear for everyone to know and understand.

And we shouldn't mislead the American people into thinking that the NSA has been acting illegally. There is perhaps no program in the United States Government that is as carefully monitored and overseen as the programs this amendment attempts to clarify.

To the extent that some in this Chamber wish to review or provide more protections and controls for these programs, we should proceed through a carefully considered and debated legislative process so that the full implications for our security are clearly understood.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7½ minutes.

□ 1745

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been described and offered as an alternative to the Amash-Conyers amendment that we will consider next. It is not.

This amendment restates the existing ban on the intentional targeting of United States persons under section 702. It also places into law for the next fiscal year the Obama administration's current ban on collecting the contents of the communications of U.S. persons under section 215. I agree with these prohibitions. But they have nothing to do with the current misuse of section 215 to engage in the suspicionless, bulk collection of Americans' telephone records.

The dragnet collection under section 215 telephone metadata program reveals call information—including all numbers dialed, all incoming phone numbers and call duration—but not the content of communications. Therefore, this amendment would have no impact whatsoever on this misuse of section 215. Metadata reveals highly personal and sensitive information, including, for example, when and how often one calls the doctor, a journalist, or the local Tea Party or ACLU affiliate. By tracing the pattern of calls, the government can paint a detailed picture of anyone's personal, professional, and political associations and activities.

Congress never authorized this type of unchecked, sweeping surveillance of our citizens. It is this problem—the indiscriminate, bulk collection of metadata under section 215—that we need to fix right now.

The Amash-Conyers amendment does so by restoring the required reasonable relationship between the collection of records and specific persons being investigated under section 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment ensures that this standard is not ignored by the administration or by the FISA Court, as is happening now.

This amendment does not fix the problem with 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment does. However you vote on this amendment, and I intend to vote in favor of it, it is imperative that we also vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment because this amendment, although doing no harm, does not solve the problems that Congress and Mr. SENSENBRENNER and many others have articulated with respect to the misuse of section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment, because it helps focus on what concerns most Americans and it clarifies what really is and is not happening.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is a challenge for those of us on the Intelligence Committee to talk openly about this—even the safeguards—in some of these programs. But this amendment helps make it clear and reassures Americans about some of the things they may have read or heard that is occurring with NSA. But at the same time, this amendment is not an overreaction that actually increases the danger that Americans face from terrorism around the world.

This amendment says clearly that NSA cannot acquire information for the purpose of targeting Americans, and it says clearly that NSA may not acquire, monitor, or store the content of the communication of any Americans.

I think the key point that Members need to know is there are multiple layers of safeguards to make sure that these programs operate exactly in the way that the FISA Court has laid them out to operate.

The Intelligence Committees of both the House and Senate do a considerable amount of oversight, get regular reports. Even if somebody accidentally punches a "2" versus a "3" on their keyboard, we get a report about that. And it even goes so far as members of the Intelligence Committee can go sit next to the analysts and watch what they are doing.

But it is not just the Intelligence Committees. The FISA Court has oversight of the same sorts of reports. They can change the guidelines that it operates under. But in addition to that, there are internal inspector general monitoring of these. So you get every branch of government involved in making sure that the safeguards are in place and those same safeguards will be in place to make sure that the provisions of the gentleman's amendment are followed as well.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, would do away with these programs. No amount of safeguards are good for them. But they never say what would replace them, they never say what would fill the gap in meeting our responsibilities to defend Americans. They would just have them go away, and I guess assume that somehow or other that Americans could be made safe.

The truth is, we had been incredibly successful and somewhat lucky since 9/11 as far as preventing further terrorist attacks on our homeland. That is because of the work of the military, intelligence professionals, law enforcement and, as I say, a fair amount of luck.

But these programs at NSA have made a crucial contribution to that success over the last decade. It seems to me it would be foolhardy to toss them away, as some would want to do.

I think this amendment strikes the right approach. I also believe, Mr. Chairman, The Wall Street Journal makes a good point in today's editorial when it says:

The last thing Congress should do is kill a program in a rush to honor the reckless claims of Mr. Snowden and his apologists.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you, Mr. POMPEO.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pompeo amendment.

This amendment strongly reaffirms that in America, privacy and security must coexist together. This amendment states in no uncertain terms that the government cannot use section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, to intentionally target an American for surveillance.

This important amendment also reaffirms that phone conversations cannot be collected through section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It makes the intentions of Congress very clear.

I believe the Pompeo amendment makes a powerful statement that NSA cannot target Americans for the collection or listen to their phone calls. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." However, I do understand the concerns of the American people and of Congress when it comes to these programs.

On the House Intelligence Committee, we are reviewing and evaluating potential ways to change the FISA Act that will provide the intelligence community with the tools it needs to keep our country safe while also protecting privacy and civil liberties. We are committed to having this important discussion. However, I do have concerns about the amendment we will debate next.

The Amash amendment is an on/off switch for section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It will have an immediate operational impact and our country will be more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. This authority has helped prevent terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. A planned attack on the New York City subway system was stopped because of section 215.

But the Amash amendment passes this authority and it will end it. This amendment goes too far, too fast, on the wrong legislative vehicle. We need to debate the scope of this program, and we are, but this is an extreme knee-jerk reaction to the situation.

This program has been authorized and reauthorized by Congress. It receives extensive oversight by the Intelligence Committee and is a vital tool for our intelligence community to protect our Nation. Remember, 9/11 happened in part because we failed to connect the dots. One of the critical tools we now have and use to connect those dots is section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. Remember, this is just phone records—just phone numbers—no conversations.

I respectfully urge a "no" vote on the Amash amendment and a "yes" vote on the Pompeo amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from the State of California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. Why? Because it restates current law, and current law has been interpreted by the administration in a way that is, frankly, contrary to the intent of the crafters of the PATRIOT Act.

Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act says that you can obtain information that is relevant to a national security investigation.

Now, what has happened since Congress enacted that provision? It is a low bar, but under the NSA's interpretation, it is no bar at all. Because, as has been widely reported, they are collecting the information about every phone call made by every American. Clearly, that is not relevant to a terrorist investigation.

I think it is important to note that business records that are the subject of 215 include a lot of sensitive information. What are business records? phone records? Internet records? credit card records? medical records? Are these things that we would voluntarily give up to the government? No. They are incredibly sensitive, and that's why they are being sought.

I do think it is important to note that the amendment that will follow after this one doesn't end the ability of the government to pursue terrorism. We are all for that. It merely requires that the government adhere to the law, which requires that there be relevance to a terrorist investigation.

I certainly do not challenge the motivation of the gentleman who has offered this amendment, but I do think if you think that this provides a remedy, then you are wrong. This provides a fig leaf.

We should vote against it, and I hope that we will move on to the Amash amendment and solve the problem today.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct a couple of things.

This legislation is not a fig leaf. It is intended to clarify some things that have been said, some beliefs that people hold, about what section 215 authorizes and what section 702 authorizes.

It is intended to make crystal clear to everyone here, as well as to the American public, the boundaries of these two important national security programs. These laws have been in place and interpreted by multiple administrations in the same way. There was no change in this law when this President came into office, and we should continue to support these programs regardless of who is the Commander in Chief for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. AMASH. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to execute a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court order pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) that does not include the following sentence: "This Order limits the collection of any tangible things (including telephone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) that may be authorized to be collected pursuant to this Order to those tangible things that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation described in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

We are here today for a very simple reason: to defend the Fourth Amendment, to defend the privacy of each and every American.

As the Director of National Intelligence has made clear, the government collects the phone records without suspicion of every single American in the United States.

My amendment makes a simple, but important change. It limits the government's collection of the records to those records that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation pursuant to section 215.

□ 1800

Opponents of this amendment will use the same tactic that every government throughout history has used to justify its violation of rights—fear. They will tell you that the government must violate the rights of the American people to protect us against those who hate our freedoms. They will tell you there is no expectation of privacy in documents that are stored with a third party. Tell that to the American

people. Tell that to our constituents back home.

We are here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicionless collection of every American's phone records?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think the American people and, certainly, some well-intentioned Members in this Chamber have legitimate concerns. They should be addressed. We should have time and education on what actually happens in the particular program of which we speak.

I will pledge to each one of you today and give you my word that this fall, when we do the Intel authorization bill, that we will work to find additional privacy protections with this program which have no email, no phone calls, no names, and no addresses.

Fourteen Federal judges have said, yes, this comports with the Constitution; 800 cases around the 1979 case have affirmed the underpinnings of the legality of this case—800. So 14 judges are wrong, and 800 different cases are wrong. The legislators on both Intelligence committees—Republicans and Democrats—are all wrong.

Why is it that people of both parties came together and looked at this program at a time when our Nation was under siege by those individuals who wanted to bring violence to the shores of the United States?

It is that those who know it best support the program because we spend as much time on this to get it right, to make sure the oversight is right. No other program has the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch doing the oversight of a program like this. If we had this in the other agencies, we would not have problems.

Think about who we are in this body. Have 12 years gone by and our memories faded so badly that we've forgotten what happened on September 11?

This bill turns off a very specific program. It doesn't stop so-called "spying" and other things that this has been alleged to do. That's not what's happening. It's not a surveillance bill. It's not monitoring. It doesn't do any of those things.

What happened after September 11 that we didn't know on September 10—again, passing this amendment takes us back to September 10, and afterwards we said, wow, there is a seam, a gap—was somebody leading up to the

September 11 attacks who was a terrorist overseas, called a "terrorist," living amongst us in the United States, and we missed it because we didn't have this capability.

What if we'd have caught it?

The good news is we don't have to what-if. It's not theoretical. Fifty-four times this and the other program stopped and thwarted terrorist attacks both here and in Europe—saving real lives. This isn't a game. This is real. It will have a real consequence. This is hard.

Think about the people who came here before us in this great body—Madison, Lincoln, Kennedy served here—and about the issues they dealt with and about the politics of "big" and of moving America forward while upholding the article I mandate to this House in that we must provide for the general defense of the United States. Think of those challenges. Think of those challenges that they met.

Are we so small that we can only look at our Facebook "likes" today in this Chamber, or are we going to stand up and find out how many lives we can save?

Let us get back to the big politics of protecting America and of moving America forward. Soundly reject this amendment. Let's do this right in the Intel authorization bill.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment will not stop the proper use of the PATRIOT Act or stop the FISA authorities from conducting terrorism and intelligence investigations. I'd never block that.

All this amendment is intending to do is to curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and storage of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it will continue to allow them to conduct full-fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensure that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by this Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment.

I rise in support of this amendment, which I am cosponsoring with my colleague from Michigan, Representative JUSTIN AMASH.

This amendment will prevent mass collection of personal records, such as phone calling information, under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act. When Congress passed and later revised this provision, we did not intend for it to authorize the bulk, indiscriminate collection of personal information of individuals not under investigation.

However, we have learned that this law has been misused to allow the collection of call detail information on every phone call made in the United States under a bizarre interpreta-

tion of the statute's authorization to collect "relevant" information. As my colleague and author of the statute, Representative JIM SENBRENNER, has stated, "This expansive characterization of relevance makes a mockery of the legal standard."

This amendment will not stop the proper use of PATRIOT Act and FISA authorities to conduct terrorism and intelligence investigations. All this amendment is intended to do is curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and storage of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it would continue to allow them to conduct full fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensuring that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment to demonstrate our bipartisan commitment to protecting individual liberty.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, this is a very important issue that we are taking up today because the number one duty of the Federal Government is the safety of the American people—of our constituents and of our own skins, the skins of each one of us in this Chamber today. As we know all too well, national security is a real and present danger, and it is something that we have to take quite seriously. We can't deal in false narratives.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of Americans' phone calls. It's not true. It's not happening.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of the American people's emails. It's not true. It's not happening.

We need to deal in facts. The facts are real, and the facts are these:

The only people who have benefited from the revelation of classified information by someone who worked for this government—who intentionally and without authorization declassified some of the most sensitive national security information that we have—are those who are engaged in Islamic jihad. They will have been benefited, and those whom we seek to protect will have not.

Consider this:

There is more information about each one of us contained in the phone book that sits at home on your kitchen counter than information that is in the National Security Database that we're talking about today. Your name, your address are in the phone book. Your name, your address are not in this National Security Database.

No other nation in the world has the advantage that the United States of America has on national security—no

other nation—and we by this amendment today would agree to handcuff ourselves and our allies by restricting ourselves? Let it not be. Let us not deal in false narratives. Let us deal in facts that will keep the American people safe.

When you look at an envelope, when a letter is put in the mail, is there a privacy right as to what has been written on that envelope? No, there isn't. There is a privacy right as to what is contained inside that envelope. That's a Fourth Amendment right.

Is there a Fourth Amendment right to the record that you called someone on a certain day? No, there isn't—that's a record—but there is a Fourth Amendment right to what's in that phone call. Let's deal in reality, not in false narratives.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SEN-SENRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amash amendment. I do so as the person who was the principal author of the PATRIOT Act in 2001, who got that law through quickly after 9/11 and who supported and managed its 2006 reauthorization.

Let me make this perfectly clear that unlike what we have heard from speakers on the other side of this issue, this amendment does not stop the collection of data under section 215—the people who are subject to an investigation of an authorized terrorist plot. What it does do is to prevent the collection of data of people who are not subject to an investigation.

Now, relevance is required in any type of a grand jury subpoena or in a criminal collection of data for a criminal trial. This goes far beyond what the NSA is doing. The time has come to stop it, and the way we stop it is to approve this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this important issue.

Madam Chair, reports of the NSA surveillance program have broad and far-reaching consequences.

Many Americans feel that our fundamental liberties as a country and our constitutional rights are threatened. In addition, it has ruined and hurt our reputation abroad—threatening our trade relationships with allies, threatening American jobs as a result, and putting in danger our cooperative security relationships that we need to fight the war on terror.

The responsible thing to do is to show some contrition. Let's pass this amendment. Let's make sure that we can have a practical approach that shows that protecting our liberties and securities are consistent and critical for the United States of America. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, here is the question:

It's a question of balancing privacy versus security. It's a question beyond that. It's a question of who will do the balancing.

Right now, the balancing is being done by people we do not know, by people we do not elect and, in large part right now, by somebody who has admitted lying to this body at a hearing. That's wrong.

We should be doing the balancing. We were elected to do that. We need to pass this amendment so that we can do the balancing, not the folks who are not elected and whom we do not know.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I want to talk about the much ballyhooed oversight.

Every year, there is a report to the Judiciary Committee, an annual report, on section 215. This year, the report was eight sentences—less than a full page. To think that the Congress has substantial oversight of this program is simply incorrect. I cannot match Mr. SENSENBRENNER's brilliant remarks; but I do agree that when we wrote the PATRIOT Act relevance had a meaning.

Madam Chair, I submit for the RECORD a letter to Mr. SENSENBRENNER from the Department of Justice, which basically says, because 300 inquiries were made, the records of every single American became relevant. That's a joke.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SENSENBRENNER: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General dated June 6, 2013, regarding the "business records" provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 50 U.S.C. §1861, enacted as section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

As you know, on June 5, 2013, the media reported the unauthorized disclosure of a classified judicial order issued under this provision that has been used to support a sensitive intelligence collection program. Under this program, which has been briefed to Congress and repeatedly authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) obtains authorization to collect telephony metadata, including the telephone numbers dialed and the date, time and duration of calls, from certain telecommunications service providers. The National Security Agency (NSA), in turn, archives and analyzes this information under carefully controlled circumstances and provides leads to the FBI or others in the Intelligence Community for

counterterrorism purposes. Aspects of this program remain classified, and there are limits to what can be said about it in an unclassified letter. Department of Justice and Intelligence Community staff are available to provide you a briefing on the program at your request.

In your letter, you asked whether this intelligence collection program is consistent with the requirements of section 215 and the limits of that authority. Under section 215, the Director of the FBI may apply to the FISC for an order directing the production of any tangible things, including business records, for investigations to protect against international terrorism. To issue such an order, the FISC must determine that (1) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation, other than a threat assessment; (2) the investigation is being conducted under guidelines approved by the Attorney General under Executive Order 12333; and (3) if a U.S. person is the subject of the investigation, the investigation is not being conducted solely upon the basis of First Amendment protected activities. In addition, the FISC may only require the production of items that can be obtained with a grand jury subpoena or any other court order directing the production of records or tangible things. Finally, the program must, of course, comport with the Constitution.

The telephony metadata program satisfies each of these requirements. The lawfulness of the telephony metadata collection program has repeatedly been affirmed by the FISC. In the years since its inception, multiple FISC judges have granted 90-day extensions of the program after concluding that it meets all applicable legal requirements.

Of particular significance to your question is the relevance to an authorized international terrorism investigation of the telephony metadata collected through this program. First, it is critical to understand the program in the context of the restrictions imposed by the court. Those restrictions strictly limit the extent to which the data is reviewed by the government. In particular, the FISC allows the data to be queried for intelligence purposes only when there is reasonable suspicion, based on specific facts, that a particular query term, such as a telephone number, is associated with a specific foreign terrorist organization that was previously identified to and approved by the court. NSA has reported that in 2012, fewer than 300 unique identifiers were used to query the data after meeting this standard. This means that only a very small fraction of the records is ever reviewed by any person, and only specially cleared counterterrorism personnel specifically trained in the court-approved procedures can access the records to conduct queries. The information generated in response to these limited queries is not only relevant to authorized investigations of international terrorism, but may be especially significant in helping the government identify and disrupt terrorist plots.

The large volume of telephony metadata is relevant to FBI investigations into specific foreign terrorist organizations because the intelligence tools that NSA uses to identify the existence of potential terrorist communications within the data require collecting and storing large volumes of the metadata to enable later analysis. If not collected and held by NSA, the metadata may not continue to be available for the period that NSA has deemed necessary for national security purposes because it need not be retained by telecommunications service providers. Moreover, unless the data is aggregated by NSA, it may not be possible to identify telephony

metadata records that cross different telecommunications networks. The bulk collection of telephony metadata—i.e. the collection of a large volume and high percentage of information about unrelated communications—is therefore necessary to identify the much smaller subset of terrorist-related telephony metadata records contained within the data. It also allows NSA to make connections related to terrorist activities over time and can assist counterterrorism personnel to discover whether known or suspected terrorists have been in contact with other persons who may be engaged in terrorist activities, including persons and activities inside the United States. Because the telephony metadata must be available in bulk to allow NSA to identify the records of terrorist communications, there are “reasonable grounds to believe” that the data is relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism, as section 215 requires, even though most of the records in the dataset are not associated with terrorist activity.

The program is consistent with the Constitution as well as with the statute. As noted above, the only type of information acquired under the program is telephony metadata, not the content of any communications, not the identity, address or financial information of any party to the communication, and not geolocation information. Under longstanding Supreme Court precedent, there is no reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to this kind of information that individuals have already provided to third-party businesses, and such information therefore is not protected by the Fourth Amendment. See *Smith v. Maryland*, 442 U.S. 735, 739–42 (1979).

Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that activities carried out pursuant to FISA, including those conducted under this program, are subject to stringent limitations and robust oversight by all three branches of government. As noted above, by order of the FISC, the Government is prohibited from indiscriminately sifting through the telephony metadata it acquires. Instead, all information that is acquired is subject to strict, court-imposed restrictions on review and handling that provide significant and reasonable safeguards for U.S. persons. The basis for a query must be documented in writing in advance and must be approved by one of a limited number of highly trained analysts. The FISC reviews the program approximately every 90 days.

The Department of Justice conducts rigorous oversight to ensure the telephony metadata is being handled in strict compliance with the FISC’s orders, and the Department of Justice and The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) conduct thorough and regular reviews to ensure the program is implemented in compliance with the law.

The program is also subject to extensive congressional oversight. The classified details of the program have been briefed to the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees on many occasions. In addition, in December 2009, the Department of Justice worked with the Intelligence Community to provide a classified briefing paper to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees to be made available to all Members of Congress regarding the telephony metadata collection program. It is our understanding that both Intelligence Committees made this document available to all Members prior to the February 2010 reauthorization of section 215. That briefing paper clearly explained that the government and the FISC had interpreted Section 215 to authorize the collection of telephony metadata in bulk. An updated version of the briefing paper was provided to

the Senate and House Intelligence Committees again in February 2011 in connection with the reauthorization that occurred later that year.

Finally, we do not agree with the suggestion in your letter that the Department’s March 9, 2011 public testimony on section 215 conveyed a misleading impression as to how this authority is used. Quoting a portion of that testimony, your letter states that it “left the committee with the impression that the Administration was using the business records provision sparingly and for specific materials. The recently released FISA order, however, could not have been drafted more broadly.” In fact, key language in the testimony in question noted that orders issued pursuant to section 215 “have also been used to support important and highly sensitive intelligence collection operations, on which this committee and others have been separately briefed.” We hope that the explanation above regarding the use of this authority to identify specific terrorism-related telephony metadata records helps to clarify the point.

The recent unauthorized disclosure of this and other classified intelligence activities has caused serious harm to our national security. Since the disclosure of the telephony metadata collection program, the Department of Justice and the Intelligence Community have worked to ensure that Congress and the American people understand how the program operates, its importance to our security, and the rigorous oversight that is applied. As part of this effort, senior officials from ODNI, NSA, DOJ and F131 provided a classified briefing for all House Members on June 11, 2013 and separate classified briefings to the House Democratic Caucus and the House Republican Conference on June 26, 2013.

The Department of Justice is committed to ensuring that our efforts to protect national security are conducted lawfully and respect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans. We look forward to continuing to work with you and others in the Congress to ensure that we meet this objective.

We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance with this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK,

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, this is not about how sincere the NSA people are in implementing this technique. It is not about how careful they are. It is whether they have the right to collect the data in the first place on every phone call on every American every day.

The PATRIOT Act did not specifically authorize it. Section 215 talks about tangible things that are relevant to an authorized security investigation. In the NSA’s interpretation of that, “relevant” is all data all the time. That is simply wrong. We should support the Amash amendment and vote for it.

□ 1815

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, amendment IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, house, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Those who choose to trade liberty for security will find they have neither.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Warrants need to be particular and specific about the place to be searched and the items to be seized.

No judge would ever sign a general search warrant like the British did, allowing the police to search every house on the block, much less seize everybody’s phone records, but this is what has happened under section 215 under the government.

The government has gone too far in the name of security and the Fourth Amendment has been bruised.

Rein in government invasion. No more dragnet operations. Get a specific warrant based on probable cause, or stay out of our lives.

And that’s just the way it is.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairperson, this amendment stops the government from misusing section 215, to engage in the dragnet collection of all of our personal telephone records. Congress did not grant the executive the authority to collect everything it wants so long as it limits any subsequent search of that data.

This amendment restores the requirement that records sought are relevant to an authorized foreign intelligence or terrorist investigation. It restores the minimal relevant standard required by Congress but ignored by successive administrations.

No administration should be permitted to operate above or beyond the law as they have done in this respect. I therefore urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. General warrants, writs of assistance, that’s what we’re looking at, and the Founding Fathers found that to be anathema. What they’re doing does violate the Fourth Amendment. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and we’re supposed to rely on a secret agency that deals with a secret court that deals with a selective secrecy committee; and Members of Congress are limited to their access to the actions of that committee, but we’re supposed to trust them.

Folks, we’ve got a job to do. Vote “yes.”

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chairwoman, countless men and women from my State of Hawaii and all across the country have worn the uniform and put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms and our liberties. I cannot in good conscience vote to take a single dollar from the pockets of hardworking taxpayers from across the country to pay for programs which infringe on the very liberties and freedoms our troops have fought and died for.

Ben Franklin said:

They who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

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

We're here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicion list collection of every American's phone records?

When you had the chance to stand up for Americans' privacy, did you?

Please support the Amash amendment and oppose the NSA's blanket surveillance of our constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes for the closing argument to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to strongly urge opposition to the Amash amendment.

This program has stopped dozens of terrorist attacks. That means it's saved untold American lives.

This amendment is not simple. It does not limit the program. It does not modify it. It does not constrain the program. It ends the program. It blows it up. Some of you've heard the analogy that if you want to search for a needle in a haystack, you have to have the haystack. This takes a leaf blower and blows away the entire haystack. You will not have this program if this amendment passes. And it does so, despite all of the safeguards you have already heard.

This program is constitutional under Supreme Court precedent—not recent precedent. Precedent goes back to 1979, just 2 years after I was born, the year that one of the young sponsors of this amendment was born. This program is approved by large bipartisan majorities of this body on the statute—text that they approved, not their secret intents or wishes.

It is overseen by article III judges who have been confirmed by the Senate and are independent of the executive branch. It is reviewed by the Intelligence Committees, and it is executed primarily by military officers, not generals, but the majors and the colonels who have been fighting and bleeding for this country for 12 years.

What is it, metadata? It sounds kind of scary. It's nothing more than an Excel spreadsheet with five columns: called to, called from, date, time, and the duration. Five columns, billions of rows. It's in a lockbox. It can't be searched unless you have specific suspicion of a number being used by a terrorist. Only then do they go into that database and do they run a search for what that number has been calling.

Why do you need it? Verizon, AT&T, other companies will not keep this data for the years necessary. Secondly, you need it quickly. When I was in Iraq as a platoon leader with the 101st Airborne, if we rolled up a bad guy and we found a cell phone or we found a thumb drive, we would immediately upload that data so intelligence professionals could search it so they could go roll up another bad guy, because you only have a few hours to stop a terrorist once you catch another terrorist.

Folks, we are at war. You may not like that truth. I wish it weren't the truth. But it is the truth. We're at war. Do not take this tool away from our warriors on the frontline.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan 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 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. TERRY of Nebraska.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 100 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chair, I withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24.

The Acting CHAIR. The request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 is withdrawn, and the amendment stands

adopted in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 409, noes 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—409

Aderholt	Cotton	Graves (MO)
Alexander	Courtney	Grayson
Amash	Cramer	Green, Al
Amodei	Crawford	Green, Gene
Andrews	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Crowley	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Cuellar	Grimm
Barber	Culberson	Guthrie
Barr	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Hahn
Barton	Davis (CA)	Hall
Bass	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bentivolio	DeFazio	Harper
Bera (CA)	DeGette	Harris
Bilirakis	Delaney	Hartzler
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Heck (NV)
Black	Dent	Heck (WA)
Blackburn	DeSantis	Hensarling
Blumenauer	DesJarlais	Higgins
Bonamici	Deutch	Himes
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Boustany	Dingell	Holding
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Hudson
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Bridenstine	Duffy	Huffman
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Ellison	Hunter
Brown (FL)	Ellmers	Hurt
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Israel
Buchanan	Enyart	Issa
Buchshon	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Esty	Jeffries
Butterfield	Farenthold	Jenkins
Calvert	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Camp	Fattah	Johnson (OH)
Cantor	Fincher	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Fleischmann	Jones
Cárdenas	Fleming	Jordan
Carney	Flores	Joyce
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Kaptur
Carter	Fortenberry	Keating
Cartwright	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Cassidy	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kildee
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Kind
Chu	Gallego	King (IA)
Ciilline	Garamendi	King (NY)
Clarke	Garcia	Kingston
Clay	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Cleaver	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Clyburn	Gerlach	Kline
Coffman	Gibbs	Kuster
Cole	Gibson	Labrador
Collins (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Conaway	Goodlatte	Lance
Connolly	Gosar	Langevin
Cook	Gowdy	Lankford
Cooper	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Costa	Graves (GA)	Larson (CT)

Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

NOES—12

Becerra
Capuano
Cohen
Conyers

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Beatty
Bustos
Campbell

□ 1847

Messrs. COLLINS of New York, GALLEGRO, HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, McDERMOTT, GRIMM, LEWIS, PEARCE, PAYNE, ANDREWS, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) 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 205, noes 217, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—205

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Cappan
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kildee
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Weber (TX)
Welch
Williams
Wilson (SC)

NOES—217

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (PA)
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Payne
Pelosi

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Beatty
Bustos
Campbell

□ 1851

Mr. CIBILLINE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411—Pompeo amendment #99, “yes” and 412—Amash amendment #100, “No.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411, "yes" and 412, "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider a final period of general debate.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Washington (Mr. HECK) and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Madam Chair, every summer, Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington's 10th Congressional District hosts nearly 6,000 ROTC cadets from all across the Nation. These cadets conduct an assessment exercise we call Warrior Forge. The exercise is an invaluable tool in shaping our next generation of Army officers.

For 40 years, this course has honed the skills, provided the cohesion, and fostered the knowledge necessary to create the Army's next leaders. I have visited this program, and you need not have a single doubt about the quality of the next generation of military leaders in our Nation.

Yet, Madam Chair, an effort is afloat to radically change this proven system, without the knowledge or input from this Congress. Members of this body, including myself, the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, and the former ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee have been requesting from the Army a simple brief and cost-benefit analysis of this proposed radical transformation. And for over 2 years, those requests have repeatedly been delayed and dismissed and denied.

Now, while my preference would have been to offer a limiting amendment to this legislation, I asked the ranking member and the chair if, in this instance, we could work together to seek from the Army a timely report so that Congress and the relevant committees can do our job, which is to ensure proper oversight.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. I am aware of it, and would gladly work with him to get the answers on this proposal.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member very much.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I simply want to take this time to thank someone I have a profound respect for, as we all do, my chairman, our chairman, BILL YOUNG from Florida, for the masterful job he has done leading us to this point. And I would ask that he be given a round of applause.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee and the staff. And I would also want to thank four young people who've worked in our offices

this summer for all of their efforts on our behalf: Craig, Morgan, Deepa, and Matt.

Finally, I want to thank all of my colleagues. We did work our way through 100 amendments. From my perspective, this is exactly how this institution should work, to have issues and disagreement, to have discussions, to have votes, and to have a conclusion to the process, and to report a bill.

So, again, I thank my colleagues, and I thank the chair and the colleagues I work with every day on the Defense Subcommittee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I'd like to use my time to say thank you to the House and all of the Members who participated in some vigorous debate, for having conducted the affairs of the House in a most professional way, proving to our constituents that we can work things out, that we can work together.

□ 1900

I just want to say thank you to Mr. VISCLOSKY, who is handling the minority leadership on this bill for the first time. I think he deserves a lot of credit and a lot of applause for the good job that he did in keeping this schedule on track.

PETER, thank you very much.

While it seems a long time ago, it was only Monday night that we finally received the 100 amendments that would be filed and considered during the debate. We had to analyze those amendments by Tuesday—yesterday—so that we could begin the debate on this bill. Our staff did an outstanding job in working late into the night Monday night analyzing these amendments so that we could consider where we would be on those amendments.

I would like to read the names of the members of our staff, headed by Tom McLemore as staff director and Paul Juola in a similar position for Mr. VISCLOSKY. Also, Becky Leggierrri, Brook Boyer, Ann Reese, Megan Rosenbush, Tim Prince, Walter Hearne, B.G. Wright, Paul Terry, Maureen Holohan, Jennifer Miller, Adrienne Ramsay, and Sherry Young. They are a professional staff. It's hard to find any more of a professional staff than those that I just mentioned.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE

of Texas) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, 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. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 312, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2397 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 86, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 87, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. 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 re-appropriate resources in areas critical to our national security and to defend Israel, our most important ally in the Middle East.

The motion to recommit adds \$20 million in funding for Israel's Iron Dome defense program and \$5 million for the Arrow defense program in order to bolster protection against short- and long-range missile attacks.

Now here's something on which we can all agree. Defending Israel is in the interest of our national security. The bond between the United States and Israel is rooted in our shared national interest and our common values of democracy, rule of law, and basic human rights. Israel's security is our security. The same forces threatening Israel jeopardize the United States. And this is not a partisan issue.

All of us who have been to Israel are struck by how close Israelis live to neighbors who want to destroy them. As a former mayor of a city, I ran a city where we had real problems like gangs and crimes; but never did I have to worry about the towns next door shooting rockets at my residents. I can't imagine what it would be like to be the mayor of Sderot.

In 2008, before we had Iron Dome, a surge in Hamas rocket attacks forced Israel to launch a ground operation that, tragically, claimed over a thousand Israeli and Palestinian lives.

Fast forward to last November. In just 1 week, over 1,500 rockets were fired at Israel again by terrorist groups in Gaza. Thankfully, this time, Iron Dome intercepted over 80 percent of the deadly attacks, preventing war and saving lives.

I know that we can all agree that support for Israel's missile defense program is not merely a favor we do for Israel. Our political and military leaders have long praised the strategic significance of Israel's powerful military advancing our interests in the region, saving our Nation billions of dollars on military personnel and equipment that we might otherwise be forced to deploy.

Looking at Israel's neighborhood, never has this situation been so urgent for both our countries, with increased threats from Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda, and instability in Syria, Egypt, and Jordan. We must do all we can to strengthen Israel's defenses, and that is why this amendment to increase funding for these defense systems is so timely and so necessary.

Support for Israel has always enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support. So I urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to come together on this important amendment to support Israel and promote stability in the Middle East.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. There's no doubt that Iron Dome is an extremely effective missile defense system. And because of that, the committee fully funded this bill at \$220 million for Iron Dome, which is fully in line with the President's request and the recently passed defense authorization bill.

Additionally, this is the third year of consecutive funding for a 4-year commitment. The truth of the matter is they really can't spend it any faster or any more effectively. So as is so often the case, this motion is purely a political statement, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—192

Andrews	Green, Al	Owens
Barber	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Hahn	Payne
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Holt	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Honda	Polis
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Rahall
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carney	Jones	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Connelly	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Costa	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loebsack	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	(NM)	Speier
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maloney,	Tierney
Dingell	Carolyn	Titus
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doyle	Matheson	Tsongas
Duckworth	Matsui	Van Hollen
Edwards	McCollum	Vargas
Ellison	McDermott	Veasey
Engel	McGovern	Vela
Enyart	McIntyre	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	Visclosky
Esty	Meeks	Walz
Farr	Meng	Wasserman
Fattah	Michaud	Schultz
Foster	Miller, George	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watt
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Gallego	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	

NOES—231

Aderholt	Bachmann	Benishek
Alexander	Bachus	Bentivolio
Amash	Barr	Bilirakis
Amodei	Barton	Bishop (UT)

Black	Harper	Pompeo
Blackburn	Harris	Posey
Bonner	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Radel
Brady (TX)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Reichert
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Renacci
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Bucshon	Hultgren	Roby
Burgess	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Cassidy	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Joyce	Roskam
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothenfus
Cole	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Runyan
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kline	Salmon
Cook	Labrador	Sanford
Cotton	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cramer	Lamborn	Schock
Crawford	Lance	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Denham	Long	Shuster
Dent	Lucas	Simon
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Marino	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stewart
Ellmers	McCaul	Stivers
Farenthold	McClintock	Stockman
Fincher	McHenry	Stutzman
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Terry
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McMorris	Thornberry
Flores	Rodgers	Tiberi
Forbes	Meadows	Tipton
Fortenberry	Meehan	Turner
Fox	Messer	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Valadao
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Gabbard	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Walden
Garrett	Moran	Walorski
Gerlach	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Weststrum
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Noem	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Nugent	Williams
Gosar	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Nunnelee	Wittman
Granger	O'Rourke	Wolf
Graves (GA)	Olson	Womack
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Woodall
Griffin (AR)	Paulsen	Yoder
Griffith (VA)	Pearce	Yoho
Grimm	Perry	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Petri	Young (FL)
Gutiérrez	Pittenger	Young (IN)
Hall	Pitts	
Hanna	Poe (TX)	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Bustos	Horsford	Rokita
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	
Coble	Neal	

□ 1915

Messrs. STEWART and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

YEAS—315

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Alexander	Gabbard	McKinley
Amodi	Gallego	McMorris
Andrews	Garamendi	Rodgers
Bachmann	Garcia	McNerney
Bachus	Gardner	Meadows
Barber	Garrett	Meehan
Barr	Gerlach	Messer
Barrow (GA)	Gibbs	Mica
Barton	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)
Beatty	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Benishek	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Bentivolio	Gosar	Moran
Bera (CA)	Gowdy	Mullin
Billirakis	Granger	Mulvaney
Bishop (GA)	Graves (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Black	Green, Gene	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Bonner	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Boustany	Grimm	Nunes
Brady (PA)	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Brady (TX)	Hall	O'Rourke
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Olson
Bridenstine	Hanna	Owens
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Pascrell
Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Paulsen
Brownley (CA)	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Buchanan	Heck (WA)	Perry
Buchson	Hensarling	Peters (CA)
Burgess	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Holding	Peterson
Calvert	Hoyer	Petri
Camp	Hudson	Pittenger
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Capito	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Cárdenas	Hunter	Pompeo
Carter	Hurt	Posey
Cassidy	Israel	Price (GA)
Castro (TX)	Issa	Price (NC)
Chabot	Jackson Lee	Radel
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Rahall
Clyburn	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Coffman	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ribble
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Kaptur	Rigell
Cannon	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Cook	Kilmer	Roe (TN)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Courtney	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Kline	Roskam
Cuellar	Kuster	Ross
Culberson	Labrador	Rothfus
Daines	LaMalfa	Royce
Davis (CA)	Lamborn	Ruiz
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Runyan
Delaney	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lankford	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Larson (CT)	Salmon
DeSantis	Latham	Sanchez, Loretta
DesJarlais	Latta	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Scalise
Dingell	LoBiondo	Schneider
Doggett	Loeback	Schock
Duckworth	Long	Schwartz
Duffy	Lowey	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Scott (VA)
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Enyart	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Sessions
Farenthold	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Fattah	Lummis	Shea-Porter
Fincher	Maffei	Sherman
Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Marchant	Shuster
Fleming	Marino	Simpson
Flores	Matheson	Sinema
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Foster	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Foxx	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Smith (WA)

Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

NAYS—109

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell

Coble
Herrera Beutler
Horsford

McCarthy (NY)
Pallone
Rokita

□ 1930

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2397, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2397.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, during the final vote series last night, I inadvertently voted "no" on the DeLauro amendment No. 44 that would prohibit the use of funds to train the Afghan Special Mission Wing. I would say for the record that I support the amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO, and had I voted correctly, I would have voted for the amendment.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2641

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as cosponsors Congressman CAPUANO and Congressman PALLONE from my bill, H.R. 2641, the Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA DESERVES AN ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, the President said today that it is time for the House to lay out our ideas to give the middle class a better shot. He said it is time to move past stale debates.

Madam Speaker, the only reason these debates are stale is because the House bills that have been passed to create jobs in America are stalled in the Senate and by the President.

This isn't difficult. We need to cut burdensome regulations that stop job creation. The President needs to agree to build the Keystone pipeline. The President needs to agree to explore for American energy to lower the price of gas and diesel. The President needs to agree to permanently delay all of ObamaCare. America deserves an economic recovery.

REPEAL THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, let me just commend Congressman SCHIFF and the 185 Members who voted today to restrict the authorization for the use of military force.

Today's vote is a very important step in our effort to repeal this overly broad blank check to wage war anywhere, at any time, and for any length, which of course I could not vote for September 14, 2001.

I have a bipartisan bill which would repeal the authorization to use military force, and doing so would provide Congress an opportunity finally, a long overdue opportunity, to have a meaningful debate about our constitutional role in declaring war.

Last week, I released a public report from the Congressional Research Service citing 30 instances where this resolution has been invoked. Most Americans, and of course my colleagues in Congress, would be surprised to know that these activities include deploying groups in Ethiopia, Djibouti, Georgia, Yemen, Kenya, the Philippines, Somalia—I could go on and on. It also includes justifying detentions at Guantanamo Bay and warrantless surveillance activities.

Finally, let me just say it is time to repeal this authorization and rein in the overly broad and deeply troubling NSA domestic spying program.

I urge all Members to join our continuing efforts and cosponsor my bill, H.R. 198, to repeal the AUMF.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, Washington, DC, July 10, 2013. MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Barbara Lee.
From: Matthew Weed, Analyst in Foreign Policy Legislation.
Subject: The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force: Background in Brief.

This memorandum responds to your request for information on presidential utilization of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF; P.L. 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), enacted in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, to justify and undertake military and other action. It contains very brief discussions of the relevant provisions of the AUMF, and the use of U.S. armed forces and other actions initiated under AUMF authority. Material in this memorandum may be used in other Congressional Research Service (CRS) products.

2001 AUMF USE OF FORCE PROVISION

Section 2(a) of the AUMF authorizes the use of force in response to the September 11 attacks:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

ANALYSIS

Scope: The authorizing language is broad in its scope concerning the prevention of any future acts of terrorism that might be perpetrated against the United States, but is circumscribed by authorizing the targeting only of those nations, organizations, or persons determined to be involved in perpetrating the September 11 attacks or harboring those who perpetrated the attacks.

War Against Non-State Actors: The AUMF is considered groundbreaking as it (1) empowered the President to target non-state actors, even to the individual level, as well as states, and (2) did not specify which states and non-state actors were included under the authorization.

Current Debate: After nearly 12 years in force, executive branch reliance on the AUMF has raised a number of concerns for a number of commentators and Members of Congress. These concerns relate to Congress's constitutional role in exercising its war power, as well as several types of executive branch activities to counter terrorism that are perceived as problematic. In contrast, Obama Administration officials have testified that the legal framework for the current conflict against Al Qaeda and associated forces, which includes the AUMF, remains valid and effective in meeting the U.S. military's requirements for conducting counterterrorism operations.

ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER AUMF AUTHORITY

CRS has located 30 occurrences of a publicly disclosed presidential reliance on the AUMF to take or continue military or related action (including non-military action like detentions and military trials).¹ Of the 30 occurrences, 18 were made during the Bush Administration, and 12 have been made during the Obama Administration.

Pursuant to the AUMF, President George W. Bush notified Congress that he was de-

ploying U.S. armed forces to Afghanistan in 2001 to oust the Taliban from power and eliminate al Qaeda training sites and safe harbors in the country. In addition, Presidents Bush and Obama have invoked the AUMF to use U.S. armed forces or engage in other actions to: counter the terrorist threat against the United States following 9/11; deploy and direct such forces, or report on ongoing use of such forces in: Afghanistan; the Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Djibouti; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; Iraq; and Somalia.

Engage terrorist groups "around the world".

Engage terrorist groups "on the high seas".

Detain individuals at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and to take other actions related to detainment decisions; and Conduct trials of terrorist suspects in military commissions.

¹ See Appendix for information on each notification. Based on notifications from the President concerning deployments of U.S. armed forces in the Federal Register and Compilation of Presidential Documents. It is possible that actions have been taken under the AUMF without being disclosed in these publications, and may have been disclosed to Congress through other means.

APPENDIX

Table 1, below, provides dates and subject matter of each of the presidential notifications located by CRS that reference the AUMF as authority for the deployment or use of U.S. armed forces or other activities. In many cases, the notifications indicate the continuation of a given deployment or activity.

TABLE 1—LIST OF PRESIDENTIAL NOTIFICATIONS REFERENCING AUMF

Date	Relevant country, geographic area, targeted group, or type of action
9/24/2001	Afghanistan; the Taliban.
10/9/2001	al Qaeda; other terrorist organizations.
11/13/2001	Military detention and trial of terrorist suspects.
9/20/2002	Afghanistan; Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay.
3/20/2003	Yemen; Djibouti; Guantanamo Bay.
9/19/2003	Afghanistan; Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay.
3/20/2004	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Georgia; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; high seas.
11/4/2004	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Yemen; Ethiopia; Kenya; Eritrea; Djibouti; high seas.
5/20/2005	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; high seas.
12/7/2005	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; high seas.
6/15/2006	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; high seas.
12/15/2006	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; high seas.
2/14/2007	Executive Order 13425: includes Military Commissions.
6/15/2007	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Horn of Africa; Somalia; high seas.
7/20/2007	Executive Order 13440: includes detention and interrogation of terrorist suspects.
12/14/2007	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/13/2008	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
12/16/2008	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/15/2009	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
12/15/2009	Presidential Memorandum includes Guantanamo Bay issues.
12/16/2009	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/15/2010	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Djibouti; Horn of Africa; global counterterrorism; high seas.
12/15/2010	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
3/7/2011	Executive Order 13567: includes detention at Guantanamo Bay.
6/15/2011	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
12/15/2011	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
2/28/2012	Military detention of terrorist suspects.
6/15/2012	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; Somalia; Yemen; high seas.
12/14/2012	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; Somalia; Yemen; high seas.
6/14/2013	Afghanistan; Somalia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay; high seas.

Sources: Federal Register; Compilation of Presidential Documents.

39TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an anniversary that has pained the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for 39 years.

On July 20, 1974, in blatant violation of international law, Turkey violently invaded Cyprus and captured the northern part of the island.

Since the invasion, Turkey has established a heavily armed military occupation that continues to control nearly 40 percent of Cyprus and has forced 160,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not impossible to conceive a unified Cyprus that respects the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots.

Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States, and we owe our support for both peace and the end of this illegal occupation.

SARATOGA RACE COURSE

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, "and they're off." That traditional refrain as horses come out of the gate ushered in yet another Saratoga season just days ago—this time a very special season.

I recognize Saratoga Race Course as it celebrates 150 years of thoroughbred racing in Saratoga Springs, New York.

On August 3, 1863, a son of Irish immigrants, John Morrissey, who served two terms in this body, staged the first horse race at what is now known as the Oklahoma Track, giving birth to the oldest continually active sporting venue in the United States.

Notable sportswriter Red Smith once said of the Saratoga Race Course, "From New York City you drive north for about 175 miles, turn left on Union Avenue and go back 100 years."

Racing in Saratoga produces over 2,000 jobs, nearly \$15 million in tax revenue and an economic boost of \$200 million to the surrounding region each year.

I am honored to recognize 150 years of tradition and community spirit that come to life in a most unique and exciting way, that have a special place in our American story.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, the following way: "And down the stretch they come." Happy 150th, Saratoga.

BEATRIZ ARREDONDO

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the memory of Beatriz

Arredondo, an inspiring woman who embodied the spirit of love and compassion.

Beatriz, or "Nena" as she was called by her loved ones, passed away on June 28, 2013.

Beatriz was born on January 16, 1943, in Tamaulipas, Mexico. At a very young age, she knew that she wanted to be a loving wife and mother, and she dreamed of one day seeing her grandchildren. She accomplished these goals magnificently.

Fifty-four years ago, she met Ernesto Arredondo, Sr. and they were married for 46 years. They have four beautiful children—Ernesto, Jr., Edoardo, Everardo, and Elizabeth.

Beatriz is survived by her husband, her children, and her 10 grandchildren.

As is said in St. Paul's Second Letter to Timothy:

She fought the good fight. She finished the race. She kept the faith.

She is now in God's arms.

Our prayers are with the Arredondo family.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening with my colleagues in the House GOP Doctors Caucus, and other Republican Members, to talk about this most, most important subject, and that is this recent delay of the employer mandate.

The Obama administration's announcement that it will delay implementation of the employer mandate due to the enormous regulatory burden on businesses, Mr. Speaker, is proof positive that the Affordable Care Act is a job killer.

The administration's excuse for the delay was to simplify reporting requirements for small businesses. But employers haven't been against the mandate solely due to its burdensome reporting requirements.

□ 1945

While it's estimated that ObamaCare will require American job creators, families, and health care providers to spend more than 127 million hours a year on complying with the law, a far greater concern to business owners is the impact the mandate will have on job creation. The cost of the health insurance and of ObamaCare's fines will drive up the costs of labor and will continue to be a drag on this economy. This is further evidence that the administration does not get how the law will impact the economy.

The U.S. Chamber reported that 72 percent of small business executives would have a harder time hiring because of ObamaCare. The employer mandate has been cited by business owners repeatedly as a major obstacle

to expansion. They simply cannot afford it. At a recent small business roundtable, one Georgia business owner said to me, I want to provide health care insurance for my employees. ObamaCare has forced me to choose between that and hiring new people.

For instance, one common deterrent to growth that is often cited by small businesses is the 50 employee threshold, at which point a business must provide insurance to its employees once the 50th full-time employee is hired. This misguided provision has repeatedly forced different hiring practices by these companies.

I heard that Heatco, a company which specializes in the design and manufacture of world-class heating solutions, which is located in my district in Bartow County, Georgia, had looked into expanding. The thing is that it currently has—you guessed it, Mr. Speaker—49 employees, and due to the added ObamaCare cost, to expand by adding an additional employee, it will cost more than automating some of their processes.

The administration cannot say with a straight face that businesses are more concerned with reporting requirements rather than with the overbearing costs that ObamaCare will add to their bottom lines.

President Obama's announcement doesn't reduce the harmful effects that the mandate will have on employers as we move forward. It could, however, provide cover. Let me repeat that: it could, however, provide cover for Democrats during an election year. This political calculation protects them from voter backlash and from the reality that ObamaCare—their law—is to blame for an economy that is literally hemorrhaging jobs.

This is yet another example of the Obama administration's replacing the rule of law with partisan, raw politics. This unilateral decision is an abuse of executive power; and in my opinion, it is a clear demonstration that President Obama will disregard for political gain the laws he has signed.

In 2010, Democrats in Congress determined that the enforcement of the egregious employer mandate would begin on January 1, 2014. As bad as the law may be, the administration does not have the power to rewrite the law. That responsibility belongs—where?—right here in Congress. Just look at your Constitution, which I keep in my pocket. It's somewhere deep inside my pocket, but I guarantee you that it's in here, because I put it in here every single day.

Legalities aside, postponing the mandate for 1 year is not enough. It simply delays the inevitable. When it's eventually enacted, Mr. Speaker, hours will still be cut, and pay will still be reduced. Businesses hovering just under the 50 employee threshold will still have to weigh the costs of expansion; and because of the requirement, many will be unable to grow. It is just further proof that the administration does not understand how business works.

The lack of response from this administration is also increasingly frustrating. House Republicans have held numerous hearings, asking for more information as to how this decision was reached. We have sent letters to the Secretary of the Treasury, and we have sent letters to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We have asked witnesses in order for us to gain a better insight into this ruling, but have continuously been rebuffed, in other words, no response to our requests. It's offensive to the American people that the administration cannot offer clear guidance on a central piece of its ObamaCare fiasco.

This delay will also affect the verification of individuals in this insurance exchange. It's amazing that the administration is suggesting that we will rely on the honor system to determine Federal payments. This is truly outrageous. According to the law, you aren't eligible for ObamaCare subsidies if your employer has offered you what the government considers to be affordable coverage. This is spelled out clearly in the law. With the delay of the employer mandate, however, the government won't be able to verify whether the individual has been offered coverage, and this will open the door—wide open—for enormous fraud and abuse, and the costs will skyrocket.

We've seen the same thing in other entitlement programs that rely on this so-called honor system. It's clear that what we are seeing is a tactic of "subsidize first, ask questions later."

Remember the old phrase "pay and chase" on Medicare claims? It is the administration's goal to enroll as many people in the ObamaCare exchanges as they can and as soon as they can, i.e., in this year of delay, so that we will never be able to repeal this bill. The Federal takeover of one-sixth of the economy raises taxes on small business owners and on middle class families. It guts Medicare, seniors—it guts Medicare—and it will irreparably harm the doctor-patient relationship.

Instead, we need State-based reforms that will lower costs, give patients more control of their own health insurance policies, increase access, and ensure a higher standard of care.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, who was an anesthesiologist by profession before coming to Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the doctor is absolutely right. That employer mandate will increase the costs for employers, which means we're going to get less job creation and less job growth in an economy that can't do with any less job creation. In fact, as the doctor probably knows, since January, virtually all of the jobs created in this country because of this mandate have been part-time jobs. We are rapidly converting to a part-time economy. That's

not what Americans expect—that's not what Americans deserve—and that problem won't be solved until that mandate goes away, not just delayed but goes away.

The doctor talked about the costs per employee when the employee pays. What the doctor hadn't mentioned is the cost if you go on the individual market, because that's the other market created under the President's Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. You've also heard much in the past week because the President has gone around, pointing to New York and saying, Do you see, premiums are going to go down 50 percent—the wonders of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the President can only talk about New York because, in virtually every other State, there will be huge increases. So we have to examine why the decrease in New York is 50 percent. It's because they start with such a high premium that, even at half the cost, they're still multiples of the premiums of those in the other States.

For instance, let's take a look at what the average premium in New York right now is for a healthy 30-year-old nonsmoker who is buying a policy, because the President and the Secretary of HHS and everyone who has screened this plan has said, unless you get healthy young people to buy insurance, the whole plan falls apart. So let's look at what it will cost for that 30-year-old nonsmoking male—the people who are among the highest of the uninsured, the highest in number. This is the average plan. The median-priced plan in New York is \$5,750 a year, or about \$500 a month right now.

Now, that median-priced plan in the President's home State of Illinois is \$1,450, or about \$1,300 a month—about one-fourth the price of the New York policies, because New York has ObamaCare-type regulations in place. That's why their costs are so high right now. In fact, ObamaCare is not quite as regulated as is the New York market, so the prices can come down a little bit, but do you know, if it comes down from \$500 to \$250, it's still twice the cost of that policy in Illinois right now.

Maybe we should look at the Vice President's State of Delaware where the average 30-year-old male's policy price is about \$1,380, or let's round to \$1,200 a month. That's about one-fourth the price of the current policy in New York, and even with those tremendous ObamaCare savings, it will be half the price of the policy in New York, the ObamaCare policy.

Let's look at what has happened in some other States other than New York. I'll talk about my home State of Maryland, which is the largest non-profit insurer. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I said the "nonprofit" insurer, because you can't blame profit as the reason for a high cost. The largest nonprofit insurer said that the average price increase is 25 percent; and for a young healthy

person, exactly the ones who have to be signed up for the ObamaCare scheme to work, it's as high as a 150 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, if we can't get healthy young people to buy insurance now, how in the world are we going to convince them to buy insurance in Maryland when it costs almost twice as much?

We can run all the taxpayer-financed ads, because that's what it's going to be. All of the people watching who have televisions will see what happens this fall as we spend millions and millions of taxpayer dollars to try to convince healthy young people to buy a plan that's way too overpriced.

Let's look at California. Maybe the big States are different. New York is expensive. Maybe California is different. In California, the average cost of that plan for a healthy young person is \$2,200, or about \$200 a month. Why, it's less than half of the cost in New York. Sure enough, in figures released last month in California, the costs of the ObamaCare individual plan will increase by 64 to 146 percent. So that \$200-a-month premium is now going to be \$400 a month.

Mr. Speaker, young people who are entering the job market are entering at relatively low levels of pay. Where in the world are they going to find \$400 to pay for an overpriced plan that they've seen advertised on their local NBA game—and, of course, with the ads paid for with taxpayer dollars?

This is why this house of cards will collapse. We are in for a rough time this fall. People in America who depend on their health care insurance are in for a really rough time. The costs are going to go up, and the confusion will be immense. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better, so that's why we have called on the President. Forget the 1-year delay of the mandate on employers only. We need a permanent delay on the entire plan, and the time for it is now. The President today made a big deal on his pivot to jobs.

Mr. President, I would suggest stopping the \$100 million trips to Africa and go talk to some of our small business employers and ask them what are their concerns. How will they create jobs? This is what they would tell the President, Mr. Speaker. They would tell the President to get rid of that ObamaCare. That's a weight hanging over my business's head that I can't afford, that I can't predict, and that is stopping me from hiring people; and for the people I have now, it's making me shift them to part-time jobs.

□ 2000

So we've come full circle, Mr. Speaker. If what we want is a part-time economy, let's barrel ahead with ObamaCare. America deserves much better than part-time jobs. We deserve to create full-time, good paying jobs by the small businesses and large businesses in this country that are just waiting to show economic growth. We

have got to remove this lead weight from around their neck.

I thank the doctor from Georgia for yielding the time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield time to the gentleman from Kentucky, colleagues, I want you to look at this first poster because a lot of what the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Speaker, was talking about in regard to costs shows it pretty simply here. The change in the cost per employee, because of the health care law, if you have 49 employees, as we've talked about, there is no increase in the cost of health care because you don't have to provide the government-mandated expensive coverage. So there is no increase. That's why, of course, they keep the employee rate at 49 and don't hire those extra employees.

If you're at 50, though, and you are under the mandate, the increase is \$800 per employee; if you are at 75 employees, the increase is \$1,200 per employee; 100 employees, a \$1,400 increase; and 150, a \$1,600 per year increase per employee. That's why so many of these small businesses are right there, my colleagues, at 49, with no increase because no job growth or employees that are hired at 29 hours a week. Try to support yourself, much less a family, on 29 hours a week.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding. I appreciate him letting me be a part of the Doctors Caucus for tonight.

I don't want to pretend that I am a doctor. I certainly am not, but I appreciate the opportunity to be here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the health care bill. It's nice that this has been organized so we can be here tonight to talk about a topic that is critical to the American people, and that's the crushing mandates in ObamaCare.

As we know, last week, Mr. Speaker, the House considered two bills to relieve the American people of these mandates: the Authority for Mandate Delay Act would give large employers a reprieve from compliance with ObamaCare's employer mandate until 2015, and the Fairness for American Families Act would grant individuals until 2015 to comply with the law's individual mandate.

This one-size-fits-all health care law is a train wreck. It's been quoted as a train wreck by members of the other party who voted for it in the other body. The administration has clearly realized its employer mandate will hinder businesses in their ability to grow and, just a few weeks ago, announced their decision to delay the implementation of this bill.

I appreciate being here tonight because I come from a small business manufacturing background that provides health care at a low cost to our employees. I believe I understand the complexities that an employer faces in providing health insurance for their

workers. This law encourages employers to cut workers' hours, pare back their numbers of workers, and move workers from existing health insurance plans onto the exchange.

Well, I'm glad to see the administration is finally paying attention to the disastrous consequences of this law. It is disappointing that they expect families and small business owners to comply with the crushing mandates while they give big businesses a break. Improving access to health care and making it more affordable should be the goal and the outcome. I will continue to fight for full repeal of this law, but in the interim, I'm glad the House moved last week to delay the implementation of the crushing mandates.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. Although he is not a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, I think that we might take a vote here on the House floor. The cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus is here with me, and I'm going to recognize him in just a second. So he and I are cochairs; so, Mr. GUTHRIE, we may indeed make you an honorary member. Thank you very much. We appreciate your input.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not just about the doctor-patient relationship. The reason we're giving this presentation tonight and the leadership has asked us to talk about this issue, the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus—and it includes medical doctors, I think about 16 of us. It includes dentists. It includes a clinical psychologist. It includes a hospital administrator—formerly, before becoming a Members of Congress—advanced practice nurses, bachelor of science nurses, people in the health care space that know of what they speak. And in that regard, I can't think of anybody, Mr. Speaker, who knows this issue better than my cochairman of the House GOP Doctors Caucus and fellow OB/GYN physician, Dr. PHIL ROE from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, as I want to talk about what Dr. HARRIS just spoke about a minute ago. I want to do that before I actually explain how we got where we are to our viewers.

What Dr. HARRIS didn't say is that in the small group market in New York in 1992, there were 1.2 million people who got their insurance through the small group market. At that point in time, Governor Cuomo initiated no pre-existing conditions in the small group market community rating. And "community rating," for those who don't know what that means, it means that your sickest patient or your sickest customer can't be charged more than three times what a well person is. So they're not actually paying the cost of their care; someone else is paying that cost. So that's community rating. And "guaranteed issue" means you can't be

turned down, exactly what we're doing here.

What happened to that market? Within 10 years, that market all but evaporated in New York. There were 120,000. It dropped by 90 percent. Today, in a State with almost 20 million people, there are 31,000 people—that's .0016 or so percent of the people—who are in that State that get their insurance through that market.

What is it? Not only did they basically ruin that market, it's now one of the most expensive in the United States, and the only way it's going to come down is for those premiums to be subsidized by young, healthy people. As Dr. HARRIS said, young people like my three children, who just got out of college and are starting their families, cannot afford something that basically they're not paying for. I wanted to point that out. I thought it was very important to understand how we got there and to why we think this won't happen again.

Let's go back, Dr. GINGREY and Mr. Speaker, to how we got here. Basically, the health care debate started because health care needed reform in this country. The reason it needed reform is we had costs going up more than inflation—no question that was occurring—and we had a group of our people in this country who work every day who were uninsured. We needed to do that. We had people with preexisting conditions that couldn't get health insurance. You and I saw them. It was maybe a woman who had developed breast cancer, dropped out of the job market, and on the way back in couldn't find it. So there's no argument from us that we needed to have health care reform.

So what did we have? We had a Doctors Caucus at that time that had nine physicians, and not one of us was asked one thing about this health care bill. I brought 31 years of experience to the House floor and experience with health care reform in Tennessee where we tried to reform our Medicaid program, called TennCare.

How is this supposed to work? The idea was we're going to expand coverage and make it more affordable.

What was the President's promise, Mr. Speaker? The promise was, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you like your health insurance coverage, you can keep your health insurance coverage, and we're going to make the costs go down.

What is the reality? People are losing their doctors for a variety of reasons, the cost has gone up dramatically, as Dr. HARRIS pointed out. Let me also point out about what sectors are involved and who in health insurance. It is complicated.

In ERISA-approved plans, if you work for a company that provides health insurance coverage, that covers about 60 percent of the people in this country. About 160 million people work under that. Let's say in my practice we have 400-plus employees in my medical

practice that get their health insurance through their job. That covers about 60 percent of the people in this country. Sadly, in the last 4 or 5 years, because of the change in the percent of people who are employed in the workforce, that number has actually gone down 2 percent to 58 percent, instead of going up as it usually does in most recoveries. Number two, Medicare, and number three, Medicaid.

So all of this entire debate about—remember, preexisting conditions are not an issue in that group of people, and we're looking at over 80 percent. So this 2,700-page bill really had to do with less than 20 percent of the population. I think we could have done something much simpler, much less expensive, and certainly much easier to explain.

We're going to spend an hour here tonight, Mr. Speaker, in trying to break this down to where the average person can understand it, understand how it affects me and my family. I'm going to hopefully share some of those things with you.

I chair the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions in the Education and the Workforce Committee. I've held three hearings around the country. I held one in Evansville, Indiana, one in Butler, Pennsylvania, and recently in Concord, North Carolina. What happened is we had businesses come in. Remember, the market that wasn't functioning was a small group market and the individual market. And let me explain how the individual market works.

When I left my practice 5 years ago to run for Congress, after 31 years of practice, I left the practice, I had group insurance covered under ERISA, that 160 million people in my family. I left that, and I then am on the individual market. Because I'm treated differently tax-wise, the day before, I had a tax-deductible health plan. The next day, I could buy that plan, but guess what? It was much more expensive because it was not tax deductible. That's how individuals find themselves. So those are the people we were trying to help.

What's happened to them? Well, I'll give you an example. In our State of Tennessee—Dr. HARRIS spoke about several States. I spoke to our State insurance commissioner just recently, and in the individual market, someone out there who is a young person going out to get insurance, they've just finished college or whatever—we'll talk about the under 26-year-olds in a little bit, about what the bill actually did. Those rates are going up between 45 percent and 75 percent in my State; in the small group market—that's where small businesses go out and select their insurance—50 percent to 55 percent. Does that sound like rates are going down? And this story is all over the country. State after State after State you see this in.

I wanted this plan to work because, as I said, we did need health care re-

form, but we needed patient-centered, market-driven health care reform that would help hold those costs down and put the decision making not in bureaucrats' hands, not in insurance companies' hands, but in doctors' and patients' and families' hands. That's who it needs to be in.

I think the ObamaCare plan started this way: How do we fund this plan? Well, they knew it was going to be expensive because of all the tax subsidies that were going to go out.

Where did the money come from? The money came from about a \$700 billion grab from Medicare, a plan that's already underfunded, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have a plan now in Medicare where for every dollar placed in that plan—and I'm on Medicare, as Dr. GINGREY is. Every dollar we spend, the recipient gets \$3 out. We know that's not sustainable. We have as many as 10,000 people a day entering Medicare age, which means that every year we're going to have 3 million people who turn 65 years of age as the baby boomers hit. We have an already underfunded Medicare plan adding in the next 10 years 30 to 36 million people onto a plan that we're taking \$700 billion out of.

How do we control that cost, Mr. Speaker? We pass a part of that bill called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Wow.

What is that? Well, I think that's one of the most egregious parts of this entire health care plan, and it's an interesting little thing.

You have 15 unelected bureaucrats proposed by the President, approved by the Senate, paid \$164,000 or \$165,000 a year to a 6-year term accountable to no one. The courts can't do anything about it. We have to have 60 votes in the Senate to overturn what they do or agree with what they do, and you couldn't get 60 people in the Senate to agree that the sun was coming up in the east tomorrow. So don't worry about them worrying about your health care.

What can they do? Basically what they can do, they start out—and this board is now supposed to be appointed this year, and they have a budget, which we've tried to cut the funding for because, as I said, I think it's the most egregious part of this plan.

□ 2015

What can they do? Well, they can withhold and cut providers. And when you cut providers enough, and that's doctors and hospitals and medical providers, they will refuse to see those patients. I've had it pointed out a thousand times. Oh, it says in the bill, you cannot ration care.

Well, there is a very good article—and I still read my medical journals—in the New England Journal of the Medicine, one of the most prestigious journals in this country, that reviewed the Independent Payment Advisory Board and looked back over the past 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, 21—and this analysis of the Independent Payment Advisory

Board wasn't for it or against it; it was just analyzing the effects of it. And in looking back over the past 25 years, in 21 of those 25 years, cuts would have occurred. We all know, Dr. GINGREY and I know, and we know that our colleagues out there have been prevented from cuts by the action of this body right here and the sustainable growth rate in Medicare.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time just for a second, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is bringing up a subject that is so important that our colleagues understand on both sides of the aisle, this IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board that Dr. ROE is talking about, it's 15 bureaucrats. Well, none of them have been appointed yet. Not one. Nada. And the law says that if the Secretary doesn't appoint, or these 15 are not appointed—and, yes, they are going to make about \$175,000 a year—then she, and it's a "she" right now, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or whomever in the future, they don't have to have that board; one individual bureaucrat can make these cuts, these, really, rationing cuts is what it is.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. It will put the power in one person and take the power away from this body right here, which is why we have a bipartisan bill to overturn this and reclaim the power which the people gave us. We are accountable to the people, and right now when you make those cuts, we would have almost no way to fix it.

I think that is a great point, and I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, Dr. GINGREY pointing that out.

So we have that board, the money grabbed from Medicare.

Number two, 21 new taxes to pay for this bill. One of them is a medical device tax. Let me assure, you as a physician, I have been the recipient, as many of my patients have been, from all of the incredible improvements in laparoscopic surgery. I watched it start from its infancy, learned my first laparoscopic procedure when I was a captain at Fort Eustis, Virginia, in 1974 in the military after having returned from Korea. I learned how to use a laparoscope, and I watched all of this wonderful new equipment occur to where we are doing absolutely marvelous things, minimally invasive to patients, and it has improved patient care dramatically.

There will be taxes on that new innovation. What I'm fearful of, in my State, the single biggest export we have is medical devices, that this will be pushed offshore, and the thing we have been the shining star in the world is medical innovation. There's no question about it, and we do not want to lose that.

So we have 21 new taxes. And there are taxes on health care plans; the mandates are taxes. So we have the taxes.

ObamaCare works because of a three-legged stool, Mr. Speaker. This is how it works:

It works because of Medicaid expansion. That is over half of the new people there, a plan that already is under siege in most States in the Union;

Number two, the individual mandate—that's what I'm getting around to—the mandates that occur because we have to have young, healthy people subsidizing others to make the individual market work; and

Number three, the mandate on business.

And last week in a blog from the Treasury, not in an announcement from the White House, just a blog came out and said, hey, we are not going to have the business mandate for a year. And I applaud the President for that. It is not something that I disagree with. The disagreement is it's the law of the land. I don't see how you can unilaterally decide I'm going to enforce this part of the law because I can't make it work right now, or the individual mandate, and we voted last week, as the Speaker knows and I believe the Speaker supported, both of the bills that Mr. GUTHRIE talked about.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time just for a second, Sunday it was, on the Sunday morning "Meet the Press," and that's what this next poster shows, yesterday, on NBC's "Meet the Press," Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, the Democrat majority leader from Nevada, proclaimed that:

ObamaCare has been wonderful for America.

Well, let's just take a look at some of the headlines from this past week on just how wonderful it has been.

Investors Business Daily says:

ObamaCare mandate delay, employers keep job cuts. For many workers, the 1-year delay in ObamaCare's employer mandate was too little too late.

Reuters says analysis:

ObamaCare struggles to meet make-or-break deadline. With time running out, United States officials are struggling to cope with the task of launching the new online health insurance exchanges at the heart of President Barack Obama's signature health reforms by an October 1 deadline.

Time magazine:

ObamaCare increases cost and complications. The Obama administration's recent announcement that the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate will kick in a year late could ripple beyond the brief extension, increasing costs and complicating implementation of other vital parts of the law.

Think the exchanges as an example.

And then CNN Money says this:

Delay in the ObamaCare employer mandate has simply put off rules businesses had already started to adjust to.

That's the reality here, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Tennessee knows it. I think my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle know it, and that's why, in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that, hey, is it really the employers, the small busi-

ness men and women that were knocking on the White House door saying, We can't meet these reporting requirements, please help us do something; or was it some of my Democratic friends, whether in this Chamber or the other body, saying, 2014 is going to be kind of a tough year for us having to defend this train wreck? I think that's what the Senator from Montana said. Of course, he's going to retire rather than face the music. I can't say that I blame him.

That's what's going on here. People are not dumb. I think they can read between the lines. I hope my colleague can stay awhile longer. I'd like to yield to him at this point.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You always hear, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans have no ideas for health care. Well, we had plenty of ideas; they just weren't heard. We had 80 amendments to this bill. None—and I want the people who hear this, to show you how frustrating this process has been, now that we're looking at this almost incomprehensible bill, is that we had 80 amendments to the Affordable Care Act taken to the Rules Committee. I think I had 10. Not one—not one—amendment was ruled in order. Not one.

Dr. HARRIS was here a moment ago and talked about the price of an individual insurance policy in the State of New York, and then he talked about the price of an insurance policy in Delaware and Illinois. Think about if a person in New York, an employer, a person in a small business, an individual there, hey, I'd like to buy my plan in Illinois. If I could buy it across State lines, I could save myself a lot of money, and I can guarantee you the price in New York State would come down or people would buy those plans somewhere else. That's why empowering the free market system will help and work in health care.

Let me go to the real world, Mr. Speaker. Let me go to Concord, North Carolina, and I held a field hearing there. I want to introduce you to a business owner there, Mr. Horne, who has a textile manufacturing business. He has 350 employees. If you are in the textile business, you're a pretty good businessman if you're in business today, as difficult as that is. He provided 80 percent of all the health care costs for his employees. They covered 20. He covers all preventive services, everything. If you need a colonoscopy, if you need a mammogram, he covers all of that. In addition to that, he has a health nurse at his business to help if you have issues there. So he has a prevention and wellness program. He's done everything right.

So what exactly does he get for this? What he gets for this, when the fiscal cliff bill was passed, because of the way his company was set up, he got an increase in his personal tax rate. He got that. Number two, he got a \$62 per person, not per policy but per person,

which will cost him tens of thousands of dollars. And guess what that money goes to do? It goes to indemnify insurance companies so that they'll be induced to provide this insurance on the exchange and they won't lose money. Mr. Horne gets absolutely nothing.

So what will he have to do? He'll either have to cut his salaries, he'll have to cut the benefits, or he won't hire someone or he won't be able to make needed investments.

Let's go to my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee, where I was mayor before I came here. My political job there was being mayor of our local community. I just talked to our city manager not long ago, and we're going to get a bill in our community of 60,000 for \$177,000, of which we get absolutely nothing because it is on the self-insured market. And anybody who is self-insured, and a lot of major businesses, and I talked to one who's going to get a \$25 million—and I won't mention who it is. It's a major company. Everyone in this room will know who it is. They write a \$25 million check. That could be to hire new employees. It could be for new plant and equipment. It could be to grow their business. It's a globally competitive company that has to compete around the world.

Let me introduce another person here, Sonny's Real Pit Bar-B-Q. That's a famous restaurant in the Charlotte area. We had the field hearing over there, and we sampled Sonny's barbecue the night before we had the field hearing. It was great. What that company is doing is that they found out that 70 percent—since the recession, 70 percent of people changed their eating-out habits by reducing or even eliminating dining out. And increasing menu prices, which is what they'll tell you to do, people quit coming to your restaurant and you go out of business. What they are finding out is they have had to cut, as Dr. GINGREY clearly pointed out, they're looking at cutting their employees' hours to 29 or under so that many full-time employees will now be part-time employees so they'll go under that threshold of 49.

The community college where we held the hearing made a very eloquent statement that they were going to have to not allow adjunct faculty. What most community colleges do, about 65 percent of their faculty are full-time, but the others are people in the community, Mr. Speaker, maybe like Dr. GINGREY, who would teach a health class or a class on whatever issue would be in his specialty.

Well, now, because of what the IRS has said, you can only teach three classes or you hit the 29-hour threshold. How does that happen? Well, for every hour you're in the classroom, they count 2 hours outside the classroom. I think it's called the Cambridge hour. So you can only teach three classes. It will mean in their community college that they won't be able to offer certain classes on time. It'll delay students getting out. The State of Virginia has 7,000 part-time workers, and

they're going to be sure they stay under those 29 hours. And they make it a little more individual.

Someone that I know in my district works for a chain restaurant, Mr. Speaker, divorced woman who works full-time. She relies on tips and relies on her 40 hours a week. She has a health insurance policy. She's going to lose her health insurance policy, and they are going to cut her hours to 29, which means that for every month, she loses an entire week of wages.

□ 2030

So she now has got to go find a second job to pay her bills, Mr. Speaker. And I can go on and on with examples like this that I've heard in testimony.

Just yesterday, we had testimony on the mandate. Certain of the businesses appreciate the year of reprieve. We voted here on the House floor in a bipartisan manner, Mr. Speaker, I might add, to also take individuals. My goodness, here's a person out here that just graduated from college, got their first job, and we're taxing them if they don't buy this insurance. And let me point out how quickly the young people will figure this out.

I did something rather unique, as Dr. GINGREY did. I heard here on the House floor we should pass the bill and then read it and find out what's in it. Well, guess what? I did just the opposite. I read the bill and found out some things. I went back and checked to be sure I was correct on this.

But here's what happens if you don't pay the penalty. Let's say you're a young individual out there and you say, I just can't afford \$400 or \$300 a month out of my paycheck. I've got student loans and other things to pay for. I'm trying to get into my first apartment. The penalty is this: it's \$95 for the first year.

So what can the IRS do to collect that money? They can't garnish your wages. They can't do that. There's no civil or criminal penalty so there's nothing they have to come after you. The only thing they can do is if you have overpaid your taxes or if you have a refundable credit coming in like an earned income tax credit or child tax credit, they can withhold your refund. That's the only recourse they have.

Young people will figure it out. And why will they figure it out and not buy it? Why is this going to collapse? It's going to collapse because these young people are going to pay the \$95, not the \$300 a month or \$200 a month that they're going to pay. They'll pay the one-time penalty, if the IRS can ever figure out how to collect it. That's what they're going to do. And if you don't have all these young, healthy people paying in, it doesn't work.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I've got one last poster that I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues. It's a little complicated. I'll try to make it as simple as I can.

Basically, let's start right here with the employer. Under that, in this dia-

gram, fewer than 50 full-time employees, including full-time equivalents, then no employer penalty for offering a health insurance benefit. But in the most egregious situation, the employer has 50 or more full-time employees, including full-time equivalents, and the employer decides not to offer coverage. If a tax credit is obtained by at least one of those full-time employees in an exchange, then the annual penalty to that employer is \$2,000 for the year—not just for that one, but for every single employee that he or she employs. It could be hundreds; it could be thousands.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Above 30.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. They get a break for 30, yes.

Again, we just have maybe a little bit of time left, and I wanted to point out some things to our colleagues.

I want to call this "ObamaCare Shot and Chaser." Bear with me a little bit because I think this is interesting and cute at the same time.

ObamaCare has been a train wreck since its inception. March 23, 2010, almost 3½ years ago, the Democrats passed it to see what's in it. And now families, taxpayers, and job creators are paying one steep price. Between its skyrocketing cost, unsustainable and wasteful programs, and job-strangling policies, a majority of Americans disapprove of this law—and they disapprove of it today.

On top of that, implementation of ObamaCare has become a full-fledged disaster, as we've pointed out this evening. Some of its biggest supporters agree with us—and not news media publications that are considered particularly conservative.

As for the President, he just can't seem to make up his mind on the employer mandate. He was against it in 2009 before he was for it in 2010. After signing the mandate into law, the administration announced earlier this month it would delay the employer requirement for 1 year. When the House of Representatives acted last week to really make it constitutional—because he didn't have the right to do that—but when we voted to allow him to do that, the same White House issued a veto threat on the bill. The thing that he had done and that we made it legal for him to do, he's going to veto that.

So the shot:

We have heard concerns about the complexity of the employer mandate requirement and the need for more time to implement them effectively. We have listened to your feedback and we are taking action. The administration is announcing that it will provide an additional year before the Affordable Care Act mandatory employer mandate and insurer reporting requirements begin.

The chaser. That was the bill that we passed, H.R. 2667. Employer mandate delay is unnecessary. These are the words of the administration:

Enacting this legislation would undermine key elements of the health law.

That was stated July 17 by the White House veto threat. President Obama's

repeated flip-flops on the individual mandate are well-documented. He pledged support for it in 2007 on the campaign trail to a group of union workers. When his health care plan was released months later, the individual mandate was noticeably absent. He went on to attack his Presidential primary opponents—think HC—for supporting the requirement, only to change his mind once again shortly thereafter.

I could go on and on. I think we've made our point here tonight, and maybe we can yield back a little time. I will yield to my colleague, and he can yield back to me for closing.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we're here to get it right. I've always said this—and I truly believe it—the politics will take care of itself. The people will decide. We don't need term limits. They term-limit us. Let's quit worrying about the politics, and let's do the policy. Let's get the policy right.

A 2,700-page bill crammed down the throats of the American people will never work. It never has worked. It never will work. And that's why we're here tonight, taking pains to explain and make sure that anybody within earshot understands that we're sincere about this. It's not partisan. We need to get rid of this law, and we need to replace it with something that truly will effect those changes that Dr. ROE was talking about in regard to the cost of health care and the accessibility. We didn't even talk about accessibility and about whether or not there will be any doctors there to see these patients.

So I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. People ask me if there are things in the bill I like. Absolutely. You can't write a 2,700-page bill and not put some things in there that are positive. There are positive things in the bill. We should have worked together in a bipartisan way to look at those positive things we agreed to and then things we didn't agree to.

I think the approval rating now for the Affordable Care Act is at 35 percent. Is this objection just Republicans? Are just Republicans out there?

Well, let me read to you just a little bit here. This came up in testimony yesterday in my subcommittee hearing. The letter was from James P. Hoffa, general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Joseph Hansen, international president of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union; and Donald D. Taylor, president of UNITE-HERE, a union representing hotel, airport, food service, gaming and textile workers. This is to then-Speaker PELOSI, now minority leader:

When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Perverse incentives are causing nightmare scenarios. First, the law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' work hours below 30 hours a week.

Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is two-fold: fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

These are the presidents of three major unions.

So it's not just Republicans, Mr. Speaker. It's the public beginning to focus on this now, because this bill is becoming the law of the land January 1. I wish it had worked as smooth as it could. It has not. And it has not because it's not doing what it promised, which was the single most important thing, which is cut the cost of care so more of us out there could afford to have it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank all of the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus who participated tonight. If I tried to add up the number of years of clinical experience in our group of about 21 members on the Republican side of the aisle in this caucus, it would probably be 600-plus years. So we really do know of what we speak. We don't have every answer, but we know of what we speak; and we want to get it right. That's what this is all about.

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

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. Tonight, the Congressional Progressive Caucus would like to talk about voting rights and how important that is to this country and to every single person in our country.

Last week, both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees held hearings on the Voting Rights Act and what steps we need to take forward to protect the right to vote in this country. There's potentially no right that is more important, no issue that is more important to this country that we should consider than our right to vote. It should be our most fundamental right. It's the right that preserves all other liberties that Americans hold dear.

When aspiring Americans take the citizenship test, they're asked, What is the most important right granted to U.S. citizens? And the correct answer: the right to vote. Protecting this right should be the primary concern of our democracy. So you would think that when that question is asked, What are our most important rights, and the answer is, The right to vote, it would be something that's enshrined in our U.S. Constitution and you would think there is explicitly a right to vote. I certainly thought that. But you would be wrong. It's startling to think, at first,

It seems against everything you think you've been taught and against the principles that our country has been built on. But within our Constitution there is no explicit right to vote.

We have to remember that when our Constitution was originally ratified, the right to vote was specifically not guaranteed. In fact, it was an incredibly restrictive law. Only white male property owners above the age of 21 could vote. That was less than 20 percent of the country's population at the time. Many of our Founders specifically did not want to expand the franchise of voting, believing most in society were unqualified for the privilege. In fact, John Adams famously wrote:

It is dangerous to open so fruitful a source of controversy and altercation as would be opened by attempting to alter the qualifications of voters. There will be no end of it.

Mr. Speaker, since that time, our Nation's attitudes towards voting have changed slowly but very progressively. But the fact that we have needed constitutional amendments prohibiting discrimination based on race, gender, and age demonstrates that we possess no guaranteed right to vote in our Constitution.

Meanwhile, these accomplishments have oftentimes been accompanied by a myriad of tactics, laws, and strategies meant to suppress the vote: literacy tests, poll taxes, grandfather clauses, voter intimidation.

□ 2045

These targets of discriminatory efforts have changed as well. Our first literacy tests were adopted to keep Irish-Catholic immigrants from voting. Then we saw a wide array of efforts to stop African Americans from going to the polls.

Now, today, the bills introduced to restrict the right to vote may be a little less obvious and voters lawmakers wish to suppress are a little harder to define, but these efforts are nonetheless discriminatory.

We have seen burdensome registration requirements and reduced early voting opportunities, which are often critical for low-income Americans who cannot take off work on Election Day. African Americans and Latinos, in particular, have utilized early voting days in very high numbers.

College students have been the targets of a number of efforts to decrease their participation, from disallowing student IDs as an acceptable form of voter identification, to stricter residency requirements, to limited polling locations on campuses.

Voter ID and burdensome registration requirements often make it harder for senior citizens also to be able to vote. In Wisconsin, we've had this issue before us. Many senior citizens no longer carry their driver's license because they no longer drive, and yet that's one of the very things that they may need to go vote with a photo ID.

I myself didn't realize the full extent of the attack on our right to vote until

voter ID laws were actually introduced in my home State of Wisconsin. As is often the case with voter ID laws, Republicans justified the photo ID requirement as a way to counter voter fraud in our State.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this crisis of voter fraud is a fraud in and of itself. As the Brennan Center for Justice points out, you are more likely to be killed by lightning than you are to commit voter fraud in your lifetime. To be killed by lightning is more common than voter fraud in this country.

Now, in Wisconsin, we're very proud that we're one of the top three States for voter participation—Maine, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—and we're known for our clean and effective elections. Our chief elections officer found that since the year 2000 in statewide elections the State has seen about 20 instances of voter fraud out of more than 6 million votes cast. Most of those instances of voter fraud involved felons who were ineligible to vote but voted—a problem that doesn't get fixed with a photo ID.

So why did the Wisconsin Legislature believe we needed to combat against voter fraud? What does it mean when you have a cure in search of a disease? Well, in my experience, there's usually an ulterior motive. And in the case of restrictive voting laws, the design is to suppress the vote, to encourage lower voter turnout in the hopes of influencing elections. In other words, it's about elected officials trying to pick their voters rather than the voters picking their elected officials.

Now, in Wisconsin, we're very fortunate because our State constitution specifically guarantees the right to vote. Because of this provision, the suppressive voting laws that have been introduced in our State have largely been blocked by the courts.

But what I did realize is that, while Wisconsin had a strong amendment that protected our right to vote, our U.S. Constitution does not. Unfortunately, without a guaranteed Federal right to vote, we will continue to see the types of disenfranchising efforts that have become a plague on our modern society.

Mr. Speaker, that takes us to today and last month's Supreme Court decision that struck down section 4 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 4 was the act's preclearance formula, the formula that determined which States and counties needed to get Federal approval before they make voting law changes. The Court ruled that the formula was outdated and, thus, unconstitutional.

Now, I think the Court may have forgotten that when we reauthorized the Voting Rights Act, overwhelmingly, just from 2006, we had 390 supporters in the House of Representatives and a unanimous 98-0 vote in the Senate. Clearly, there was strong support in the legislative body for the Voting Rights Act that was now turned aside by the Supreme Court.

Either way, what we know for certain is that before the ink was even dry on the Supreme Court decision, State legislatures began to act. Of the nine States that were fully covered by the Voting Rights Act, six have already started to move on legislation that would restrict the right to vote. Let me just read you a couple quotes from a couple of these States.

Texas—this was really quick. This is the headline: “That was quick: Texas moves forward with voter ID law after Supreme Court ruling.” That’s from the National Journal on June 25:

The Texas law requires voters to show photo identification to vote—a measure that was blocked by the Justice Department, arguing the law would discriminate against racial minorities. At the time, Attorney General Eric Holder called the law a “poll tax.”

And that’s where Texas went as soon as that Supreme Court decision happened.

In Mississippi, the headline: “Mississippi’s Secretary of State Moves to Enforce Voter ID Law.” Their new voter ID law may seem innocuous, but more than one out of 10 of every eligible voters do not have a government-issued ID, clearly making it harder for people to vote in the State of Mississippi.

Finally, just another example is in the State of North Carolina. The headline: “Senate Republicans Unveil Stricter North Carolina Voter ID Bill.” Again, according to the article from the Charlotte Observer, Republican lawmakers are emboldened in their effort to push a photo identification requirement for in-person voting after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a key part of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The ruling means the bill would no longer need Justice Department approval before it becomes law.

So we’re seeing in State after State after State that was protected by the Voting Rights Act that States now are trying to change those laws and make it harder for people to have that ability to go out and vote.

Now, I happen to agree with the Court that the formula was outdated. As I previously detailed, it doesn’t reflect the current attempts to restrict the right to vote. In fact, it underestimates them.

Let’s look at it this way: under the Voting Rights Act, nine entire States and certain counties in six others were covered, but just this year already, more than 80 restrictive voting laws in 31 States have been introduced.

Given my experience in Wisconsin and what I’m seeing in States across the country, I knew that we had to take action at the national level. So I got together with Congressman KERTH ELLISON from Minnesota and we worked with FairVote to work on a right to vote amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would guarantee an affirmative right to vote for every single American.

Our amendment is as simple as it is necessary. It says that every American

citizen possesses the fundamental right to vote in any public election where they reside, and Congress has the power to protect this right.

This amendment would create an important change from current policy. No more would Americans have to prove that their right to vote has been infringed. If you live in a State right now, you have to prove that that State, in changing voting laws, has somehow infringed your ability to vote in order to have success. Instead, under our constitutional amendment, the burden of proof would go to the States, and the States would have to demonstrate that any new law they put in place would not burden any of their citizens’ ability to have a right to vote.

Now, our vote is the great equalizer in this country. My brother and I have one thing in common with the Koch brothers: we each come with one single vote. The average person in the world, you may not have billions of dollars like Sheldon Adelson, but the one thing that you have in common with Sheldon Adelson is that you each have one single vote.

Now, I understand that ratifying the Constitution is not an easy task, but on this measure, it’s a deeply important one. We can, and we must, build a grassroots movement needed to ensure our most fundamental right is not subject to the partisan whims of State legislatures.

I am holding in my hand pages and pages of people across the country who support a national right to vote constitutional amendment. Over 28,000 people have signed petitions. They’re circulated by U.S. Action and PCCC, Bold Progressives that have got signatures saying we need to make our Constitution work for every single American, that every single person has that right to vote. This has 28,000 names right here of people who support this most fundamental right.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the right to vote is not a Republican right or a Democratic right, it’s an American right. And if the recent Voting Rights Act decision demonstrates anything, it’s that we need to do everything we can to help protect that right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reinforce that the Congressional Progressive Caucus is going to do everything that we can to make sure that every American has the right to vote, and that a right to vote amendment to the U.S. Constitution is the most sure, most effective way to get that done.

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

CHALLENGES FACING INDEPENDENT AND COMMUNITY PHARMACISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, it’s good to be here at the end of a day in

which there’s been a lot of excitement here on the floor, a lot of voting going on, a lot of debate, which is what we’re up here for.

One of the things that I have committed to, as we talked about a little bit last week, is pointing out some things that may fall a little bit under the radar but actually matter a great deal to the people of not only the Ninth District, but to the people of the United States.

Up here, we can get, many times, lost in what I’ll call the big picture items or the latest of what’s hot, so to speak, and tonight I want to talk about our local pharmacists.

I have a little pharmacist I go to. We have several, but one of the main ones I go to is Woody’s Pharmacy, Kevin Woody. And I go in there and I know that when I ask him about the drugs for myself, for my wife, my kids, he gives me answers. He helps me know why they interact, what goes on. We’ve got pharmacists in all kinds of settings that do that every day for folks. But our local pharmacies, and especially our community pharmacies, right now are under attack.

I’m going to be joined, hopefully, here in a little bit by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to talk about the challenges facing independent community pharmacies. You see, local pharmacists play a vital role in America’s neighborhoods and communities, particularly in the more rural areas of northeast Georgia. They provide unparalleled guidance, assistance, and resources for families, including my own. I’m committed to protecting access to independent and community pharmacists and helping to level the playing field through effective and robust oversight of pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs.

It’s a tough enough task to survive in this economy, and the overregulation by the administration is only making it more difficult. I am committed to working with my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to promote legislation that will provide consumers with greater choice of pharmacies, require fair standards for PBM pharmacies, support access to diabetes testing supplies, protect traditional pharmacy compounding, and ensure that our military families can enjoy the many benefits that community pharmacies provide.

In many cases, independent and community pharmacists have dedicated their careers to providing quality patient care. However, they’ve been continuously cut by unfair reimbursements, overbearing audits, and a take-it-or-leave-it approach to contracts. Over the next 30 minutes, I look forward to discussing the challenges facing independent and community pharmacists and the important role they play in the lives of many of our constituents.

Although we cannot sufficiently cover these issues in the next half hour, I hope this will be the first of

many conversations on this floor about this important topic. And this is what I mean about ideas and topics that may not make the headlines, they may not bring the stories on the opening of the evening news, but they affect us daily in our lives and they're often overlooked.

When we deal many times on this floor, and I have spoken of it before, is how do we deal with and what is the cost of regulation and how they are affecting our everyday lives, this is one of the areas, especially with our community pharmacists, that they're affecting right now. It's affecting how they do business.

As one community pharmacist told me recently, that if something doesn't change soon, that in my area of northeast Georgia, which has a vibrant community pharmacy along with PBM pharmacists and others, that within 10 years there may not be a community pharmacist left in northeast Georgia. That's a scary thought, Mr. Speaker.

When you think about that for a second, when you look at an industry that many of us grow up and you have stories going back to when many pharmacists had soda stands; they had just a full-service place where you could go. Even my pharmacist today still has the scoops of ice cream. One of the ways my kids want to come with me to the store is they say, I'll go with you if you're going to Woody's because I want a scoop of ice cream.

So it's a family place. It's something that I think brings back a sense of Americana, but it also hits at the very idea of what we'll just take as just good old-fashioned entrepreneurship—businesses that mean something to our community but also provide a service that is invaluable. Right now I think those are under attack, and those are the things that just concern me.

When we look at that possibility, as the pharmacist told me, he said that there possibly may not even be community pharmacists in our area within the next 10 years, that really struck my attention; and it's made me, before I was even elected, begin to look at what are the problems and how can we address those as we go along.

□ 2100

I can give examples. And I bet almost every Member here on both sides of the aisle can come in and talk about their pharmacist, wherever they may work, but a community pharmacist who they can call on and ask about. My parents—I have watched them grow up and they get older, and when we have questions about their medicines I know that I can call my pharmacist and ask him questions. I know that many of you—and maybe even you, Mr. Speaker—have that person that you can talk to about the drugs and the issues that just keep us healthy.

One of the things that they also help us do, and community pharmacists do, is provide that preventive care that keeps us from getting into these long-

term illnesses which drive up the health care costs, which is talked about so much on this House floor. And really from my perspective the tragedy of ObamaCare is: let's get back to the very roots of medicine. And as the doctors were speaking earlier tonight on the floor, talking about how we can do preventive medicine and make sure that the health of our constituents is taken care of, community pharmacists do just that.

One of the first challenges facing our local pharmacists I want to discuss here tonight relates to diabetic testing supplies and the competitive bidding process. Earlier this year, I wrote the Comptroller General Gene Dodaro expressing concern about the impact that the Medicare Competitive Bidding Process will have on patient access to diabetic testing supplies.

Seniors in northeast Georgia, and across the State, rely on their ability to get the testing supplies from their local pharmacists. Many have written to me expressing their concerns that applying competitively bid pricing to independent community pharmacies could negatively impact their access to these essential supplies.

In more rural communities, such as northeast Georgia, an independent community pharmacy may be the only available option for seniors. Their local pharmacist helps them properly use their test strips and meters and provide much needed resource and guidance in managing their disease.

A 72 percent reduction in reimbursement for retail pharmacies that are currently supplying these items to Medicare beneficiaries was announced on January 30, 2013. This reduction in reimbursement took effect on July 1 of this year.

Here are some of the feedback that Georgians have given about the impact that this reimbursement reduction is having on their quality of life and access to care. We've heard things like: "I've had difficulty finding a new provider; my product of choice was unavailable; I've been forced to change providers; the quality of my care and services is poor; my cost has increased; I've experienced poor communication from CMS; I'm confused about the changes."

Independent community pharmacists typically sell diabetic testing supplies to provide a service to patients, not to make money. Even before the reduction in reimbursement rates, the profit margins on these supplies were very low.

Now, pharmacists have to choose between keeping their business open or giving their patients the supplies and care they need. This isn't a choice they should be forced to make. In an area and a time in which our economy and jobs are suffering, this is another example of a business that is fighting against the world, so to speak, to stay in business and to employ those 3 or 4 or 5 or up to 10 or 15 people that take care of the people in our communities, Mr. Speaker.

This is something we need to take care of. This is something when you hear the feedback from folks who are calling our office and writing our office and calling their pharmacist and saying: "I'm having difficulty finding a new provider; I can't make sense of this; I'm forced to change my provider; and the quality and service are poor." We need to take a look at what's going on.

Another pressing issue from my local pharmacists is the lack of oversight and transparency when it comes to the pharmacy benefit managers. PBMs are actually one of the least regulated segments of the health care market, yet they are the cause of numerous frivolous audits that local pharmacies are subjected to.

Now, supporting strong PBM transparency requirements is key to delivering real savings to patients. Unlike my local pharmacist, and those across the Nation, PBMs do not have a real relationship with patients. In fact, it is not uncommon for them to secretly retain most manufacturer payments—e.g. rebates, discounts and other fees—instead of passing the savings on to patients.

Additionally, PBMs have been known to switch plan members from low- to high-cost drugs and manipulate generic pricing. At the end of the day, the data points to the fact the PBM market is broken. I can speak to this from my own personal experience. As I've shared before, I believe when we talk about problems, we need to relate it to what people can understand. For this, I can understand it through my family, but also through my parents, who have talked about how their drugs have been changed, or they've been given short notice of changes, or when they get them from their doctor, who gives them the prescription to take them to their pharmacy, they have a problem because they're not going to be certified because there's been a change just in the last little bit in what drug the coverage will make, and the PBMs have had a large part in that.

What I believe is, their conduct is anticompetitive and anticonsumer, and independent community pharmacists are often left vulnerable to their market power.

But there are solutions to this problem. For example, allowing the smaller to collectively negotiate will help level the playing field.

The threat of antitrust liability in the status quo prevents these collective negotiations, and I believe an antitrust exemption is appropriate and consistent with past exemptions enacted by this Congress.

It is with that that I am proud to be an original cosponsor of what is known as the "Protecting our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013," which I believe achieves this goal.

The author of this bill, Mr. MARINO, and I have had several conversations discussing his examples and what brought him into an understanding of

what is going on with our community pharmacists and the problems that have developed here. And I want to applaud, and I want to take out and highlight Members who have brought forward pieces of legislation that I believe matter to our constituents and they matter to the American people.

This is a conservative piece of legislation that brings forward and highlights a problem with our community pharmacists, who are reliable businessmen in their communities. And by doing so and taking that part, Mr. MARINO has helped bring forth a piece of legislation that I am glad to support and look forward to moving forward, hopefully through the committee process and onto this floor and eventually signed into law.

Now, understand, there's a lot of discussion that needs to be had here. PBM takes their fair share of blame, and there are a lot of problems in this situation. It is something that we need to discuss because it matters to the people back home, it matters to the very essence of health and health care, which we come down to this well and we talk about all the time. We talk about costs, we talk about the problems with access. This is an area where I believe we can continue to move forward.

There's also another pressing matter facing independent community pharmacists, particularly in northeast Georgia, and that is abusive audit tactics. I believe, like many Americans, that pharmacy audits should be focused on uncovering actual fraud and abuse. Audits play an important role in ensuring high-quality patient care and services.

Unfortunately, PBMs are leveraging their power to abuse the auditing process. They're singling out expensive drugs and using typographical and other trivial errors to recoup from pharmacies significant amounts of money—not to return to Medicare, but to line their own pockets.

Now, this is where I'm going to use an example that I had a few months ago. I had a number of pharmacists, my local pharmacists all over northeast Georgia, came in and they met with me. All I did was, I sent out a note because I had been hearing about this from my local pharmacist and from others, and I said, come talk to me about what you're experiencing.

Like a lot of times—and Mr. Speaker, maybe you've done a similar thing with businesses—you expect maybe three or four people to show up. In my conference room I had a full house. Pharmacists who left and drove, some as many as 2 hours, to come to that office to sit down and talk about the problems that they were facing. What that told me in the middle of the day was that the issues and the problems that they have were more important to them than spending time at their shop that morning, and were finding somebody to cover their shop so they could come talk about this because it's af-

fecting the very quality of their existence.

Now, as we look at this, they began to give me examples. For example, let's say your local pharmacist fills a \$500 prescription for you that you called in over the phone or you had called in from the doctor's office. The pharmacist dispensed the correct drug in the correct amount and provided you the correct directions for taking the drug. Mr. Speaker, do we have a problem at this point? I don't think so. You're getting the right drug in the right amount in the right container with the right label. Everything is there on what your doctor had wanted you to have.

But if the pharmacist makes a mistake in his personal records in his checking off—instead of checking the “called in over the phone” box he checks “the faxed in” box—a PBM could then during their audit of the pharmacy find the mistake and take back the entire \$500. Not just the copay, and not just the profit the pharmacy received; they take back the entire cost of the drug.

Now, I've said before, there are a lot of things that make me scratch my head. This is one of them. It's one thing to come in and be audited, it's one thing to find a mistake in which there's a clerical error—and there needs to be some correction to that clerical error. But let me go back, Mr. Speaker, and remind you that it was dispensed properly in the correct amount with the correct drug and the correct facility with the correct directions on there. But, however, on the paperwork on how the call came in, how they took the prescription down, they were audited and deemed for that, and they were not just deemed for the amount of their copay or their profit even; they were deemed for the entire amount of the drug.

What's really interesting about this is I've also had several of my pharmacists say it is eerily interesting to them that when they're audited, it's not the generics that are audited, it is the brand names that seem to be audited, the higher cost drugs that find their way onto the audit list. I think that's really interesting because what happens is if one mistake comes, you're talking about a major cost for these pharmacists. This is not something they can continue to eat.

Now, it can be said they can appeal it, and they can go through the process, but it is something over and over. They don't get to appeal it and hold the money. They have to send the money in and then appeal. Now, does that sound fair? I don't think so.

I think what we've got to do here is begin to look at this problem in its entirety. The PBM could pocket the entire cost of a correctly dispensed drug, even what the pharmacy paid wholesale. This leaves me baffled. Obviously, an auditing measure should be in place, but for transparency and accountability, not to financially penalize one's competitors.

Oh, by the way, some of the PBMs are actually involved in the competitors to the local pharmacies in which they audit. Just a small reminder.

I can stand here all evening and tell you story after story of the unfair and almost unbelievable auditing practices that my local independent folks have had to deal with.

One local pharmacist told me about how they had already been audited three times that year, and they were preparing for their fourth. Mr. Speaker, do you know when he told me that? March. He had been audited three times, getting ready for a fourth, and it was January, February, March. This seems to be a problem.

Interestingly enough, the audits don't focus, as I've already said, on generic drugs. The audits typically look at administrative errors on high-priced drugs.

This comes as no surprise. We know that the PBMs are looking to take money, line their pockets, and not care for patients. They don't sponsor baseball teams, they don't participate in chili cook-offs, and they sure aren't going to any tomato festivals. Patient care takes a back seat to profit margins.

I believe that Congress should take a closer look at PBMs because, in the status quo, after a pharmacy has been audited, recoupment funds go back to the PBM. This is unacceptable. In other words, you're auditing, and the fines that you get, the penalties that you get, go to you. Again, there seems to be an incentive problem here. You're dealing with the high-cost drugs, you're missing the generics, you're looking for clerical errors on correctly dispensed drugs. The patient never had a problem, but yet the pharmacist was deemed.

I'm committed to working with my colleagues to make sure that Medicare is getting its fair share of funds back. There is one word we hear a great deal on this floor. No matter the debate topic it is bound to come up at least once. And that word is “transparency.”

But there are few areas in which this concept is more important. You see, transparency saves money and helps markets work better. It helps it work as it was intended to work.

Transparency allows plans and payers, including large corporations and governments, to confirm that a PBM is, in fact, providing the service it was hired to do: to secure low drug costs.

Now, remember, in this world of regulation—and for those who know me in my short time up here in Washington, this is one of the issues that I have focused like a laser on, regulation. In fact, tomorrow morning, I encourage Members if they are not busy and they want to come to a regulatory reform caucus breakfast, come see us. We'll have breakfast there for them, and we're going to discuss the effects of regulatory reform and why this matters.

Many times, we in the elected office, we talk about regulatory reform and

why it matters, and it's going to make sense. I believe tonight we've shown how it affects local community pharmacists, and that's something that needs to be looked at.

□ 2115

But again, what were the PBMs supposed to do? They were supposed to secure low drug costs. They were supposed to secure a better way for our Medicare savings. This is not what is happening.

Unfortunately, under today's policy, the plan's sponsor has no way to verify that their PBM is sharing manufacturer rebates or that the PBM is negotiating the lowest possible cost for specific drugs. In fact, recent data indicate the exact opposite is occurring. For example, TRICARE anticipates a savings of \$1.67 billion by negotiating its own drug prices and rebates for its 9 million beneficiaries rather than going through a PBM. Let me state that one more time, Mr. Speaker. TRICARE anticipates saving \$1.67 billion by negotiating its own drug prices and rebates for its 9 million beneficiaries rather than going through a PBM.

I happened to be on this floor for the last couple days and in that chair, listening to discussions on our DOD appropriations and on the struggles that we're having with our funding for our vital services in our defenses. Don't you think that this is something that we can afford, not only in defense, but in other areas as well? I believe it is. The State of Texas estimates it could save \$265 million by switching to a transparent PBM contract. This is no chump change we're talking about here tonight.

Although my time draws to a close, I am pleased that the conversations are just beginning. The challenges facing independent community pharmacies are great, but the important role they play in our towns and States is even greater. It is coming to a time and a place like this in which we can look forward to solutions that matter. I did not come to Washington, D.C., simply to watch things happen and to wonder why. I came to be part of a solution. Like you, Mr. Speaker, we are part of a freshman class that came here believing, as I've said before, that this is a place to which people still look to make this country continually the greatest country on Earth, and people look to us for solutions and answers. The way they do that is by looking at commonsense legislation. They look at commonsense solutions that affect them every day.

For many, many people in this country—and especially in my home of northeast Georgia—local pharmacies are a place that sponsor those football teams and baseball teams. They are the places where senior citizens go as I have watched many times in the pharmacies that I go to whether it be my own pharmacy or not.

Just the other day, I went in and saw a sweet little senior citizen lady I'd

pastored for 11 years. In my first church, I actually had 45 senior adults. They were all that was there. I was 28 years old, and all of a sudden, I gained all of these grandparents. So, for me, it was something I learned a great deal from. When I watched this sweet old lady come up to the counter, she asked Kevin about some issues that she was having with her drugs. She was trying to figure out what was going on, and Kevin took the time to talk with her and to explain, No, this is not what's really happening. This is what you need to do, and this is the medicine you need to take. He took the time to care.

Pharmacists all across this country—and I want to make this very clear; this has nothing to do with pharmacists individually. Pharmacists, whether they work in large shops or small shops, in community stores or large box stores, are wonderfully dedicated professionals who do a wonderful job. They work hard in helping their customers, and they work hard at helping those who have come in between.

When we deal with this kind of environment, we make sure that our local pharmacies are the ones that can have a chance to continue to grow and to prosper in their communities. When we have our community pharmacies operating as they should, then we are going to be able to continue the process of making sure that our communities have the pharmacies that they can depend on and also a transparency that comes with dealing with these PBMs and with the auditing practices which have been really tearing apart our pharmacies and community pharmacies as a whole.

I go back to that one statement that my local pharmacist said to me. He was sitting there, and he was looking across, and he was explaining what I've talked about here tonight about the auditing practices. He said that, if this doesn't change, our pharmacists will be out of business, that there won't be any pharmacies left in the community world. For northeast Georgia, that would be a tragedy.

I am pleased tonight to also see my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), who has been a real leader in this area, and I am a proud cosponsor of his legislation, the Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013. I would love to yield to him now to share further on what we've experienced during this time.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, today, independent pharmacists are facing an increasing number of challenges that threaten their very livelihoods. These are the independent mom-and-pop pharmacies that all Americans have come to know and to love. They are the neighborhood staples that you have come to rely on. They are where you can go for basic medical advice, and they are where new parents can have their children's prescriptions filled. On average, independent pharmacies fill over 200 pre-

scriptions every day, provide immunization, durable medical equipment, diabetes training, and other vital services. Unfortunately, these independent pharmacies are more vulnerable than ever and are having to lay off workers at an alarming rate.

As more independent pharmacies are forced to close their doors, I am increasingly concerned about the impact that this will have on American families, especially on those in rural areas like my district in northeast Pennsylvania. Not only does their closure jeopardize the local drug supply, but it also has dangerous consequences for the surrounding areas' medical providers—that's right—dangerous consequences for the surrounding areas' medical providers.

One of the biggest dangers to local independent pharmacies is the pharmacy benefit managers industry, or PBMs. Over the past few years, the PBMs' power has become concentrated in the hands of a few, enabling them to dominate over their competition. Independent pharmacies are at a competitive disadvantage, which prevents them from providing their customers with vital prescriptions at a reasonable cost.

I have heard from a number of pharmacists that PBMs have an incredible market power over independent pharmacists. Even worse, the political power of only a handful of companies has enabled them to grow and to swallow their competition, which is only expected to intensify if ObamaCare is fully implemented.

This is why I, along with my colleague to my right and JUDY CHU of California, introduced H.R. 1188, the Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013. This bipartisan, commonsense legislation provides a limited exemption for independent community pharmacists from antitrust laws. My bill would level the playing field by enabling the mom-and-pop pharmacies to work together in order to negotiate better contract terms from the large drug companies and pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs. The unchecked practice of PBMs has gone on for too long, and it's time we passed H.R. 1188 in order to stop these harmful practices.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate that.

As our time draws to a close tonight, I am pleased that we can begin these conversations. That's what I want to have with the American people and with our body here, bringing out and highlighting legislation and the work that I believe is being done here, because I believe there are great things that can happen when we pull together and when we find the things that matter to Main Street. When we do that—Congressman MARINO and others as we pull forward like this—we are actually bringing ideas to the forefront that help and build our economy, that talk about those jobs, that keep those jobs in the community, and provide a great public service.

When we are looking at a health care situation and an aging population, our community pharmacists need to be a vital player in that market, making sure that our health and our well-being are taken care of in a kind and caring and compassionate way. The challenges facing independent community pharmacists are great, but the important role they play in our towns and States is even greater still.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership, and I want to thank him for joining me here tonight and for being a part of discussing real solutions and real answers of why a conservative agenda is important to America, because it matters to Main Street, because it matters to real people in everyday life situations.

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

THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and thank you to the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and to the rules of this body that allow for Members to come down to this well in the most important place where free speech is allowed, and I am extremely grateful for that opportunity to be here tonight.

One subject that I would like to focus on this evening is the issue that is being taken up here in Washington, D.C. It has gotten some attention in recent weeks—certainly with a bill that came through the United States Senate—and that was a bill that granted amnesty to illegal aliens. That bill passed through the United States Senate. Unfortunately, that bill does nothing about the main problem that we deal with in immigration, and that's border security.

Twenty-seven years ago, Ronald Reagan made a deal with the American people, Mr. Speaker. He said this, that we're going to have a onetime deal. We're going to deal with immigration right now.

It kind of sounds like very familiar rhetoric that we're getting today—we're going to deal with this issue once and for all. We're going to take this issue off the table. Then President Reagan said, We're going to secure the borders. We're going to make that happen, but we're also going to grant amnesty to the illegal aliens who are here in the United States. He estimated about 1 million illegal aliens would be here in the United States.

Once the bill was passed, the American people found out it wasn't 1 million illegal aliens. It was 3.6 million illegal aliens who were granted amnesty status. Once that amnesty status was granted, the United States had a policy of dealing with chain migration, and pretty soon that turned into 15 million

foreigners or illegal aliens who were allowed to come into the United States as immigrants.

Now, we're all immigrants. I'm an immigrant. Mr. Speaker, I imagine you're an immigrant. All of us are descended from immigrants. This is a good thing. We're not here bashing immigrants. If we didn't have immigrants, we wouldn't have a country. We love immigrants. What we love also is the rule of law. We believe in the rule of law.

That's what this Chamber is. In fact, this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is surrounded. There are medallions above every door in this Chamber, and those medallions have the faces of lawmakers over the time of recorded human history. Each one of these is a silhouette, and they contributed to the rule of law by adding to the certainty for mankind—for good rules and a good society that we can live under. In this Chamber, many of the American people may not know that our motto, "In God We Trust," is written above the stand, Mr. Speaker, where you're standing today just above the American flag. Just opposite from "In God We Trust" is a lawmaker unique among all of the lawmakers in this Chamber. That lawmaker is Moses. Moses faces the Speaker, and you'll note, Mr. Speaker, that Moses is the only lawmaker who has a full face.

Why would that be? Why would Moses be given a status different than all of the other lawmakers in this Chamber?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's for this reason. I believe it is because of the great English jurist Blackstone, who is the mentor to the Founders of this Nation. Blackstone wrote that English common law and all of law in England is based upon the foundation bedrock of the Ten Commandments as given through Moses, and Moses is the full face—the most important lawgiver—because all of the law you see, all of the subsequent lawmakers down throughout the recorded annals of human history rest on the foundation of law and the rule of law as given by Moses and as given by God—according to the holy Torah and to the Bible—to Moses, and all of law descends from there.

Why that history lesson? Why that lesson on talking about law and a lawgiver while we're in the middle of talking about immigration?

It's because, right now, Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill and also the proposed House bill, the so-called DREAM Act, are premised upon the condition that people who came into the United States by breaking the law would receive an unparalleled benefit, much more so than the benefit of those who come into America legally. How many people come into America legally every year? It's shocking. People think we're not allowing people in. A million people a year, Mr. Speaker, are allowed into the United States legally. They go through the process, and they become

American citizens, and we applaud. I have been to naturalization ceremonies, proudly welcoming individuals in.

□ 2130

Today I was in a cab just before I came over here. A man from Pakistan was thrilled to be an American citizen. I shook his hand. I said, I'm so grateful that you're here, and I'm grateful that you came into our Nation legally. I'm grateful. Welcome. We're happy you're here.

I married a family of immigrants. My in-laws came here through the legal process. Why is this important? It's important because we as a Nation of laws must observe those laws. Now we're looking at changing that status by rewarding people who broke laws and putting them at the head of the line in front of people who stood by the law and did everything they could to follow the law to become legal citizens.

If you look at every nation in the world and their immigration policy, and if you look at the numbers of people of every single nation of the world—remember, Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the most populated country—there are more people in China than there are in the United States, and yet the United States is such a generous group of people, we allow more legal immigration in one year than the rest of the world. Every country of the world combined, we allow more legal immigrants, a million people a year.

Yet we still have 4 million people on a waiting list doing everything right, trying to come into the country legally. So why, I ask, Mr. Speaker, would we put to the front of the line lawbreakers, people who decided we're not going to pay attention to the law to the lawgivers of history, to Moses who gave the original Ten Commandments? We're going to break this law in this body where law is made; we're going to break this law. And for some reason this body would choose to benefit those who broke our laws? I say no, because the real problem with immigration, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to keep it legal and make it legal. That's why our very first consideration and only consideration should be complete border security first.

Border security for America first. Why? Because amnesty for illegal aliens is incredibly expensive. The estimate, Mr. Speaker, is \$6 trillion of additional debt for our children, \$6 trillion in redistribution of wealth with amnesty for illegal aliens. Nearly half of that number, Mr. Speaker, shockingly would be for retirement benefits for illegal aliens. So while you and I and millions of Americans have been working and paying in over the decades to Social Security and to Medicare, while we've been paying in and while people who are baby boomers like myself are just about at that time to draw down on our Social Security and our Medicare benefits, now we

would open the door wide, we would benefit and grant citizenship, a legal protected status, and immediate access to Social Security and Medicare, ObamaCare, Medicaid, 80 different means-tested welfare programs. Why would we do this? Is it because we have an abundance of money that's overflowing from our Treasury and we have absolute no idea what to do with it? I don't think so. Just in my brief time in Congress, we have doubled the national debt. That's one bill, essentially full-on amnesty, perpetual amnesty, with no means of deportation ever, with no border security ever. That's the fake bill that is coming out of the Senate.

What is the House of Representatives looking to take up? It is a different bill. It's called the DREAMers bill, and we're all told that what we need to do is get behind this effort to reward instant legalization status to children of illegal aliens. I want to put this on the floor for the American people. The children of illegal aliens very well may make up the largest subset of illegal aliens in the United States, but we need to recognize this is fake, back-door amnesty.

This isn't feeling sorry for kids or trying to deal with people through no fault of their own who are here in the United States illegally. This is what we're talking about. We're talking about millions of individuals who would be given instantaneous legal status. But it isn't just the children, Mr. Speaker. Because they would be given amnesty, they would immediately have the right to apply, and it would be granted, for their parents to have legal permanent status.

We aren't just talking about millions of kids, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about all their parents, too. So take all of the kids, and then double the number for their biological parents. Then, if there is a waiting period—let's say 5 years until they get their full legal status—then the parents can apply for legal status for their parents. And it goes from there. Very likely what we will see is a family reunification, chain migration, and rather than tens of millions of illegal aliens, some have estimated as much as over 100 million additional illegal aliens would be given amnesty in addition to the generosity of every year.

Why is this important? Again, because we hate immigrants? Absolutely, 1,000 percent no. That's not true. Number one, the rule of law. We need to observe the law. Number two, dealing with our debt and with the cost. It costs a fortune to have illegal immigration. Here's the third reason: it's because we will never solve this problem. You see, all we will have done, Mr. Speaker, is made sure that we will increase this problem, and we will have it with us forever because we will have ongoing perpetual amnesty.

I would like to ask to join me right now, my fellow colleague, Representative STEVE KING from Iowa, who has been essentially the leading voice on

this issue in Congress, talking about making sure that we, the American people, recognize what we're going into.

You see, we had the ObamaCare bill. The former Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, said we had to read the bill to know what was in it. It's a travesty. It's bankrupting America. Also, with the so-called DREAM Act, which, let's face it, it is three-quarters of the cost of the terrible fake border security bill in the Senate. So you've got this terrible full-on amnesty bill in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, the DREAMers bill takes you three-quarters of the way to the full-on amnesty bill. So when you take these two bills and you put them in conference committee, you can have either 100 percent amnesty or you can have 75 percent amnesty. When you split the difference on that, where are you? You've got amnesty. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's a fake, no-border security, but it's a total authentic, nearly 100 percent amnesty bill.

I'd like to ask Representative STEVE KING to speak to that now as I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding, and I appreciate the delivery you make and understanding in driving this issue. If a few of us don't stand up and drive this issue and remind, Mr. Speaker, that the American people observe what we do here—and they are thoughtful, they're intelligent, they're analytical, and they understand the history of this country, and they don't want to have somebody feed them a line. They want to know the squared-away truth. That's why I dig down into a bill like S. 744, the Gang of Eight's bill in the Senate, and take it apart and analyze it and put it back together and come down with this conclusion.

From the beginning, I called it the Always is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act. The reason I say that is because you'd have to just kind of have a little bit of license with our grammar. But if you is in America, you get to stay. If you was in America, you get an invitation to come back. And if you ever get here, you always will get to stay here. So it's the Always Is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act.

If that doesn't trip your biblical trigger, then I can describe it this way in more secular terms. It is the Perpetual and Retroactive Amnesty Act, which means it was on forever and it also invites the people who have been deported in the past. It says, We really didn't mean it. If we deported you in the past, it was by a mistake that we didn't realize because our President hadn't been elected yet, and he hadn't decided that he was going to violate his constitutional oath and grant this executive edict that's called the "Morton Memos" that legalizes the people that are here.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that we had 400,000 people that were adjudicated for removal in this country,

and the President issued an order and used our precious resources to go back and comb through the records again, and that directive said, Look at them on an individual basis. The reason they do that is because they claim they have prosecutorial discretion. If they deal with individuals, then they cannot enforce the law. But if they have to put it into classes of people, then they know that they don't have prosecutorial discretion from a legal point.

So they use resources to comb through those 400,000 names of people to find ways they can waive the application of the law. That's amnesty by executive edict, and it's using resources to grant that. It didn't matter that they were young or old. If they hadn't committed a felony and been caught at it, or if they didn't commit and been caught at these three mysterious misdemeanors, they were going to get the application of the law, which was removal. They were just waiting for their final removal order, and so the President believed that he had the constitutional authority to grant this amnesty.

Now, this was just the precursor to the balance of the Morton Memos, which are the DREAM Act lite, so to speak, this executive edict for the DREAM Act. And it then sets up four categories of people, generally young people, but now we see, according to the Gang of Eight's bill, age up to 35. If up to age 35, if you want to test that you came to America, say, before your 16th birthday or your 18th birthday, depending on which policy you want to take—now, it really wasn't your fault; it was your parents' decision.

Well, it reminds me of a long shirt-tail relation who found himself in jail on Christmas Eve, and his father decided he would bail him out and bring him home for Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, Christmas dinner, and take him back to the jail where he belonged again. When his father showed up, let me say this uncooperative son was so resentful that he said to his father, It's not my fault, Dad, it's your fault because you controlled everything. You controlled my genes and you controlled my environment. I didn't control either one. I'm a product of nature and nurture, and you are the one who produced the nature and nurture; therefore it's your fault that I'm in jail. I can tell you what his father said: You can stay in jail if you think it's not your responsibility and think it over.

Well, I heard this new theory come in the committee here just yesterday, I guess it was, that young people can't form intent. I wondered about that. That was a bit of a new theory for me. We do prosecute intent in this country and we prosecute intent of juveniles.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, Representative KING had stated that in the committee they were told that young people could not form intent. And my question would be, under the proposed DREAM Act that we have looked at so far,

we're looking at that from age zero to 35. These people would be given automatic amnesty from being an illegal alien. Then, of course, we know their parents would immediately be able to come in as legal permanent residents, as well. So my question would be: Do we consider that you are not legally capable of forming an intent when you're age 35?

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, as that is my point.

We know that young people can form intent. That's why we discipline them at a young age; 2-year-olds get a little discipline because they have intent; 3-year-olds have a little more intent, and they get a little more discipline. By the time they get to be 7 or 8, they are actually disciplined. So I think that's an argument that moves us off the target. Regardless of whether they have intent when they're 1 day old, 1 week old, 1 month old, 1 year old, or 10 years old, whenever that time comes, when they become of age and they realize that they're unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they remove themselves. It's just the law. So we expect them to accept this responsibility, whether it was the intent that they had when they came in or the intent that they have to stay tomorrow. If we don't do that, then we've absolved a whole class of people from a responsibility and rewarded them with the objective of their crime.

These are the things that trouble me. If we destroy the rule of law, an essential pillar of American exceptionalism—we could not be a great Nation without the rule of law. If we destroy that even in the narrower version of immigration or the even narrower version of the DREAM kids, if we do that, then it expands into all people that are here illegally because age is the only difference, and you cannot draw a bright line.

Furthermore, then you have expanded the amnesty throughout all immigration, and you've destroyed the rule of law. And if we can't restore it in this time, since we've been struggling to do so since the 1986 Amnesty Act, we could not restore the rule of law with regard to immigration for all time. And we could therefore, then, not control immigration in this country any longer, only by trying to keep people out by barriers at the borders. But we then couldn't enforce the law against anybody that got in.

□ 2145

Can you imagine, turning over the immigration law in the United States to everybody but those who are in America? If you're not in America, you get to decide immigration law; and if you're in America, you don't get to decide immigration law. That's what we're dealing with.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much. One thing that I wanted to mention as well, in speaking with one of

the experts, Mr. Speaker, Robert Reitor from the Heritage Foundation, we asked him: What is the average age of the average illegal immigrant into the United States? He said it is age 34. Isn't it a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation being proposed is to grant amnesty to anyone 35 or below. And again, they would instantaneously be able to apply for legal permanent residence for their parents, and it would be granted automatically.

So we are talking not about a tiny subset. We're talking about a tremendously huge subset. But here's the other identifying feature that Mr. Reitor had said: the average age being about 34, the average education level being something less than 10th grade. Now, that's not to make fun of anyone that they don't have the education level, but I'm talking about the impact now not on the illegal immigrant, I'm talking about the impact on the American people, on American citizens who are senior citizens, American citizens who are in the working age population, and also the young people who will shoulder the burden for all of the debt that is being handed to them right now.

I'm thinking also, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that when an individual comes into this country and they have less than a 10th grade education, the statistics bear it out, Mr. Speaker, according to Heritage Foundation, that those individuals over the course of their lifetime are revenue consumers. In other words, they take more out of the United States Treasury than they pay in.

And so if we allow the DREAM Act, which is three-fourths of the way amnesty, which is backdoor amnesty, for all practical purposes full-on amnesty, if we allow that, we are bringing into this country legally tens of millions of individuals who would be taking out of the Treasury at the worst possible time—when we have pensions to pay, when we have health care to pay, when we have education to pay for, police, fire protection. And the estimate is that we're looking at over \$30,000 a year in annual subsidy, direct payout for the average illegal alien that's coming into the United States.

Now, they do pay taxes. They might pay about \$10,000 in taxes, but they are a net minus. They are a cost to the Treasury of about \$10,000. Why is this important? Because we are talking about people. Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about American people, American senior citizens who worked their whole life for their Social Security and their Medicare and who are nervous about the fact that we are going into bankruptcy.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about people all right. We're talking about the American worker, 22 million of whom can't find full-time employment. And now we have James Hoffa from the Teamsters Union who wrote a letter this last week, and he said, Mr. President, what's wrong with you? Mr.

Speaker, he said we worked hard for a 40-hour workweek, and now the new norm is 30 hours a week or less, and no benefits package. So where's the jobs? Where's the wages? Where's the benefits packages? Are the jobs all fleeing to illegal aliens that we're making legal? Or are we going to think about our senior citizens who are Americans who fought and bled and died for this country, for the workers of this country, and for the people that we are about to hand the baton to, the next generation, who are going to take over this country?

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I think we have some intelligent and some responsible Members of Congress that probably haven't contemplated something that I'm about to say. I hear them talking about they're okay with increasing the workforce, especially in the low-skilled categories because they believe that agriculture needs laborers and food processing needs laborers. I hear that from agriculture and I hear that from food processors, too. But here are the facts. The double-digit unemployment, the highest unemployment levels that we have, are in the lowest skilled jobs.

So when you go into double-digit unemployment and the low-skilled people are in oversupply, you have to believe that labor is a commodity like corn or beans or gold or oil, and it is determined by supply and demand in the marketplace. And if you have an oversupply of people that are willing to work in unskilled or underskilled jobs, then the wages go down and get suppressed.

An example would be like this. In the packing plant in the town where I was born, people that worked in the packing plant 25 or perhaps 30 years ago made equivalent to the salary of a college-educated teacher working in the same town, and they could raise their family and pay for a modest home. Those children would have an opportunity to go to college, if they chose, and they could live a happy life by punching the clock and going to work every day and cashing the check and paying the bills.

Today, people working in the same plant are making about half of what the teachers are making; and the teachers aren't overpaid in that community, either. That's what we're dealing with. The difference is that the people who used to work in that plant 30 years ago, they're not there anymore. But people who came to work in the plants have been recruited from foreign countries and put into that workforce, and there has been such an oversupply that they've driven the wages down—supply and demand.

So why would we as a Nation, when we have an oversupply of people who are willing to do low and unskilled work, and the wages are suppressed and the unemployment rate is up, why would we go out and legalize another 11

or 22 or 33 or 44 or 55 million people? Why would any nation do that? Why would a nation that has 100 million people of working age that are simply not in the workforce decide we don't want to pull those people to work, we're going to let them collect the 80 different means-tested welfare benefits, and instead we're going to go over here and import tens of millions of people to do this work, then realize that you've got a double liability here because people working in the lower skilled jobs can't sustain themselves in this society with the wages that they're getting because they're suppressed by oversupply. And on the other side of this, you've got these 100 million people, a lot of them are drawing from the public Treasury and we're paying them not to work. You put that all together, we've got a double liability here instead of a double asset.

I spent part of my life in the trucking business. We always say we want a payload both ways. We don't want to go empty two directions. We want a payload both ways.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's true.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can underscore enough the fact that when we are looking at the DREAM Act, people think we are talking about a very small group of people. This is a large group of people, and we're talking about amnesty, three-quarters of the way of amnesty. So the Senate bill is 100 percent amnesty for all illegal aliens in the United States. The DREAM Act is three-fourths of the way toward full amnesty. It isn't just children. We're talking about 35-year-olds, with the average age being 34 of an illegal alien, and we're talking about them having an immediate ability to make their parents legal.

So the \$6 trillion cost is pretty darn close with the DREAM Act as well. Again, just realize politically what happens here. We're looking at 100 percent amnesty in conference committee with three-quarters of the way amnesty in conference committee. Does anybody think we're going to have anything less than full-on 100 percent amnesty and no border security.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think the gentlelady has described it very accurately. We have to be very careful what vehicles get sent over to the United States Senate that could eventually be turned into a conference report.

I know that we have an assurance that it's not going to be such a thing, but we also know that there are things that come up that surprise us. So I ask people that are advocating for different pieces of legislation that would come off of this floor, paint for me the path through which enforcement legislation could get to the President's desk without amnesty attached. And even if it did get to the President's desk with the best enforcement model that you could imagine, that amnesty attached, the President would sign it and he wouldn't enforce the law; he would just grant the amnesty.

I had a statement that I would like to introduce into the RECORD just for clarity purposes. And I want to say that I appreciate the gentlelady coming down here and leading on this event here tonight and taking such a strong voice. We have a great country still, and we can be a greater country yet, but we must reanchor and reestablish ourselves to the principles and the pillars of American exceptionalism. We cannot do it without holding the rule of law intact.

[From the Associated Press]

MEXICO CHILDREN USED AS "MULES" BY DRUG GANGS

(By Omar Millan)

TIJUANA, MEXICO.—Luis Alberto is only 14 but has the wizened gaze of a grown-up hardened by life. He never met his father, worked as a child, was hired by a gang to sell drugs and then got addicted to them. In October he checked into Cirad, a rehab center west of this border city that handles about 500 drug addicts at a time, a fifth of them younger than 17.

"They brought me here because I was using and selling 'criloco,'" Luis Alberto said, referring to methamphetamine, the drug of choice for 90 percent of adolescents in detox because of its low cost and easy availability.

Luis Alberto is just one of an increasing number of young people being used as "mules" to ferry drugs across the border into the U.S. or sell them in nearby Mexican towns, said Victor Clark, an anthropologist who studies drug trafficking.

"Minors are cheap labor and expendable for organized crime in an area where there are few job opportunities or places for recreation, and where the distribution and consumption of drugs have grown fast," Clark said.

Mexican authorities say they are aware of the problem, but there are no official figures on the number of adolescents detained for selling or distributing drugs because the law forbids keeping criminal records for minors.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement says that between 2008 and 2011, the number of youths aged 14 to 18 caught trying to cross the border between Tijuana and San Diego to sell drugs has grown tenfold. Lauren Mack, spokeswoman for ICE in San Diego, said 19 minors were arrested in 2008, 165 in 2009, 190 in 2010 and 190 again last year.

Most of them were high school students who carried drugs, usually methamphetamine or cocaine, hidden in their bodies or in their cars, Mack said.

Clark said similar things are being seen all along the border, at Mexican cities like Nogales, Ciudad Juarez and Reynosa. "It's growing at a worrying pace," he said.

Officials at drug rehab centers across Tijuana estimate that of the approximately 500 adolescents now undergoing treatment, about a tenth of them are like Luis Alberto, not only addicted to a drug but also used by cartels to sell it.

Luis Alberto, whose last name cannot be published because he is a minor, said he started selling drugs about two years ago in a neighborhood of east Tijuana along with other minors who were hired by "a boss." He made about 200 pesos (\$16) a day, which he says he spent on food and drugs.

"Between me and my friends we sold about 40 packets a day. My boss kept 1,100 pesos (about \$88) per packet and the rest was for us. Sometimes there were about three or four packets left over and we just divided them among ourselves," he said.

Sometimes the drug bosses used the children as lookouts in case police or soldiers approached, he added.

Mexico's cartels have also employed children for their hit squads.

In what may be the most shocking case involving a youth in Mexico's drug war, a 14-year-old boy born in San Diego and known only as "El Ponchis" was arrested in December 2010 in central Mexico and told reporters he had been kidnapped at age 11 and forced to work for a cartel. He said he participated in at least four beheadings.

The number of youths 18 and younger detained for drug-related crimes in Mexico has climbed from 482 in 2006, when President Felipe Calderon launched his offensive against drug traffickers, to 810 by 2009. The latest available numbers indicate 562 youths under age 18 were arrested in the first eight months of 2010.

In Tijuana, officials grew aware of the growing involvement of young people at the end of 2008 as more and more youths turned up at drug rehab centers and told their stories, said Jose Luis Serrano, director of the El Mezon rehab center.

Serrano said that on average 70 adolescents come to his center each month with addiction problems, and about a tenth of them have also worked in the drug trade.

Jose Ramon Arreola, director of the department for children and adolescents at the Cirad center, has seen a similar trend. "There are a lot of drugs on the street; anybody can tell you how easy it is to get some," he said.

Serrano said drugs became extremely cheap by the end of 2008, with methamphetamine easily available and selling for about 15 pesos (a little over \$1).

Due to increased border vigilance, "it became harder for the drug traffickers to cross the border into the U.S., and they started paying their employees with merchandise, which the employees then had to distribute along the border. That was when we noted an increase in teen drug use, mainly crystal (methamphetamine)," Serrano said.

According to the National Survey on Addictions, Tijuana has Mexico's worst methamphetamine addiction problem. The Tijuana Psychiatric Institute says it has about 22,000 meth addicts.

Serrano and Arreola point to outdated laws as one reason gangs have recruited young people to help push drugs. In Baja California, children under 17 can be jailed for no more than seven years even if they are convicted of serious crimes such as murder, violent robbery or involvement in a drug cartel.

Tijuana was one of the first cities to which Calderon sent troops to fight the cartels five years ago, yet hundreds of kilos of drugs still arrive each week for local consumption or for sale in other cities, military and police officials said.

The Sinaloa cartel, considered Mexico's most powerful crime organization, is mainly responsible for bringing in heroin, cocaine and marijuana, said Gen. Gilberto Landeros, the military official in charge of Baja California. Other gangs from Jalisco and Michoacan bring in mainly methamphetamine, he said.

"We are fighting the supply but not the demand, and as long as there is demand, there will be people producing and distributing the drugs," said Jose Hector Acosta, director of the treatment department at the Youth Integration Center, an organization that has been treating drug addicts for 37 years.

John: "A moment ago you mentioned the issue of amnesty here, and this seems to be a big sticking point in the House on what to do moving forward. Would you describe amnesty as anything that allows people who are

in this country illegally for any amount of time, for any reason, that if those folks are allowed to gain full citizenship you would define as amnesty?"

SK: "That's pretty close, John, I mean you know I defined it as a pardon and a reward for immigration lawbreakers coupled with the reward of the objective of their crime. I think that your definition's very close to that of mine."

That doesn't mean there aren't groups of people in this country that I have sympathy for, I do. And there are kids that were brought into this country by their parents unknowing that they were breaking the law. And they will say to me and others who defend the rule of law "we have to do something about the 11 million." And some of them are valedictorians—well my answer to that is—and by the way their parents brought them in. It wasn't their fault. It's true in some cases, but they aren't all valedictorians. They weren't all brought in by their parents.

For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there that they weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.

Those people would be legalized with the same act. And until the folks that want to open the borders and grant this amnesty can define the difference between the innocent ones who have deep ties with America and those who have been, I'll say have been undermining our culture and civilization and profiting from criminal acts, until they can define that difference they should not advocate for amnesty for both good and evil."

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I am grateful that he is putting into the RECORD the pillars of American exceptionalism. That is our Nation. Again, what we are concerned about is America first; the American people first; American jobs first; American wages first; American benefits first. And unfortunately, a study came out in April from Harvard that said illegal aliens have contributed to a loss of income of \$1,300 a year. Let's not drive that number any further. So I am very grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss this with the American people this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

WHAT AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
WILL COST AMERICA

(By Jim DeMint and Robert Rector, Heritage Foundation)

The economist Milton Friedman warned that the United States cannot have open borders and an extensive welfare state. He was right, and his reasoning extends to amnesty for the more than 11 million unlawful immigrants in this country. In addition to being unfair to those who follow the law and encouraging more unlawful immigration in the future, amnesty has a substantial price tag.

An exhaustive study by the Heritage Foundation has found that after amnesty, current unlawful immigrants would receive \$9.4 trillion in government benefits and services and pay more than \$3 trillion in taxes over their lifetimes. That leaves a net fiscal deficit (benefits minus taxes) of \$6.3 trillion. That deficit would have to be financed by increasing the government debt or raising taxes on U.S. citizens.

For centuries immigration has been vital to our nation's health, and it will be essential to our future success. Yet immigrants should come to our nation lawfully and

should not impose additional fiscal costs on our overburdened taxpayers. An efficient and merit-based system would help our economy and lessen the burden on taxpayers, strengthening our nation.

A properly structured lawful immigration system holds the potential to drive positive economic growth and job creation. But amnesty for those here unlawfully is not necessary to capture those benefits.

We estimate that when those who broke our laws to come here start having access to the same benefits as citizens do—as is called for by the Senate "Gang of Eight" immigration bill—the average unlawful immigrant household will receive nearly \$3 in benefits for every dollar in taxes paid. The net annual cost is \$28,000 per unlawful immigrant household.

Given the U.S. debt of \$17 trillion, the fiscal effects detailed in our study should be at the forefront of legislators' minds as they consider immigration reform.

Already, illegal immigrants impose costs on police, hospitals, schools and other services. Putting them on a path to citizenship means that within a few years, they will qualify for the full panoply of government programs: more than 80 means-tested welfare programs, as well as Social Security, Medicare and Obamacare. The lifetime fiscal cost (benefits received minus taxes paid) for the average unlawful immigrant after amnesty would be around \$590,000. Who is going to pay that tab?

Our government is now in the business of redistribution. As Nicholas Eberstadt, an economist at the American Enterprise Institute, has pointed out, federal transfer payments, or taking from one American to give to another, grew from 3 percent of spending in 1935 to about two-thirds of all spending in 2010. Adding millions of unlawful immigrants to U.S. programs will have a massive negative fiscal effect.

Our findings are based on empirical research and reflect common sense. Unlawful immigrants have relatively low earning potential because, on average, they have 10th-grade educations and low skills. Heads of households like that, whether from the Midwest or Central America, will receive, on average, about four times as much in government services and benefits as they pay in taxes. Adding millions more to bloated welfare and overburdened entitlement programs would deepen the fiscal hole our country is in.

In addition to costing taxpayers, amnesty is unfair to those who came to this country lawfully. More than 4 million people are waiting to come to the United States lawfully, but our dysfunctional bureaucracy makes it easier to break the law than to follow it.

Our cost estimates are in some ways very conservative: The \$6.3 trillion figure does not factor in the waves of unlawful immigrants who could pour into this country hoping for another future amnesty. As scholars at the Heritage Foundation and elsewhere have explained, the comprehensive immigration bill being considered in the Senate differs little from previous empty promises to secure our borders and enforce immigration laws on the books. When amnesty was granted under a similar plan in 1986, there were about 3 million unlawful immigrants; now we have more than 11 million.

Instead of forcing through a complicated, lengthy bill, Congress ought to advance piece-by-piece immigration solutions that enjoy broad support and build trust with the American people. We should move to streamline our legal immigration system, encourage patriotic assimilation to unite new immigrants with America's vibrant civil society, fulfill promises to secure our borders and strengthen workplace enforcement.

We are proudly a nation of immigrants. People the world over are attracted to the United States because we are a nation of laws. Granting amnesty to those who broke the law and putting them on a path to citizenship would be unfair, would encourage more bad behavior and would impose significant costs on American families.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and July 25 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical-mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2323. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2012 Annual Report regarding the Department's enforcement activities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1691f; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2324. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2325. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rescission of Supervised Investment Bank Holding Company Rules [Release No.: 34-69979] (RIN: 3235-AL35) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2326. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Programs: Essential Health Benefits in Alternative Benefit Plans, Eligibility Notices, Fair Hearing and Appeal Process, and Premiums and Cost Sharing; Exchanges: Eligibility and Enrollment [CMS-2334-F] (RIN: 0938-AR04) received July 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2327. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2328. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-39, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2329. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2330. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Use of Meeting Rooms and Public Spaces [FDMS No.: NARA-13-0001] [Agency No.: NARA-2013-033] (RIN: 3095-AB77) received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Contract Support Costs of Self-Determination Awards; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2332. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the Office's report on applications for orders authorizing or approving the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications and the number of orders and extensions granted or denied during calendar year 2012, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2333. A letter from the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's 2012 Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2334. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Martinez Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Martinez, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0345] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2335. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Symphony Summer POPS Fireworks 2013 Season, San Diego, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0388] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2336. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0383] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2337. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Displays, Barnegat Bay; Barnegat Township, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0431] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2338. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Red Bull Flugtag National Harbor Event, Potomac River; National Harbor Access Channel, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0114] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2339. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2012, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(f);

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2340. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medications Prescribed by Non-VA Providers (RIN: 2900-AO77) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2341. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report "The Year in Trade 2012"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1961. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line (Rept. 113-175). 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. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 2804. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, 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. POE of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2805. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2806. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that importation of certain containers containing de minimis residual matter shall be excepted from the Customs laws of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr.

ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HURT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUNDYAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2808. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Salt Lake County, Utah, as wilderness, to facilitate a land exchange involving certain land in such National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YODER, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2809. A bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the sustainable growth rate and Medicare payment for physicians' services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2811. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2812. A bill to encourage States to prohibit "stand your ground" laws and require neighborhood watch programs to register with local law enforcement agencies and the Department of Justice, to direct the Attorney General to study such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2813. A bill to amend the Water Supply Act of 1958 to establish a mechanism to permit State and local interests to release to the United States future water storage rights associated with Corps of Engineers reservoir projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 2814. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Main Street in Strawberry, Arkansas, as the "Noel Austin Harris, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2815. A bill to authorize a pilot program to improve asset recovery levels, asset management, and homeownership retention with respect to delinquent single-family mortgages insured under the FHA mortgage insurance programs by providing for in-person contact outreach activities with mortgagors under such mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2816. A bill to extend the pilot program under section 258 of the National Housing Act that establishes an automated process for providing alternative credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors under certain mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to remove the non-discrimination requirements relating to health care providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2818. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TURNER, Mr.

RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 2819. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for equity relating to medical costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2821. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the States to call a limited convention solely for the purposes of considering whether to propose a specific amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the effect of treaties, Executive orders, and agreements with other nations or groups of nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of

Texas, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the use of foreign law as authority in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 316. A resolution expressing heartfelt condolences and support to the people of India and all those affected in the aftermath of the deadly flash floods and landslides triggered by massive monsoons of June 2013, which devastated many states in northern India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CHU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 317. A resolution celebrating the upcoming 2015 Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles, California; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

109. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution opposing section 9 of H.R. 1919; 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. HOLDING:

H.R. 2804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; and, Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This trade related bill is addressed under the Constitution's Commerce Clause; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause Art I Sec. 8 and the fifth Amendment.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Commerce Clause provides for regulation of commerce between the states.

Article II, Section 3, Clause 2—The Property Clause allows Congress to manage the lands under its control, including water resources.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2814.

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 establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section, 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 52.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 53.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 54.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 129: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 176: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 279: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 301: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 366: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 506: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 508: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 647: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 676: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 680: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 685: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 721: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 752: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 760: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 822: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 850: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 855: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 900: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 920: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 921: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 985: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1001: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1020: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1024: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1095: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1150: Ms. WATERS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1281: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1286: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1318: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1340: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1389: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1409: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1416: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1579: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1621: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1634: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1652: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1726: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1734: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1755: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1771: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1775: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1787: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1805: Mr. BARBER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1816: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1825: Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1827: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1845: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1851: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1867: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1920: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1931: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1980: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1982: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1998: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2000: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2009: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2019: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2084: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2099: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2116: Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2144: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2146: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2149: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2150: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2224: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2264: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2273: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 2288: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2310: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2332: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2366: Mr. CLAY and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2399: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2401: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2403: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2418: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2429: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2449: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2453: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2456: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2468: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2476: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2557: Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 2575: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 2581: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 2586: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2607: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2613: Mr. ENYART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2614: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2619: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2633: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2641: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2643: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2646: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 2682: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. YODER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 2692: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2700: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2708: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 2709: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2717: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 2721: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2750: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 2771: Mr. HALL.
 H.R. 2775: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 2776: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 34: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. BASS.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H. Res. 285: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 293: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H. Res. 307: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 314: Ms. LOFGREN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2641: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. PALLONE.