

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2015.
Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena issued in connection with court-martial proceedings.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

JACKIE SPEIER,
Member of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before we get started, I would like to discuss a matter of deep importance to the gentleman and myself, of a dear friend, John Stipicevic. He is a trusted aide for many years on this floor, and he will be departing us. He wants to spend more time with his wife, Kristin, and their new baby, Lucy Grace. I would like to thank him for his service to this country and his service to this conference. I know he is a good friend, also, to the gentleman across the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the public's perception—because that is what is covered most—is the confrontation that occurs between the parties, the differences that we have. But one thing that is a reality that the public ought to feel good about is they have extraordinarily good staffers, staffers who are committed to their country, to the House, and to the American people, who do wonderful work.

Stip is a wonderful, wonderful positive participant, who made this House a better place in which to work, who made the substance of what we did more understandable for Members. He facilitated cooperation. He did not create confrontation. And we will miss it.

We wish him the best, of course, as he leaves the House of Representatives, like so many of our staffers do, who go on to do better than most of us are doing, at least from a certain perspective. I want to wish him the very, very best. I want to thank him on behalf of not only myself, because he is a good friend, but also on behalf of my staff with whom he has worked very closely over the years. I know all of them appreciated the relationship they had, and have, with him. So I want to congratulate him and wish him good luck and great success.

I yield, again, to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words about Stip.

Let me get to the schedule.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, no votes are expected in the House on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that first votes of the week are expected at 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and the remainder of the week, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House may also consider a bill to extend certain provisions of the Tax Code.

Additionally, I expect the House to consider an omnibus appropriations bill.

Mr. HOYER. Just to repeat—of course, the majority leader announced it yesterday, and again today—we will not be having votes on Monday.

Has the gentleman decided whether there will be a pro forma session yet on Monday?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still looking at that, and I will let the gentleman know as soon as possible.

□ 1315

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

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Members, as the majority leader has indicated, will not be having votes until, at the earliest, 6:30 on Tuesday.

I believe that the balance of the week—or such time as may be necessary in order to complete the work of this session of the Congress—will dictate the length of time that we go on the schedule. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. It is my intention that we will stay until we get our work done, but when we get our work done, we will depart for the holiday season.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

To further clarify, I know there has been some talk about a CR that may be sufficient to get us into next year. As I understand what the majority leader is saying, it is our intention not to do that, but to, in fact, complete the appropriations process and the funding of government for the balance of the year until September 30 of next year. Is that accurate, sir?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

Yes. As the gentleman knows, we just passed a CR moving into next Wednesday. It is our intention to have our

work done and to not need to pass any further CRs.

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

I would say to him that—and I think he knows and I know—although I don't think either of us is directly involved in the hour-to-hour negotiations that are going on—but, nevertheless, negotiations still go on, Mr. Speaker—I am hopeful that, on both sides, we can see that which is unacceptable to the other side and put that aside for a later day.

The appropriations process, of course, is about funding government. The appropriations process is about keeping government open. The appropriations process is about how do we best serve the American people.

I am hopeful that that will not get mired down or prevent our success in coming to an agreement on the omnibus because of issues on which, clearly, there are significant policy differences and which can be argued on another day and in another bill, but will not undermine the completion of the appropriations process.

I presume the majority leader hopes that as well. Hopefully, over the next few hours and, really, over the next couple of days, we will work on that because, if we don't, we are going to be here on the 17th, the 18th, the 19th, or the 20th, according to what the majority leader said, in order to get our work done.

Is that accurate, Mr. Leader?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

It is our intention to get an omnibus done in a bipartisan manner. Those are the negotiations that are going on now. I'm hopeful that we can get that done and finished by next week.

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

The only thing I would add, Mr. Speaker, is there is also a tax extender bill that is being discussed. The tax extenders are some of the items that Members on both sides of the aisle believe are appropriate and necessary to help grow our economy and create jobs, which has support on both sides of the aisle.

But it is clear that the extender bill, as I understand it, is a bill that can be very, very large—as large as \$800 billion in unpaid tax cuts—which, from our perspective on our side in the House of Representatives, will substantially exacerbate our deficit, and that will undermine the viability of getting tax reform done in the next session or in the years to come.

We think, therefore, that it would be far preferable to have pending getting tax reform done—hopefully, next year if we can do so in a bipartisan fashion—and to have a shorter term. The Senate passed a 2-year bill, which is really a 1-year lookback to 2015 and a year forward to 2016. We need to certainly do that. I think we could get a bipartisan vote for that. I don't know where the negotiations are on that bill.

I would like to inform the majority leader, as he probably knows privately, that we have great concerns on this side of the aisle about a bill of the magnitude that is being discussed and the impact it will have on our deficit, on discretionary spending, and on our opportunity to pass major needed—and a bipartisan expectation of doing—tax reform so our tax system is simpler, fairer, is producing the revenue that we need, but it is also making sure the American people understand and can be provided a much simpler system for them to have to respond to.

If the majority leader wants to make any remarks on that, I yield to the gentleman. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2015, TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, December 15, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S ATTACK ON GUN RIGHTS

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, the horrific attacks in San Bernardino underscore the pressing need to defeat ISIS and radical Islamic extremism. But instead of trying to fix his failed policies, which contributed to the very rise of ISIS in the first place, the President is instead attempting to divert and distract the American people by leveraging this tragedy to announce his plans to issue an executive order on gun control.

Just yesterday the White House called the San Bernardino attack an incident of gun violence. Mr. Speaker, it was terrorism, and I refuse to let this President use acts of terrorism as a means to try another end run around this Congress.

Earlier this year I stood up against the administration's attempted ammunition ban and I was successful in getting that unconstitutional policy rescinded.

So today I am again standing up against this latest attack on our constitutional gun rights in this country because, if this administration refuses to take terrorism seriously, then the American people will need their Second Amendment rights more than ever before.

CLIMATE DAMAGE WIPES OUT LIVELIHOODS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, while many around the world are watching the climate talks in Paris, some of my constituents along the San Francisco Peninsula are watching the Pacific Ocean. That is because an unusually warm climate and water has led to a record toxic algae bloom that contaminates the crabs. Our critical Dungeness crab fishery is closed, and our fishermen are suffering.

One Half Moon Bay fisherman said: “If you had asked me 6 months ago about crab, I would’ve told you we’re going to feed our families, we’re going to send our kids to college. And I’m not talking just the junior college. If they want to go to Princeton, crab can make this happen with my work ethic. This situation is a new one. This was like getting the legs pulled out from under you.”

So if my Republican colleagues are wondering if climate damage is real or if it is affecting real people, I encourage them to see the docked fishing boats and the landlocked crab pots in my district. Climate damage is wiping out people’s livelihoods. We cannot let this become the new normal.

CBO REPORT ON WORK REDUCTION FROM AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to detail a report from the Congressional Budget Office that was released this month, which says the Affordable Care Act will lead to a reduction in work hours equivalent to 2 million jobs over the next decade.

The key reason for the work reduction, according to the CBO, is healthcare subsidies which are tied to income, which will raise effective tax rates for Americans and will create a disincentive for people who are seeking promotions or new, higher paying jobs.

The report also points to tax increases and penalties as a reason for the work reduction, including the employer mandate, which imposes penalties on those companies with more than 50 employees that do not provide insurance.

The House and the Senate recently passed legislation that would repeal key parts of the Affordable Care Act, including the employer mandate. Unfortunately, President Obama has pledged to veto it.

We can’t allow these job losses to become a reality. This is why I will continue to work with my colleagues to make commonsense changes that will improve our Nation’s healthcare sys-

tem and will revitalize economic growth and jobs.

MAJOR CAMERON GALLAGHER

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the service of Major Cameron Gallagher.

I first met Cameron in 2013, when he was serving as a military fellow in my office, advising me on a range of defense and foreign policy issues. For the past 2 years, Cameron has worked in the Army’s Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison, where he has continued to be a trusted adviser to me and to other Members of the House. Cameron’s service will now take him and his family to Fort Carson, Colorado, where he will serve as a battalion executive officer in the 4th Combat Aviation Brigade.

Cameron truly represents the very best our Armed Forces and our Nation have to offer. Intelligent and dedicated, Cameron is such an optimist that he sent me trash talk emails for days in the lead-up to last year’s Stanford-Army football game. Stanford won 35-0, but that is not really the point.

Cameron, we will miss having you here in Congress. We wish you, C.C., and Henry all the best in your new assignment. And don’t forget the Schiff Hotel California policy. You can check out anytime you like, but you can never leave.

MINING SCHOOLS ENHANCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we need more mining engineers. Approximately 70 percent of the mining industry’s technical leaders will reach retirement age over the next 10 to 15 years.

In our mining engineering programs, almost all current faculty members will need to be replaced by the coming decade.

At our Federal agencies, there is already a dangerous lack of employees with the necessary technical expertise to carry out their essential duties, such as permitting and inspections.

Mr. Speaker, this is irresponsible, and it can have catastrophic consequences like we saw with the Gold King Mine disaster.

In order to sustain our Nation’s mining schools, we need to ensure that vital Federal funding is made available for faculty to conduct more research and to better educate the next generation of mineral scientists and engineers.

It can be done by using the existing funding streams under SMCRA. My bill, H.R. 3734, the Mining Schools Enhancement Act, will accomplish this goal.