

Higgins	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Himes	Maloney,	T.
Hinojosa	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Honda	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Hoyer	Matsui	Schakowsky
Huffman	McCullum	Schiff
Israel	McDermott	Schrader
Jackson Lee	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Jeffries	McNerney	Scott, David
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Jolly	Moore	Sherman
Jones	Moulton	Sires
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Keating	Nadler	Speier
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Neal	Takai
Kildee	Nolan	Takano
Kilmer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Kind	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Titus
Kuster	Pascarella	Tonko
Langevin	Payne	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Peters
Lawrence	Peters	Van Hollen
Lee	Pingree	Vargas
Levin	Pocan	Veasey
Lewis	Polis	Vela
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lipinski	Quigley	Visclosky
Loebssack	Rangel	Walz
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Lowenthal	Richmond	Schultz
Lowey	Rigell	Waters, Maxine
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Royalb-Allard	Watson Coleman
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Blackburn	Gosar	Smith (WA)
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tipton
Eshoo	Perry	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Ruiz	Whitfield

□ 1210

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 161, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on the following votes because I was absent due to a family emergency. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 158 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 622, "nay", rollcall No. 159 on Passage of H.R. 622, "aye", rollcall No. 160 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 1105, "nay", rollcall No. 161 on Passage of H.R. 1105, "aye".

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. CURTIS, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the resolution of the Senate (S. Con. Res. 11) "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following Members be the conferees on the part of the Senate, with instructions: Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TOOMEY,

Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. Kaine, and Mr. KING.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, I hereby reappoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Dr. Sharon Leon, Fairfax, Virginia.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL

Mr. HOYER. Before I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule, I would like to note the presence of the longest-serving Member of this House in history, one of the best legislators in the history of this House, and one of the most decent human beings I know. We are so proud to have him on the floor with us once again. His successor, whom he knows very well, DEBBIE DINGELL, is here with him as well.

John Dingell, Mr. Chairman, we welcome you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem, back to the House of Representatives. We are so glad to see you.

Mr. Chairman, the beautiful DEBORAH is doing a wonderful job representing your district.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. McCARTHY, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On 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 in the House.

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

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1195, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Advisory Boards Act, authored by Representative ROBERT PITTENGER. This bipartisan bill, which enjoys significant support from the Financial Services Committee, including the ranking member, will ensure that there is appropriate input given on actions being taken by the CFPB.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider two critical cybersecurity measures: H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, authored by Chairman DEVIN NUNES, and H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act, authored by Chairman MIKE McCaul. These bipartisan bills will improve cyber threat information sharing between the private sector and the government and ensure that America can meet cyber challenges now and into the future.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. Initially, I would like to just bring up a question with reference to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Advisory Boards Act. The gentleman talked about bipartisan legislation. This, as the gentleman may know, was a very bipartisan bill, with one of your Members and one of my Members, Mr. HECK, on my side, joining together in committee overwhelmingly in favor of setting up an advisory board so that there would be input from small business. Unfortunately, as the gentleman knows, there has subsequently been added a funding source which undermines, from our perspective, at the same time that we are trying to add an advisory board, the operations of the Consumer Financial Protection advisory board.

Mr. Leader, it is somewhat ironic that we just passed \$300 billion in reduced revenues without paying for them and are now worried about \$9 million. The Bible has something to say about the mote in one's eye being the object of attention. But it seems somewhat ironic, and I would hope that we could return this bill, which is a very admirable bill, to a bipartisan condition and not undermine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau at the same time that we are trying to give it some additional advice and counsel.

I would be glad to yield to my friend with, hopefully, perhaps a suggestion where we might return this bill to its bipartisan and overwhelmingly supported-on-both-sides-of-the-aisle condition.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the only change in this bill is to make sure that the taxpayers are protected and not increase the debt. It is just a simple pay-for as we move forward. It has got bipartisan support coming out of the committee, and we hope that we could be able to move forward on the floor.

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

I think the gentleman knows that I am one of the biggest proponents of

paying for things, which is why I voted against your two tax bills on the floor today. They are not paid for, and \$300 billion of revenue will be reduced. That will exacerbate the deficit. That is why we have PAYGO. So I am supportive of PAYGO, but I would like to see if we can reach a bipartisan agreement on a pay-for which does not undermine the operations of the consumer financial protection board. I know your side, with all due respect, Mr. Leader, does not like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and would like to repeal it and reduce its funding greatly. We disagree with that. We have a great disagreement on that proposition.

So all I am saying is we have a bill on which there is bipartisan support. I see my friend, Mr. LUCAS, on the floor on the ag bill. We had that on his bill, and he gave one of the most eloquent statements on the floor that I have heard about. Look, we have a bipartisan agreement; don't look bipartisanship in the eye and say "no."

So we are turning a bipartisan bill into a partisan bill not because we are against paying for it—we are for paying for it. But we are against undermining the ability of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect consumers, as it was designed to, and we need to adequately fund it without adding responsibilities and reducing its resources to protect the public.

If the gentleman wants to say anything further, I will yield to him. If not, I will go on to another subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his comments. But as the gentleman knows, most every American has had to, in the last few years, cut back based upon the economy. I do not believe it is too difficult to find \$9 million out of a \$600-million-per-year budget, and I would think the consumers would expect that of the organization as well. We can all tighten our belts to make sure that the taxpayer is protected, and I look forward to continuing to work with you. I do believe, knowing you think things should be paid for as well, that there is an opportunity here that we can find 9 out of 600.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think what I hear is we are not going to reach bipartisan agreement on that, and that is unfortunate.

The cybersecurity bill, as the gentleman mentioned, will we consider the two cybersecurity-related bills together or separately? We have heard some information over here about whether they may be joined together or whether we are to consider them discretely, each one of them. I think they are relatively noncontroversial in some respects. But would the gentleman tell us how they might be considered?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I usually don't like to get ahead of the Rules Committee, but we

will consider these bills separate but then joined together and sent to the Senate.

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

The gentleman also has brought up the issue of—well, I don't think you brought it up, but let me talk about it. As we know, April 15 occurred yesterday. The budget was supposed to be adopted as of yesterday. As the gentleman and I both know, when my party was in charge, as when your party is in charge, we haven't met that April 15 deadline. But I know the gentleman has talked about reconciliation instructions.

The Senate bill, of course, does have reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee and to the HELP Committee, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, but none others. The House apparently has left itself room to have instructions to every committee.

Can the gentleman tell us, A, when he expects the budget conference to report back and when we might consider that conference on the floor? Then, secondly, whether or not he believes that there will be reconciliation instructions beyond the Affordable Care Act. We understand that that is contemplated. But beyond the Affordable Care Act, does the gentleman expect reconciliation instructions on other matters?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, since my side of the aisle has taken the majority, we have done a budget every single year. We have passed the budget on this floor. We have voted this week to go to conference, we have appointed conferees, and we were actually excited about the change in the Senate and their moving a budget, so we are very hopeful that we will get this done very quickly. I do not want to get ahead of the conferees working, but I am hopeful that they will get back soon. Seeing how far they go, I am hopeful that they will be able to give as much flexibility as possible when it comes to reconciliation.

Mr. HOYER. So the gentleman contemplates going beyond reconciliation instructions on the Affordable Care Act to other matters? For instance, in the House budget, we replace seniors' Medicare guarantee with a premium support voucher. Would the majority leader expect a reconciliation instruction on replacing seniors' Medicare guarantee with such a premium support voucher?

Mr. McCARTHY. As the gentleman knows, I do not like to get ahead of the conferees. I will let them work forward and see what comes back. As soon as their work is done, we will notify everyone and have it back on to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I know that you don't want to anticipate, but, obviously, our Members are concerned about what they ought to be considering and planning for and making themselves aware

of the facts about. Does the gentleman expect a reconciliation instruction on the part of the budget that was passed by the House that turns Medicare into a capped block grant reducing the funding by approximately one-third?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's going line by line, but if I can be very clear, I do not want to get in front of the conference. As soon as they get their work done, there will be plenty of time to notify all Members of what comes before the House, and we will notify them at that time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I hope that is the case. And I would hope that we did not have that. We talked about—I have talked about and you have talked about—just now, bipartisanship. I would hope that we would pass a budget that then the Appropriations Committee and other committees would be able to work on so that we could have a bipartisan product, as opposed to another confrontation that would go way past October 1 of this year, and we would be back in the position of having to have a continuing resolution on which there would be a confrontation and the threat of shutting down government.

□ 1230

Obviously, to the extent that we can, as I suggested with respect to the Consumer Financial Protection Board, to the extent that we can have bipartisan agreement—the gentleman that was just with me was Senator McCANNELL.

Noting the passage of the sustainable growth rate bill which dealt with community health centers and dealt with the children's health insurance program, Senator McCANNELL said: The American people expect us to do work.

He used the SGR example as a way that we did work in a constructive, bipartisan fashion, making compromises on both sides of the aisle, with Speaker BOEHNER and Leader PELOSI representing the two parties, came together and worked, and my staff and I think your staff participated as well, and we came to an agreement.

I would hope that we would be able to do that with respect to the budget and appropriation process. Obviously, the budget was not that way. All Democrats voted against the budget. We don't like the sequester. We think the sequester undermines the national security and undermines the investments that America needs to make in its infrastructure and its education, its health care, its environment, its basic research, and other items that are of critical importance if we are going to grow the economy and create jobs.

I would hope that we could on these issues—while I understand the gentleman is saying that we will be noticed of it, but I would hope we could have some discussions about it so that we could come to, frankly, as we did with SGR, an agreement.

That agreement, as you know, passed with 392 votes. You worked hard on it;

I worked hard on it; the Speaker worked hard on it; Leader PELOSI worked hard on it—392 votes in this House. That was one of the best days we had this year. As a matter of fact, it might have been the best day we had this year.

The items that I raised are of, obviously, great concern. Hopefully, we could have discussions about that before being simply informed that those would be in reconciliation instructions.

Let me go, if I can now, the gentleman made a very eloquent statement yesterday. That statement was on the 150th anniversary of the assassination of one of the greatest Americans in history; that, of course, was Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln helped cure one of the blackest blots on America's reputation and America's moral commitment by issuing the Emancipation Proclamation. However, Mr. Leader, as you know, subsequent to the adoption of the 13th Amendment, which the gentleman also referenced, we had vicious segregation. We had policies put in place that prevented African Americans from registering, much less voting.

The gentlemen and I have had the opportunity to walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge together where Alabama State troopers were sent by Governor Wallace to stop people from simply going to register to vote.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS and our friend JOHN LEWIS, one of the great heroes of the American civil rights movement, have cosponsored a bill—JIM SENSENBRENNER being the former Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS being the ranking Democrat—have sponsored a bipartisan bill which would return the protections that were undermined by the Supreme Court decision in the *Shelby County v. Holder* case.

I believe it is important—and I think the gentlemen share this view—that we absolutely protect the rights of every American to register and to vote and to ensure that the policies adopted by any State or any county or any municipality are not such that it undermines the ability of citizens to register and to vote. This is bipartisan legislation.

I would ask the majority leader respectfully, and one of the great attributes to Abraham Lincoln who talked about a nation divided against itself, talked about a nation who did not give equality to all of its citizens, talked about a nation that needed to respect the inclusion of all people irrespective of their race, I would ask respectfully that the legislation cosponsored by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS and JOHN LEWIS be brought to this floor so that we can, in fact, ensure that every American—every American—has the right to register, to vote, and is protected by their Federal Government from the discrimination and exclusion that we know historically has happened too often.

I urge my friend, the majority leader, to bring that bill, that bipartisan bill, to the floor for debate, open to amendment and discussion and a vote.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his comments regarding Abraham Lincoln as well.

Yesterday was the 150th anniversary of his passing. It was also a significant day yesterday, as well, of the Jackie Robinson anniversary of breaking the color barrier in baseball.

As the gentleman knows, as we have walked across that bridge many times with our good friend JOHN LEWIS, the difference that it has made in those last years from when he first was beaten across that bridge and how far this country has come, and this country can go much further.

The bill is before the committee. It is not scheduled for the floor next week. We will watch as the committee continues to work. The gentleman and I can continue to work on the issue to make sure we get this done.

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

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

WELCOMING DR. JULIO FRENK AS THE SIXTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

(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 today to congratulate Dr. Julio Frenk on being named as the sixth president of the University of Miami and the first Hispanic to be selected for this job. Dr. Frenk joins my hometown Hurricanes after a 6-year tenure as dean of Harvard's School of Public Health.

The son of German and Spanish immigrants who settled in Mexico, Dr. Frenk's remarkable career as an academic and a public servant also includes his service as the Mexican Minister of Health under President Vicente Fox.

I would like to welcome Dr. Frenk and his wife, Dr. Felicia Knaul, to south Florida and to the Miami Hurricanes family. I look forward to working with him as he leads the university's continued transformation into a global research hub in a world class international city.

Go Canes.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Trade Adjustment Assistance was designed as a lifeline for hundreds of thousands of America's workers, their last line of defense when they lose their jobs through no fault of their own thanks to

NAFTA and other bad trade deals that outsourced their jobs to foreign countries. Many workers never qualified even when they were eligible.

The American people need much more than just adjustment assistance for thousands more workers whose jobs will be outsourced by the Trans-Pacific Partnership. America needs trade deals, themselves, to be adjusted, so they, again, create jobs in America rather than suck them away to foreign shores.

This hasn't happened for nearly four decades. Since 1976, our Nation has lost 47.5 million jobs due to lopsided trade agreements. Last year, our economy lost 16 percent of its growth due to the overhang of the growing trade deficit.

Thousands of steel workers in Lorain, Ohio, have just been pink-slipped and laid off due to imported steel. With every lost U.S. job, our Nation's economy gets weakened. Our working families become less financially secure. Rising into the middle class becomes impossible.

What we need and must learn is the history of bad trade deals. Congress can't repeat the mistakes of the past. Our Nation needs a new trade model that creates more jobs in America, instead of outsourcing our jobs to foreign shores.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN LEAHR

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, another outstanding member of America's Greatest Generation departed from this world.

Lieutenant John Leahr—Johnny, as he was known—a lifelong Cincinnati, is an example of an American we should all strive to emulate. Lieutenant John Leahr was a member of the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African American fighter pilots that flew missions protecting Allied bombers over the skies of Europe during World War II.

On March 27, 2009, 6 years before Mr. Leahr's death, the Tuskegee Airmen were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal. Lieutenant Leahr had hoped that the successes of the Red Tails, as they were known, would shift the racial prejudices that African Americans faced before the war; but, after fighting fascism overseas, he had to continue fighting discrimination back home.

Over the years, times changed, and the people of Cincinnati and our entire Nation began to recognize the heroism of Lieutenant John Leahr. I had the honor to get to meet John in recent years, and his story is remarkable, a story that needs to be told for unending generations.

Today, I, with all of you, honor his courage and thank him for his unparalleled service.