

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 5759, I inadvertently missed that vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, but no votes are expected. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

On Monday, in addition to our usual suspensions, the House will consider H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, authored by my good friend, Representative DAVID VALADAO.

California is facing the worst drought in over a century, and that has a negative impact not only on our State's economy, but on the entire Nation's food supply. This legislation is critical so that we don't let precious water from current and future storms wash away to the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the House is also expected to consider legislation to address the upcoming expiration of our current continuing resolution, as well as legislation on the expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note in his comments, with respect to next Thursday, that we do not expect to meet on Friday, which I understand, but it does not specifically reference that that will be the end of the session of this Congress and, therefore, conclude the 113th Congress.

Is the expectation, Mr. Leader, that, in fact, Thursday will be the adjournment date for the 113th Congress?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer to his question is: yes, it is.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman has just announced, therefore, we have 4 days left to go in this session, three of which will be voting days. I know that we have a number of things yet to come, one of which, of course, is the funding of the government.

I know there have been a lot of discussions about what form that bill will take: whether it will be an omnibus; whether it will be a CR, a continuing resolution; whether it will be a combination of those two. There is concern on our side of the aisle.

Mr. PRICE, who is the ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee, is very concerned that some of the security needs of the country will be put, if not at risk, then in doubt if there is a short-term funding of that part of the one-twelfth of the appropriations bills.

Does the gentleman know whether or not we are going to have an omnibus, which will cover all 12 of the appropriations bills and departments, or whether or not it may be a combination of some shorter-term funding and longer-term funding?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1445

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my friend for yielding.

As my friend knows, negotiations are ongoing between the Appropriations of the House and the Senate; and as soon as the conclusion of the negotiations is done, we will notify everyone and post what comes out.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I have had a brief discussion with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), with whom I have served for, I guess, about two decades while I was on the Appropriations Committee. While you and I have had conversations—I won't disclose the substance of those conversations—I believe strongly that an omnibus will give greater stability and confidence to those who carry out the programs that the Congress has set forth.

So we are very hopeful that we can reach an agreement both on—we have already reached agreement, as you know, on funding levels in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that related to last year's fiscal year and this year's fiscal year, fiscal year 2015. So we have agreed-upon numbers.

The only thing we need now agree on, I think, specifically, is riders. Those are legislative provisions in the appropriations bills. I know that we are having a lot of discussions about those, and I know we have negotiations about those. In those negotiations, Mr. Leader, I would urge you, as the majority leader of your party, to do what you can to provide for full-year funding for the entire government because I think that will give confidence to people.

With respect to Homeland Security, it will put us in a better security position—less doubt, more ability to plan, more ability to respond effectively. So I would hope that the leader could lend his very, very substantial influence and intellect and judgment to that process, which I think will be good for the country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for always being

willing to give advice, and as soon as we get the negotiations done, we will keep you abreast.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for being pleased that I continue to give advice, and encouraged by that, I will continue to do so.

One of the gentleman's colleagues that I know is very close to the Speaker, Senator BURR from North Carolina, said: "Shutting down the entire government over something never did make sense to the American people, still doesn't and won't in the future."

I know that you are committed and the Speaker is committed to not shutting down the government. I share that view with you and want to work towards that end. But there are those who do; and to the extent, therefore, that we get the government fully funded through September 30, we will not have that confrontation. I suggest, with all due respect to the leader, that if we delay a portion of that funding requirement, we are just going to have that fight 60 days from now or 90 days from now or however long this is put off when we have already agreed upon the numbers that those agencies will be funded at. But I understand what the gentleman says.

There are two other issues that I think are very, very important, one of which is TRIA. You referenced TRIA in your comments. We are very hopeful that we will follow the Senate in terms of a bipartisan engagement on this issue.

As you know, Mr. Leader, the Senate passed the TRIA bill, which extended the Federal reinsurance program for 7 years by a 93-4 vote. It was not close. There was an overwhelmingly bipartisan judgment that extending this would be good for business, good for insurers, good for contractors, good for jobs, and good for our economy to give, again, confidence that there would be the insurance available so that people could undertake construction projects either in urban, suburban, or rural areas.

I would hope very much that we could bring a bill to the floor next week, Mr. Leader, that extends for no less than 2 years—I would pull that out of it because it is less than, because I know you have the chairman of the Financial Services Committee who does not want to do the 5 years or 7 years. But the way we are going to give confidence to people in this economy is to give them some ability for long-term thinking.

If TRIA ends, there are going to be many, many projects that will not be undertaken in the private sector—forget about the public sector—which I know the gentleman from California wants to see, additional economic activity in the private sector.

As you know, 45 House Republicans have written to Speaker BOEHNER, and in that they said: "We respectfully urge you to schedule action on a multiyear extension." That would be at least 2 years. "Businesses with terrorism coverage are being told that

their coverage will end if Congress fails to act, causing the sort of uncertainty that hurts economic growth.”

Those are 45 of your Members, your colleagues, our colleagues who have made the observation. I think, therefore, for all the reasons they articulated, they are right. I have said that just now.

They also indicate, Mr. Leader, that there are at least, therefore, in this Congress, over 230 votes to pass a TRIA extension with a 5-year window. I say that because every Democrat will vote for a long-term TRIA extension. Forty-five of your Members have written a letter clearly indicating they support that. That gets you well over 230 votes. I think a majority of your party would vote for that as well. So I think we would probably get closer to 300 votes. But I would hope that we would do that because I think that is in the best interest of our country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman was correct in my announcement, I did announce that we will have legislation on TRIA on the floor next week. And I take what the gentleman said prior, about not wanting to shut the government down, and I am glad that you feel the same way. I just, at times, get concerned with the news reports that I hear from your leader—I don’t know if they are true or not—from inside your own conference about trying to withhold votes. I hope that we can continue the working relationship that we have developed and, into the new Congress as well, work together, because no one on this side of the aisle ever wants to shut the government down. That is why we will bring forth legislation that will not shut the government down and protects it at the same time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Very frankly, I am convinced that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY)—Mrs. LOWEY being the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. ROGERS being the Republican chair—could agree today and could bring a bill to the floor on Tuesday that would get overwhelming support.

The gentleman knows that in accommodating some in your caucus either for legislative additions to the appropriation bill for which you need a waiver—as you know having served on the Appropriations Committee, legislating on appropriation bills is not consistent with the rules, and therefore you need a waiver to accomplish that—and the, what we hear, unwillingness to fund the Homeland Security agency, which, as the gentleman from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM, said just the other day was a bad idea and would undermine national security because of the duties of the Homeland Security Department, what the leader on our side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. PELOSI), was saying is that we cannot commit to something that, A, we don’t know what is happening fully, that hasn’t been decided yet, but, secondly, that is inconsistent with the agreement that we have on a bipartisan basis with the Ryan-Murray funding caps and that we think Mr. ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY have agreed upon and can report out a bill that will be one that we can support fully. That, I think, is what the leader is saying. I agree with her on that.

I am, therefore, hopeful that the bill will be in a fashion that will reflect, A, the Ryan-Murray agreement on numbers, and, B, not have in it “poison pills,” as we refer to them, that will make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to support. Both of us want to keep the government open. That is the responsibility of the appropriations bills. Other extraneous legislative actions that may want to be taken which would put that at risk I would hope would not be taken; and that was, I think, what the leader was saying.

If the gentleman has nothing further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, December 8, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA CORINA MACHADO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Maria Corina Machado who is being unjustly accused, intimidated, and dragged into court under bogus charges by the regime of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela. She has been stripped of her seat in Congress, been barred from leaving her country, and is being denied due process.

In May, the House passed my legislation aimed at denying visas, blocking property, freezing assets, and prohibiting any financial transactions to members of the Venezuelan regime who are responsible for human rights abuses against the peaceful citizens of Venezuela.

The U.S. must no longer stand still as these abuses are repeated in our own hemisphere. There are 72 students, 2 elected officials, 12 military officers, and democracy activist Leopoldo Lopez still in prison under politically motivated charges. Maria Corina must not join them, and all political prisoners in Venezuela must be freed immediately.

I CAN'T BREATHE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Black men and boys killed by police.

I can't breathe.

Impunity for the killers. No justice, no peace.

I can't breathe.

Militarized police met peaceful protesters on their knees.

I can't breathe.

Weapons of war, a show of force on our streets.

I can't breathe.

Disenfranchised youth driven to violence as speech.

I can't breathe.

Cynical media think this makes great TV.

I can't breathe.

This cowardly Congress afraid of losing our seats.

I can't breathe.

Half-hearted reform when there is more that we need.

I can't breathe.

Just thinking about the despair that it breeds.

I can't breathe.

Black lives matter. Hear my pleas.

I can't breathe.

□ 1500

LNG EXCISE TAXES

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to briefly highlight an issue that I wish had been resolved this week, but unfortunately the President's veto threat of an unfinished tax extenders compromise caused this bill to remain fallow.

Under the current outdated Tax Code, LNG, liquefied natural gas, is applied the same excise tax as other fuels despite producing different energy outputs per gallon. This results in LNG users facing disproportionately higher excise tax rates than their diesel counterparts, creating a perverse inequality that artificially hinders the attractiveness of LNG as a transportation fuel.

So a truck fueling with domestic clean natural gas at Sellersburg, Indiana's LNG truck stop pays 70 percent more tax than its diesel counterpart across the street. An LNG-powered river tug fueling up at one of Ohio's river ports will, instead of paying the proposed 29 cents per gallon fuel tax for inland waterways, pay nearly 50 cents per gallon. This disparity needs to be addressed.

There has been some constructive movement by Representative THORBERRY. I applaud that effort and hope we can address this matter next year during the debate on the highway trust fund.