like Gloria who are about to enter the labor market. And they contribute to lower wages for hardworking people like Gloria's father, who dedicated their lives to their jobs and the industries in which they worked.

From the little we know from past trade deals and the shroud of secrecy being kept around the TPP and TTIP, we have to assume that these deals will be equally devastating for American workers like Chuck and future workers like Gloria.

The fact that these deals are so veiled in secrecy is unsettling, but the real economic danger comes in the form of trade promotion authority. This so-called ''fast track'' authority would compel Congress to vote on these massive trade deals within just a few weeks of being allowed to read them, without any opportunity to push for important changes including improvements to environmental and labor standards. I can imagine reasons why trade supporters would want to fast track a secret trade deal, but none of them involve the benevolent treatment of American workers or increasing the market value of their labor.

KORUS ANNIVERSARY

This week the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement passed its third year in effect. I would like to remind everyone that it was sold to us on a promise of ''more exports, more jobs.'' In truth, we have seen exactly the opposite since the deal went into effect. U.S. exports to Korea have fallen and imports have surged.

Our overall trade deficit with Korea is 84 percent higher than it was the year before the agreement was signed, an increase of 12.7 billion dollars. A large portion of that increase comes from manufacturing imports, especially passenger vehicles.

Yes, auto exports to Korea are up an estimated 23,000 cars from a pre-KORUS number of around 15,000. The bad news is that the U.S. imported 450,000 more passenger cars over the same period. This works out to another 5.7 billion dollars or 36 percent alone for our auto trade deficit with Korea. That means more than lost profits for U.S. companies; it also means lost wages and lost jobs for thousands of U.S. workers.

Let me also remind everyone that the Korean trade agreement is the model for the much larger Trans Pacific Partnership that remains shrouded in secrecy.

Gloria put it perfectly in her letter: ''America has seemingly given up.'' Is this what we want our young people to think? That we no longer care, that we are no longer committed to offering them a better future?

Lost jobs and downward pressure on wages are the legacy of trade in America, and we owe it to these young people to do better. We owe it to them to protect the American economy, to protect American jobs and to protect the middle class. We have a chance to show them that we haven't given up, and that we've learned from past mistakes, like NAFTA and KORUS. We can do this by putting an end to unfair free trade deals, and negotiating fair trade deals that work for everyone, including American workers.

We owe it to the next generation to build a new legacy for American trade. There are mutual gains to be had if the free people of the world can work together, maintaining real labor and environmental standards and showing the world a better, and freer, way to live and work. We have seen glimpses of what this can look like, but for decades, when push comes to shove, our leaders have decided to balk and cave, letting false promises and voodoo economics drive the selling out of American workers time and again. We need to demand more of this administration and the massive global trade deals it strives to enact. We need real transparency and real standards or we need to say no more to terrible trade!

Mr. TONKO. Thank you so much, Representative KAPTUR.

Let's move forward with socioeconomic environmental justice, where we can grow this Nation and job opportunities and undo those trade deficits.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Mr. TONKO for the time to discuss the troubling issue of ''fast track'' trade authority.

President Obama and some of our Republican colleagues want to use this process to ensure that the massive Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, trade deal is passed quickly and without input from Congress. Under this authority, we would have to vote on this far-reaching trade agreement that has been negotiated in secret without the ability to offer amendments or engage in meaningful debate.

Considering the TPP under fast track authority is simply another symptom of this closed Congress, where we have been deprived of our authority and responsibility to protect our constituents. And if past trade deals are any indication, American workers and manufacturers need our help now more than ever before. For as long as the United States has been signing free trade agreements, we have watched helplessly as quality, middle class jobs have flowed overseas. Quite frankly, over my career, I have never seen a trade agreement that benefited the American worker or the American manufacturer.

I come from a district that has been devastated by short-sighted trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA, and recent agreements with Korea and Colombia. It is estimated that since NAFTA went into effect, the United States has lost 5 million manufacturing jobs. In the Rochester area alone, we have only half the manufacturing jobs that we did then.

Our economy simply cannot afford another NAFTA-style, job-killing trade agreement, which is exactly what the Trans-Pacific Partnership is.

I have great confidence in the American worker and American businesses to compete and succeed in the global marketplace if given a fair and level playing field. For generations, our country has shown that hard work and ingenuity are the engines of progress and economic prosperity. Innovations that shaped the 21st century economy were conceived and produced here in the United States, many in Rochester I might add.

In return for allowing other countries to benefit from our hard work and innovation, America was rewarded with a strong middle class.

But other countries have taken advantage of us, and we have to stand strong against them. American workers should not be forced to compete against workers in countries like Vietnam where wages are as low as 50 cents per hour.

We need to level the economic playing field and stop jobs from being shipped overseas. We're not going to do that by enacting fast track and allowing more poorly conceived trade agreements like the TPP to decimate our economy.

Congress cannot afford to give this administration—or any future one—the benefit of the doubt by passing fast track authority. By now, it should be clear that a closed legislative process isn't good for Congress or the American people. I firmly oppose fast track authority and I urge my colleagues to stand up for our constituents before it's too late.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, AND COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on House Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, Effective today I hereby resign from my assignments to the House Committee on Ways & Means, House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC.

MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA. Mr. Speaker, section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 requires the concurrent resolution on the budget to include a section related to means-tested and non-means-tested direct spending programs. Section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 also requires the Chair of the Committee on the Budget to submit a statement in the Congressional Record defining those terms prior to the consideration of such concurrent resolution on the budget.

Enclosed please find two tables prepared in order to fulfill this requirement. I have also included a communication and associated tables from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, with whom I have consulted in the preparation of this material. While the non-means-tested list is not exhaustive, all programs not considered means-tested can be considered non-means-tested direct spending.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2015.

Re Spending for Means-Tested Programs.

Hon. TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you requested, enclosed are two tables that show federal spending for each of the government's major mandatory spending programs and tax credits that are primarily means-tested (that is, spending programs and tax credits that provide cash payments or other forms of assistance to people with relatively low income or few assets). Table 1 shows the Congressional Budget Office's January 2015 baseline projections for the 2015–2025 period; Table 2 shows historical spending data from 2005 through 2014, along with CBO's estimates for 2015.

The tables also include a line showing total spending for mandatory programs that are primarily not means-tested. Some of those programs have means-tested components (for example, student loans), but the tables do not show separate entries for such programs. They also do not include means-tested programs that are discretionary (for example, the Section 8 housing assistance programs and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program). However, the tables show discretionary spending for the Pell Grant program as a memorandum item because that program has both discretionary and mandatory components and the amount of the mandatory Pell Grant component depends in part on the annual amount of discretionary funding.

In the projections that CBO published in *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025* in January 2015, mandatory outlays for means-tested programs are projected to grow over the next decade at an average annual rate of 4.6 percent, compared with an average rate of 5.5 percent for non-means-tested programs, which include, for example, Social Security, most of Medicare, and civilian and military retirement programs (see Table 1).[1]

Overall, the growth rates projected for total mandatory spending over the coming decade are slower than those experienced in the past 10 years—by a little less than one-half percentage point per year, on average. Projected growth from 2016 to 2025 is slightly higher for non-means-tested programs (which will have grown at an average rate of 5.4 percent from 2006 to 2015, CBO estimates), but much lower for means-tested programs (which will have grown at an average rate of 6.8 percent from 2006 to 2015, by CBO's estimate; see Table 2).

A number of programs shown in Tables 1 and 2 have been or are scheduled to be significantly affected by changes in law, the most recent recession, and the continuing recovery. As a result, important aspects of the programs in the future may differ significantly from historical experience, and those differences may be the source of some of the variation between the growth rates in the past 10 years and those in the coming decade. For example, spending for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), subsidies for health insurance purchased through an exchange, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the refundable portions of the earned income and child tax credits has been or will be significantly affected by program changes that unfold over time:

Medicaid spending shot up by 35 percent from 2008 to 2010, during the most recent recession. After dropping off a bit in the following few years, it has been boosted by the expansion of Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act. As that expansion has been phased in, spending for the program increased by 14 percent last year and is projected to rise by 11 percent in 2015. Under current law, the rate of growth in Medicaid spending will decline through 2018, CBO projects, after which it will level off at a rate of roughly 5.5 percent per year through the end of the projection period.

Spending authority for the CHIP program expires at the end of fiscal year 2015. Consistent with statutory guidelines, CBO assumes in its baseline spending projections that annual funding for the program after 2015 will continue at $5.7 billion.[2] As a result, in CBO's baseline, spending for CHIP is projected to drop from $11 billion in 2016 to about $6 billion in subsequent years; it had grown from $5 billion to $10 billion from 2005 to 2015.

Payments of subsidies for health insurance purchased through an exchange began in January 2014 and are projected to grow rapidly between 2015 and 2018, largely as a result of significant growth in enrollment. CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation project annual growth will average about 4 percent between 2019 and 2025.

SNAP spending increased markedly during the most recent recession—roughly doubling between 2008 and 2011—as more people became eligible for those benefits. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) raised the maximum benefit under that program; subsequent legislation eliminated that increase as of October 31, 2013. The program's caseload peaked in 2014, and CBO expects that it will fall in each year of the projection period as the economy continues to improve. As a result, spending for SNAP is projected to decline slightly over the next several years, after growing by an average of 9 percent per year over the 2006–2015 period.

Outlays for the earned income and child tax credits rose by almost 40 percent from 2007 to 2008 and have grown slowly since then. They are expected to dip after 2018 because provisions expanding the refundability of those credits (which were originally enacted in ARRA and were subsequently extended) are scheduled to expire on December 31, 2017.[3] In 2025, those outlays are projected to be about what they were in 2014.

Finally, because of the unique budgetary treatment of the Pell Grant program—which has both mandatory and discretionary components—the growth rates for the mandatory portion of that program give incomplete information. The bulk of the funding for Pell grants is provided annually in appropriation acts and thus is discretionary. In recent years, spending for Pell grants also has included two mandatory components, which have allowed the discretionary budget authority provided by the regular appropriation acts to remain well below the full cost of the program.

In keeping with procedures that govern CBO's baseline, the projection for the discretionary portion of the Pell Grant program is based on the budget authority appropriated for fiscal year 2015, adjusted for inflation. (Discretionary spending for the program is shown as a memorandum item in both tables.) Thus, the baseline projection for both discretionary and mandatory spending for Pell grants does not represent an estimate of the expected future costs of the program; such a projection also would take into account such factors as changes in eligibility and enrollment.

I hope that you find this information helpful. If you have any further questions, please contact me or my staff. The primary staff contact is Barry Blom.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Enclosure.

Table 1.

Mandatory Outlays in CBO's January 2015 Baseline
(Outlays by fiscal year, billions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Average Annual Growth 2016-2025
Means-Tested Programs												
Health Care Programs												
Medicaid	335	360	384	405	428	452	477	503	530	558	588	5.8%
Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidies	24	28	28	28	32	34	37	44	46	46	54	8.4%
Health insurance subsidies[a,b]	28	55	75	86	89	91	97	102	105	109	112	15.1%
Children's Health Insurance Program	10	11	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	-5.9%
Subtotal	397	454	493	524	555	584	617	656	687	719	760	6.7%
Income Security												
SNAP	78	78	76	75	74	74	74	73	74	74	75	-0.4%
Supplemental Security Income	55	60	57	54	61	63	64	71	68	65	72	2.7%
Earned income and child tax credits[b,c]	83	85	86	87	75	76	77	78	79	80	82	-0.1%
Family support and foster care[d]	31	32	32	32	33	33	33	34	34	34	35	1.0%
Child nutrition	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	31	32	4.3%
Subtotal	268	277	274	273	267	271	275	285	284	284	295	1.0%
Veterans' pensions	6	7	6	6	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	2.0%
Pell Grants[e]	11	6	7	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	-1.3%
Subtotal, Means-Tested Programs	683	744	781	811	838	871	909	957	988	1,019	1,072	4.6%
Non-Means-Tested Programs[f]	1,847	1,947	2,018	2,094	2,241	2,370	2,516	2,708	2,820	2,933	3,165	5.5%
Total Mandatory Outlays[g]	**2,530**	**2,691**	**2,799**	**2,905**	**3,079**	**3,241**	**3,425**	**3,666**	**3,808**	**3,952**	**4,237**	5.3%
Memorandum												
Pell Grants (Discretionary)[h]	20	27	27	23	24	24	25	25	26	26	27	3.0%

Source: Congressional Budget Office; staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes: The projections shown here are the same as those reported in Congressional Budget Office, *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025*(January 2015). CBO recently updated its baseline projections as reported in Congressional Budget Office, *Updated Budget Projections: 2015 to 2025 (March 2015)*. Some of the projections are different in the March baseline, but at the request of the committee staff, the projections shown are from the January baseline.

The average annual growth rate over the 2016-2025 period encompasses growth in outlays from the amount projected for 2015 through the amount projected for 2025.

Projections of spending for benefit programs in this table exclude administrative costs that are classified as discretionary but generally include administrative costs classified as mandatory.

SNAP = Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

Because October 1 will fall on a weekend in 2016, 2017, 2022, and 2023, certain federal payments that are due on that date will instead be made at the end of the preceding September and thus be shifted into the previous fiscal year. Those shifts primarily affect outlays for Supplemental Security Income, veterans' compensation benefits and pensions, and Medicare.

a. Differs from the amounts reported in Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025*because it does not include payments to health insurance plans for risk adjustment (amounts paid to plans that attract less healthy enrollees) and reinsurance (amounts paid to plans that enroll individuals who end up with high costs). Spending for grants to states to establish exchanges is also excluded.

b. Does not include amounts that reduce tax receipts.

c. Differs from the amounts reported on Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025*because it does not include other tax credits that were included in that table.

d. Includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Child Support Enforcement program, the Child Care Entitlement program, and other programs that benefit children.

e. Includes mandatory spending designed to reduce the discretionary budget authority needed to support the maximum award level set in the appropriation act plus mandatory spending that, by formula, increases the total maximum award above the amount set in the appropriation act.

f. Does not include offsetting receipts.

g. Does not include outlays associated with federal interest payments, which are not considered part of mandatory spending.

h. The discretionary baseline does not represent a projection of expected costs for the discretionary portion of the Pell Grant program. As with all other discretionary programs, the budget authority is calculated by inflating the budget authority appropriated for fiscal year 2015. Outlays for future years are based on those amounts of budget authority and also reflect a temporary surplus of budget authority provided in 2015.

Table 2.
Mandatory Outlays Since 2005
(Outlays by fiscal year, billions of dollars)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Estimated, 2015	Average Annual Growth 2006-2015
Means-Tested Programs												
Health Care Programs												
Medicaid	182	181	191	201	251	273	275	251	265	301	335	6.3%
Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidies	0	11	17	17	19	21	24	20	22	22	24	8.9% [a]
Health insurance subsidies[b,c]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	28	n.a.
Children's Health Insurance Program	5	5	6	7	8	8	9	9	9	9	10	7.3%
Subtotal	187	197	213	225	277	302	308	279	297	346	397	7.8%
Income Security												
SNAP	33	35	35	39	56	70	77	80	83	76	78	9.1%
Supplemental Security Income	38	37	36	41	45	47	53	47	53	54	55	3.7%
Earned income and child tax credits[c]	49	52	54	75	67	77	78	77	79	82	83	5.3%
Family support and foster care[d]	31	30	31	32	33	35	33	30	32	31	31	0.3%
Child nutrition	13	14	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	20	21	5.1%
Subtotal	163	168	170	202	217	247	260	254	266	263	268	5.1%
Veterans' pensions	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	5.0%
Pell Grants[e]	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	12	16	8	11	n.a.
Subtotal, Means-Tested Programs	354	369	386	431	501	557	587	550	584	623	683	6.8%
Non-Means-Tested Programs[f]	1,094	1,188	1,242	1,349	1,787	1,553	1,648	1,710	1,752	1,757	1,847	5.4%
Total Mandatory Outlays[g]	**1,448**	**1,556**	**1,628**	**1,780**	**2,288**	**2,110**	**2,236**	**2,260**	**2,336**	**2,380**	**2,530**	5.7%
Memorandum												
Pell Grants (Discretionary)	13	13	13	15	13	20	21	21	17	23	20	4.3%

Source: Congressional Budget Office; staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes: The average annual growth rate over the 2006-2015 period encompasses growth in outlays from the amount recorded in 2005 through the amount projected for 2015.

Data on spending for benefit programs in this table exclude administrative costs that are classified as discretionary but generally include administrative costs classified as mandatory.

SNAP = Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; n.a. = not applicable.

Because October 1 fell on a weekend in 2006, 2007, and 2012, certain federal payments that were due on that date were instead made at the end of the preceding September and thus shifted into the previous fiscal year. Those shifts primarily affected outlays for Supplemental Security Income, veterans' compensation benefits and pensions, and Medicare

a. The average annual growth rate reflects the program's growth from its inception in 2006 through 2015.

b. Differs from the amounts reported in Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025* because it does not include payments to health insurance plans for risk adjustment (amounts paid to plans that attract less healthy enrollees) and reinsurance (amounts paid to plans that enroll individuals who end up with high costs). Spending for grants to states to establish exchanges is also excluded.

c. Does not include amounts that reduce tax receipts.

d. Includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Child Support Enforcement program, the Child Care Entitlement program, and other programs that benefit children.

e. Includes mandatory spending designed to reduce the discretionary budget authority needed to support the maximum award level set in the appropriation act plus mandatory spending that, by formula, increases the total maximum award above the amount set in the appropriation act.

f. Does not include offsetting receipts.

g. Does not include outlays associated with federal interest payments, which are not considered part of mandatory spending.

ENDNOTES

1. CBO published *Updated Budget Projections: 2015 to 2025* in March 2015; some of the amounts shown in Table 1 are different in the March baseline, but at the request of the committee staff, these tables show the projections from the January baseline. In total, for mandatory spending, the differences between the two baselines are small, and the average annual growth rates over the 2016–2025 period are very similar—5.3 percent in the January projections versus 5.2 percent in the March baseline.

2. Under current law, funding for the program in 2015 consists of two semiannual allotments of $2.85 billion—amounts that are much smaller than the allotments made in the four preceding years. (The first semiannual allotment in 2015 will be supplemented by $15.4 billion in onetime funding for the program.) Following the rules prescribed by the Deficit Control Act, CBO extrapolates the $2.85 billion provided for the second half of the year to arrive at projected annual funding of $5.7 billion.

3. Refundable tax credits reduce a filer's overall income tax liability; if the credit exceeds the rest of the filer's income tax liability, the government pays all or some portion of that excess to the taxpayer. Those tax credits also affect the budget, to a lesser extent, by reducing tax revenues; those revenue effects are not shown in the tables.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0023] received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

786. A letter from the Administrator, FSA Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Biomass Crop Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AI27) received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

787. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Korean Air Lines (KAL) of Seoul, South Korea; to the Committee on Financial Services.

788. A letter from the Director, Division of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: Transmission of Documents and Information (RIN: 1240-AA09) received March 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

789. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, OPS, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Professional Standards for State and Local School Nutrition Programs Personnel as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0030] (RIN: 0584-AE19) received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

790. A letter from the Deputy Director, ASPA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Official Symbol, Logo and Seal received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

791. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Sec. 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 [MB Docket No.: 05-311] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

792. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter asking Congress to raise the debt limit as soon as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

793. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Correction and Disclosure for Charitable Hospitals (Rev. Proc. 2015-21) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

794. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Empowerment Zone Designation Extension Notice [Notice 2015-26] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

795. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reporting for Premium; Basis Reporting by Securities Brokers and Basis Determination for Debt Instruments and Options [TD 9713] (RIN: 1545-BL46) (RIN: 1545-BM60) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); 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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (Rept. 114–45). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1385. A bill to provide for a legal framework for the operation of public unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1386. A bill to include subcontracting goals for small business concerns in the responsibilities of certain members of a Federal agency responsible for acquisition; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the determination of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without regard to alien agricultural seasonal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1388. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 1389. A bill to improve the mortgage finance system and the regulation of financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the requirements for joint venture offers for bundled or consolidated contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr.