



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016

No. 42

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 16, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, 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, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WIDESPREAD FLOODING IN LOUISIANA

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to my home State of Louisiana, where thousands of people throughout the State, and in my congressional district particularly, are dealing with the aftermath of widespread flooding.

Beginning on Wednesday of last week, heavy rains began falling across northeast Louisiana. By Friday, we had recorded over 2 feet of rain. Creeks

and lakes overflowed. Water topped levees and spilled into neighborhoods. State highways looked like rivers, and parking lots looked like ponds.

Since the flood began, I have visited a number of parishes throughout my district. Whether it was in north, central, or southeast Louisiana, the one constant was there were far, far too many people hurting.

As of yesterday, at least four people had died from the flood in Louisiana. Nearly 15,000 homes had been reported damaged, and the number will definitely grow. More than 6,800 people have requested help from FEMA, and that number will likely grow as well.

Lives were changed last week, and we have a long way to go to recover. The President has approved, at the request of the Governor, Federal disaster aid for most parishes affected. This is a great, great thing, and we need it. I appreciate that support very much.

I have lived in Louisiana all my life. I still live in a soybean field in northeast Louisiana not far from where I grew up in a cornfield, also close to my home. I have seen a lot of things in my time and I have seen a lot of rain come, but I have never seen as much rain as we received last week.

Unfortunately, Louisiana is all too familiar with disasters. In the last 10 years, we have seen five hurricanes, an oil spill, and now this horrific flooding. But each time we face adversity, Louisiana and her people respond. We follow Christ's commandment, which is to love and help one another.

I have been so inspired by the way our communities across Louisiana have answered the call to serve: packing sandbags in the wee hours of the morning, volunteering at shelters, cooking food for relief workers, housing stranded family members; and sometimes people who are not even known to these people, they are taking them into their homes. The acts of kindness just keep coming and coming, and we need more of them to keep coming.

There is one group of individuals I want to especially recognize, and that is our first responders. The National Guard has rescued over 3,295 people so far. Sheriffs, deputies, other law enforcement officials, and firefighters are still tallying their numbers because they have saved so many lives. These men and women have logged countless hours and put themselves in harm's way to save the lives of others.

I have heard stories of some officers using makeshift rafts to pull people from flooded homes and getting them out before waters overtook their home.

I have seen videos of the National Guard with Black Hawk helicopters rappelling into floodwaters and pulling people to safety who were clinging to trees. I saw one instance where a gentleman had been in a tree for up to 2 days.

It is just incredible what our first responders have done.

There is another story about our power company employees saving a man whose truck was swept off the road by water. Again, he had been in a tree, hanging on for life, for 2 full days before he was saved.

Story after story in parish after parish show the incredible strength our Louisianians have and the first responders' abilities and their caring and what they have done for our State.

The rains have stopped for now, but we are not in the clear by any means. The water is pushing most of our rivers over their flood stages in a big, big way. I hope another round of floods isn't on the way.

In Louisiana, we know how to bounce back from adversity, but we will only do so with the continued generosity of those who are in a position to help others. I ask the Nation to remember Louisiana in its prayers as we continue and start the process of rebuilding.

□ 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.

H1391

A REALISTIC INFRASTRUCTURE AGENDA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the tortured Presidential nominating process continues with generalities and insults, but maybe we could avert our eyes and attention for a moment and consider some real challenges that we face closer at hand.

The backdrop in the metropolitan area in Washington, D.C., is that D.C. Metro has shut down for the entire day to deal with safety concerns—an unprecedented step. The bigger issue for most people in the region, for most riders and potential users, is the system's reliability.

It is a symbol of a lack of resources and a lack of leadership, not just for Metro, but for the States of Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government itself. They have, sadly, been lacking in leadership, in vision, and providing the resources for this vital system for a region of approximately 4 million people.

At the same time, we have a looming water and sewer crisis, almost 2 million miles of pipe, in some cases long past its useful life. A water main breaks every 2 minutes. We have serious problems with system reliability with sewage.

The city of Flint, Michigan, and its terrible situation with lead in the drinking water has captured attention, but it has also pointed out for people who look deeper that this is a problem that afflicts communities across the country. We have, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, an overall grade, as a country, of D dealing with sewer and water challenges.

What if the major candidates would train their attention on serious proposals to deal with the infrastructure crisis already upon us? Not mere generalities, but let's talk about how they would pay for it. What is their vision to deal with multiple needs, and how would they set priorities?

It is not really that hard. In a number of very red States, governments have stepped up to raise the gas tax and fund transportation. In metropolitan communities across the country, in red States and blue, people are dealing with their challenges, proposing to their communities funding and vision to solve the problem.

I have got bipartisan legislation to establish a Federal water infrastructure trust fund to help start in that regard.

We ought to fix the transportation funding. There is broad support amongst labor, business, profession AAA truckers to raise the gas tax and be able to deal with our transportation challenges.

Finally, we should embrace technology in transportation, things from self-driving, autonomous vehicles, elec-

tronic payment for road systems, a road user charge being experimented on in the State of Oregon. These are mechanisms that would help us update, modernize, and make these systems more effective.

And by the way, when you hear all those candidates talking about strengthening the middle class and the economy, these proposals would put millions of people to work at family-wage jobs in every community across America. It would strengthen safety and liveability and bring people together.

You know, when we have faced up to infrastructure challenges, whether it is Dwight Eisenhower's interstate freeway system, what we have done in the past with clean water and clean air, those are things that are broadly supported by Americans. An infrastructure agenda, a realistic infrastructure agenda has the potential of bringing people together while it strengthens America, and it would certainly be a nice change of pace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KRIS ANNE VOGELPOHL

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to celebrate the life of Kris Anne Vogelpohl of Galveston. Many know Kris Anne Vogelpohl as the matriarch of the Galveston County Republican Party.

Kris Anne made her way from Colorado to Galveston, where she became chief therapeutic dietician at the University of Texas Medical Branch in 1950. It was at UTMB where she met her future husband, Dr. Elmer Vogelpohl.

Kris Anne didn't waste any time getting involved in the community and local politics, too. In fact, in 1955, Kris Anne became one of the founding members of the Galveston Republican Women. From there, she solidified her GOP trailblazer status by becoming chairwoman of the Galveston Republican Party, where she thereupon built a strong foundation for the party to grow and build on.

In addition to her political service, Kris Anne was an avid philanthropist within the community. One of the organizations she invested her time in was the Salvation Army, where she joined their county advisory board in 1959.

Kris Anne's unwavering commitment to the betterment of society was a sight to behold, Mr. Speaker. She made everyone feel so welcomed. She empowered so many people to take charge and get involved. Her enthusiasm for making our county, our State, and our country even greater was infectious. The proof is in the pudding. Galveston has become one of the strongest Republican counties along the Gulf Coast and in Texas.

Dr. Vogelpohl could often be seen with Kris Anne in event after event all

over Galveston County. You talk about stalwarts, Mr. Speaker. My prayer is that we all be such sterling examples to those who come behind us. Lord knows that Dr. Elmer, as I call him, and Kris Anne were—or make that are, quite frankly.

Kris Anne lived to be 90 years old. She was married for 55 years and is survived by her husband, two children, and six grandchildren.

Kris Anne may be gone, but in reality she is still here. She will forever be in the hearts and minds of the people she touched.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and my prayers are with Dr. Elmer, their children, their grandchildren, and with the great multitude of friends she served. My prayer is also may the Great Shepherd of the Sheep, even the Lord Jesus Christ, wrap them up in His loving arms and comfort them. May He bless them and keep them. May God bless them all, and may God bless the great State of Texas and Galveston County that Kris Anne loved so much.

In a wonderful way, He has been blessing us. He loaned us Kris Anne.

□ 1015

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER JACAI COLSON

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute and honor the life of Prince George's County Police Officer Jacai Colson, who was killed in the line of duty.

Line-of-duty deaths are always difficult to bear. A police officer or another first responder leaves their home, their station, or their vehicle, and their loved one, coworker, or partner expects to see them return.

My heart breaks for Jacai's loved ones and for the tight-knit community that is the Prince George's County Police Department.

On March 12, 2016, an off-duty detective, Police Officer First Class Jacai Colson, arrived at the District 3 police station in Landover, Maryland, with the intent of visiting a fellow officer, when matters took an unexpected turn for the worse.

We will continue to learn the details of this tragedy in the coming days. What we do know is that Officer Colson's actions saved lives and allowed his fellow officers to neutralize the threat, even as he made the ultimate sacrifice.

On behalf of the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland, I want to extend my appreciation to Officer Colson for his selfless and heroic actions and his relentless dedication to public service.

I would like to remember the legacy Officer Colson leaves behind. He was a Pennsylvania native who played quarterback at Chichester High School in

Boothwyn, Pennsylvania, where he graduated.

Officer Colson then went on to play wide receiver and defensive back at Randolph-Macon College in Ashland, Virginia. His college football coach recalled Colson as “a really respectful kid and just a high-character young man. To be honest, he wasn’t a great player, but he was a really great person.”

Officer Jacai Colson was the grandson of a career police officer. He himself joined the Prince George’s County Police Department. After 2 years of service on the force, he joined the narcotics department. Officer Colson worked as an undercover detective. Later this week would have been his 29th birthday.

I well know how difficult a job our local police officers have. They are tasked with the tremendous responsibility of meeting the increasingly diverse needs of growing populations with diminishing resources.

At a time of so much national discussion about the relationship of law enforcement to our local communities, Officer Colson reminds us all of the important service and sacrifice of our men and women in blue.

Unfortunately, his death makes three officers that have been shot and killed in Maryland in 2016. Last month two officers from the Harford County Sheriff’s Office were fatally shot: Senior Deputy Mark Logsdon and Senior Deputy Patrick Dailey.

Today our police officers are being asked to be the first line of defense in our war on terror in addition to carrying out more traditional police work.

I want to thank them for their commitment to the citizens and families of this great State. They are Maryland’s heroes, and they have my utmost respect and support.

Officer Jacai Colson’s record of service was characterized by sacrifice, hard work, dedication to duty, and, most of all, by achievement. He leaves behind a legacy of service that others can and should aspire to.

Now that his time on Earth has come to a needlessly premature end, it is my hope that Officer Jacai Colson has found the peace he has earned. On behalf of this House, I extend my sincerest gratitude and condolences to James and Sheila Colson, his parents; his entire family; friends; Prince George’s County Police Chief Hank Stawinski; Major Kathleen Mills, District 3 Commander; the entire Prince George’s County Police Department; and the Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 89.

May God continue to comfort and sustain each of you.

AMICUS BRIEF ON BEHALF OF THE U.S. V. TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 639.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation of immigrants. But, more importantly, we are a Nation of laws. We are also a Nation governed by a Constitution, a Constitution designed by our Founders to protect the people from government.

This same Constitution enumerates specific powers to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, these same powers that this President has decided he does not need to uphold.

As a result, we, as a united legislative body, will act this week against the President’s executive amnesty and overreach. We must act because it is time that Congress—Republicans and Democrats—stand up for the Constitution of the United States and against President Obama, who has decided to turn his back on the American people.

We must act because the security and economic opportunity that Americans are so desperate for today come with respecting, not undermining, the spirit of self-government for which our Nation was founded.

Mr. Speaker, the President knows that he is not permitted to write laws. Yet, through his executive amnesty, he is directly attacking Congress’ Article I power.

Today Congress will once again say no to President Obama. We will come together as an institution representing the American people to promote self-government.

I will vote in favor of the resolution on behalf of the great people of Missouri’s Second Congressional District and in defense of the powerful words of James Madison in 1788:

“The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and prevent this very tyranny we see today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

GENOCIDE OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, there were two votes that occurred earlier this week on House Concurrent Resolution 75 and House Concurrent Resolution 121, which deal with very important and complex issues that I would like to talk about this morning.

I cosponsored and voted for House Concurrent Resolution 75 because of my grave concern about the genocide occurring against Christians, Alawites, Shiites, Druze, Yazidis, and other religious minorities in Syria.

However, I was extremely disappointed by amendment language that was later added to this resolution

that provides cover or an excuse for ISIS and other terrorist organizations committing this genocide.

Specifically, the language I object to is the following: “The protracted Syrian civil war and the indiscriminate violence of the Assad regime have contributed to the growth of ISIL and will continue to do so as long as this conflict continues.”

I fully reject this amendment to the resolution because it gives moral legitimacy to the actions of ISIS, al Qaeda, and others who are committing genocide against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities in Syria.

This amendment is an obvious attempt to make ISIS look like their cause is legitimate. This is absolutely unacceptable and undermines the very heart and intent of this resolution.

This is very unfortunate because the problem of the genocide against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities in Syria is very serious.

In fact, the main area in Syria where Christians and other religious minorities have any protection today from being slaughtered and where they can practice their religious faith without fear of prosecution is in the territory that is still controlled by the Syrian Government of Assad.

The reality is that the language added to this resolution, coupled with its sister resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 121, is really aimed at justifying the overthrow of Assad, the result of which would be a complete assault and elimination of Christians and other religious minorities in Syria.

The fact that this resolution, which was originally introduced to increase protection for Christians, Yazidis and other religious minorities, has now been hijacked so that it becomes a vehicle to increase the likelihood of an even greater genocide against those religious minorities is an absolute disgrace.

The reality is that, if the Assad regime is overthrown tomorrow, every Christian, every Yazidi, and every other religious minority and ethnic minority in Syria will be in even greater danger than ever before from the genocide being perpetrated by ISIS, al Qaeda, and others who are slaughtering them.

This resolution is no longer a sincere effort to protect religious minorities. It has instead become a resolution to give more legitimacy to ISIS and al Qaeda’s genocidal activities and would bring about an even greater genocide of those religious minorities by eliminating the only area where they now have refuge.

RECOGNIZING PRINCETON, INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an outstanding community in Indiana’s Eighth Congressional District.

It is no secret that the Hoosier State is home to hardworking, innovative, and compassionate people. In the Eighth District, we are leading the way.

Today I want to highlight a couple of great accomplishments in Princeton, Indiana.

Earlier this month high school senior Jackie Young, a star guard at Princeton Community High School, was awarded the Naismith Trophy. This prestigious award is presented annually to the men and women's college and high school basketball players who achieve great success on the court and solidifies Jackie as the Nation's top high school woman basketball player.

To us in southern Indiana, the award comes as no surprise. With 3,268 career points, Jackie is Indiana's all-time leading scorer. She is a natural leader on and off the court.

Congratulations to Jackie. We wish her all the best as she prepares for her next step, playing for Notre Dame.

Additionally, a community leader and anchor of our local economy, Toyota Motor Manufacturing, will soon celebrate the 20th anniversary of its ground breaking in Gibson County.

Over the past 20 years, the plant has been a leader in economic development for our region, providing thousands of jobs and supporting local organizations.

I have had the pleasure of meeting many of the hardworking and dedicated team members at Toyota in Princeton. These men and women make quality products in Indiana that are being sold across the country and around the world, and they take pride in doing it.

On behalf of all Hoosiers across the Eighth District, I thank everyone at Toyota Motor Manufacturing for your continued commitment to our community and congratulate them on this tremendous milestone.

As one of Indiana's designated Stellar Communities, Princeton is, without a doubt, a shining example of what our great State has to offer. It is an honor and privilege to represent the people of Gibson County and Princeton here in Congress.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WENONAH HIGH SCHOOL LADY DRAGONS ON THIRD CONSECUTIVE ALABAMA GIRLS 5A BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of rising today for the third time in 3 years to congratulate the Wenonah High School Lady Dragons on winning their third consecutive Alabama girls class 5A basketball championship.

The Lady Dragons beat Central High School from Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 58-33, imploring what the local news said was a suffocating pressure defense to

cruise to their third consecutive title on March 5, 2016, at the Birmingham-Jefferson Convention Complex Legacy Arena in Birmingham, Alabama. The Wenonah Lady Dragons forced 32 turnovers that resulted in 19 points on their way to victory.

"The sign on our wall says 'Discipline plus defense equals championships,'" said Wenonah High School coach Emanuel Bell. "We're going to press. That's what we do." They put pressure on the other side.

□ 1030

The MVP of the game was Alexis Dye, who scored 12 points and grabbed 10 rebounds. "Our defense is what got us here and led us to the win," said Dye.

The other star of the team was Wenonah's very own Kaitlyn Rodgers, who scored 12 points, grabbed 14 rebounds, blocked 6 shots, handed out 3 assists, and added 2 steals. "This is what we came here for, and we want to go out with a bang," said Rodgers.

Mr. Speaker, more noteworthy is the fact that, according to Coach Bell, "Every kid on my time averages a 3.0 GPA or higher. It's easy to coach players with academic and athletic talent," says Coach Bell.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the month of March as Women's History Month, recognizing trailblazing women throughout our history, clearly these young women have blazed their own remarkable path, both athletically and academically as student athletes, and we are happy, proud to commend them.

So on behalf of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, I want to extend a heartfelt congratulations to these outstanding players and to Coach Bell.

While March Madness has gripped the rest of the State and the Nation, in Birmingham, Alabama, we are very proud of Wenonah High School's Lady Dragons. I am confident that these young ladies have bright futures ahead of them, and we will look back on these 3 consecutive years of championship wins with great accomplishment and pride.

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 10 o'clock and 31 minutes 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

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all who call upon Your name. Send Your Spirit to fill their hearts with those divine gifts You have prepared for them.

May Your grace find expression in their compassion for the weak and the poor among us, and may Your mercy encourage good will in all they do and accomplish this day.

As the Members of the people's House face the demands of our time, grant them and us all Your peace and strength, that we might act justly, love tenderly, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia 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 entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ISIL-DAESH CHEMICAL ATTACKS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we learned that ISIL/Daesh has continued their use of chemical attacks against innocent civilians, including children, with two attacks in northern Iraq. Over 600 people suffered burns, suffocation, and dehydration. And, sadly, a young child, Fatima, died from Saturday's murderous attack.

Officials have confirmed that ISIL has used chlorine and low-grade mustard gas to kill, incapacitate, and incite fear. Recent news reports say ISIL developed a special unit for chemical and biological attacks, which is a threat to American families.

It is sad that the President's legacy is weakness. He has not submitted a plan to Congress to defeat ISIL, and has repeatedly belittled their threat of

mass murder to American families. His legacy of failure is drowned children fleeing violence and dead children from chemical attacks.

I am grateful that the House of Representatives took a decisive stance against ISIL this week, accurately calling actions against Christians and other minorities genocide.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

God bless Hammond School.

STOP THE GENOCIDE

(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 in support of H. Con. Res. 75, which was passed unanimously Monday evening by the House. I regret that a family commitment kept me from being present for the vote on this important bill, which I am proud to cosponsor.

It has been with horror and dismay that we have watched the barbaric acts of ISIL against ethnic and religious minorities in Syria and Iraq. Proud people, including many Christians who have lived in the region for centuries, have been wiped out in a campaign of rape, forced conversion, and murder.

The crimes qualify as genocide, and they must be called as such. The global community has a duty, stemming both from the Genocide Convention and our common humanity, to destroy and defeat ISIL and to provide safe haven for those fleeing their monstrous acts.

The campaign of genocide against religious and ethnic minorities in Syria and Iraq must be stopped, and those responsible must face justice.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Women's History Month.

Since President Reagan's administration, we have designated the month of March as a time to acknowledge the enormous impact that generations of women have had on all of our lives.

I have been blessed to have many strong women in my life, from the medical professionals who worked by my side at both the Iron Mountain VA and Dickinson Memorial Hospital to the strong women in my family, and, finally, the many Members of Congress that I am humbled to serve beside today.

It is important to recognize the diverse and irreplaceable contributions that these women and so many others have made to our society while also acknowledging that there is still much work to be done.

While we recognize Women's History Month this March, we should honor the

important role that women play in our society every day and do our part to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to make their mark in the future.

BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Brain Awareness Week, part of a global campaign to increase public awareness about the benefits of brain research and the progress that has been made to address traumatic brain injuries.

TBIs are a significant health issue affecting our servicemembers, veterans, athletes and ordinary citizens. Military members are at increased risk for sustaining a TBI compared to civilians.

That is why I authored a law requiring the VA to assess its capacity to treat veterans with TBI and develop policies for TBI care and rehabilitation.

I recently toured the Stanford Neurosciences Institute to see how research can prevent and treat brain injuries and chronic traumatic encephalopathy, or CTE, a condition that typically affects people who experience repetitive brain traumas. Just this week the NFL admitted that there is a connection between football and CTE.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brain Awareness Week.

HONORING GENERAL JOHN "DOC" BAHNSEN, JR.

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Brigadier General John "Doc" Bahnsen, Jr., a Hancock County, West Virginia, resident who was recently recognized as a 2016 West Point Distinguished Graduate. I am honored to count Doc and his wife Peggy as my friends, and I cannot think of a man more deserving of this award.

General Bahnsen graduated from West Point in 1956 and began a 30-year career in the Army, including two tours in Vietnam. A member of the air cavalry, he piloted Hueys under fire.

He was one of the most highly decorated officers in Vietnam and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, five Silver Stars, and two Purple Hearts.

After Vietnam, General Bahnsen continued his service and helped to establish the National Training Center, where our soldiers prepare for deployment overseas.

In retirement, Doc has remained an active alumni at the Academy. He frequently travels to West Point to give lectures to cadets and is a leading booster for the West Point Rugby Team.

General Bahnsen is a true role model for America, and we should all strive to ascribe to his virtues. Through a life of service, he has proven how dedication, pragmatism, and patriotism can help make this country great again.

LOUIS VAN IERSEL POST OFFICE

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Louis Van Iersel by introducing a bill to rename the Sierra Madre post office in his memory.

Mr. Van Iersel's incredible life is a true example of the American Dream. He arrived in the United States as an immigrant from the Netherlands in 1917 and enlisted in the U.S. Army the very next day. He learned English while working in the kitchen before moving on to the battlefield.

For his acts of bravery that saved over 1,000 American lives on a single mission, Mr. Van Iersel was awarded our Nation's highest recognition, the Medal of Honor.

After the war, Mr. Van Iersel moved to my district, in the city of Sierra Madre, to raise his family. But when World War II began, Mr. Van Iersel, along with his three sons, reenlisted, this time serving in the Marines.

An immigrant, veteran, father, and husband, Mr. Van Iersel exemplified courage and service to his country. It is my honor to memorialize him forever in this way.

HEIDI LAWRENCE'S STORY

(Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia's families are struggling to make ends meet due to the war on coal. As coal mines close due to crushing regulations from this administration, families are forced to make tough choices to survive.

Heidi Lawrence lives with her family in Cyclone, West Virginia. Her husband lost his coal-mining job more than 5 months ago. Here is her story:

We are doing everything we can do to pay our bills and raise our three kids.

We have already lost vehicles because it takes everything that he gets in unemployment to pay the house payment and power bill, two things that we have to try to keep, not to mention all the other bills that just don't get paid because we can't afford them.

My husband is a hardworking man. He has worked for 8 years in the coal mines for what we have, and we are now losing it.

Mr. Speaker, Heidi is a true West Virginia coal voice. Her family is an example of what happens when Washington regulates our coal jobs out of existence.

BLEEDING DISORDERS AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my support for Americans of all ages who have been affected by bleeding disorders.

Last month I met with Cole, a 10-year-old from my home State of Delaware. Cole has hemophilia, and he and his family struggle to afford the costly treatments he relies on.

Hearing Cole's story underlined the financial burden diseases like hemophilia place on many hardworking Americans. Hundreds of thousands of families across our country shoulder both the financial and emotional hardships that come with bleeding disorders.

That is why I am speaking today in recognition of Bleeding Disorders Awareness Month. This is not only an opportunity to raise awareness, but also to stress the importance of continued funding for research on diseases like this.

In Delaware, we are lucky to have the Nemours Center for Cancer and Blood Disorders. Their research efforts are leading the way to better treatments for those with bleeding disorders, but it is not enough.

I urge my colleagues to support research for these and other diseases so that those with chronic illnesses can look forward to a brighter future.

PENN STATE'S ROLE IN DEVELOPING NEXT-GENERATION ELECTRONICS

(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 today to congratulate Penn State University, which is located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, on receiving a nearly \$18 million grant from the National Science Foundation.

These grant funds will be used over the next 5 years and will be dedicated to the growth of two-dimensional crystals in order to research how they can be used in next-generation electronics. This is very technical work which, at times, involves the use of materials only a few atoms thick.

Eventually, this research is expected to play a significant role in the development of electronics which are faster, use less energy, and can be built on flexible surfaces.

This grant for Penn State's Materials Research Institute was only one of two in the Nation awarded by the National Science Foundation.

I am proud to see such groundbreaking research happening at Penn State. It stands as proof of the university's leadership in this area of research, along with a testament to the skills of its faculty. I know this funding will be put to great use.

□ 1215

GEORGIA-12 YOUTH LEADERSHIP SUMMIT 2016

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, my office hosted the first-ever Georgia-12 Youth Leadership Summit at Georgia Southern University. Over 400 students and educators from around Georgia's 12th Congressional District represented their high schools at the summit. I was amazed by the turnout. The energy of the students was inspiring.

Many thanks to Colonel Sam Anderson, Garrison Commander at Fort Gordon; Stephanie Miller, morning host of Hot Country Hits Y96; Tyson Summers, head football coach at Georgia Southern University; and Congressman TOM GRAVES of the 14th District of Georgia, for sharing their experiences with these young leaders.

These students are the future leaders of Georgia and our country, and I want them to realize their potential, and I want to see them succeed.

I would like to give a special thanks to Georgia Southern University for hosting us, and members of my staff for their hard work in organizing and setting up this event.

Our district is very fortunate to have these great students and educators. It was evident that the young folks of Georgia-12 are an exceptional class of leaders who will step up to any occasion.

What a wonderful honor it was to host this important event last Thursday in Statesboro, Georgia.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF COLONEL FREDRICK VAN HORN

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Frederick Earl Van Horn for more than 20 years of dedicated service at Georgia Military College, an outstanding educational institution in Milledgeville, Georgia.

Prior to his tenure at GMC, Colonel Van Horn honorably served our Nation in the U.S. Army, where he completed three tours of duty in Germany, one in Italy, and a 2-year combat tour in Vietnam. His military achievements and medals include a Purple Heart.

Colonel Van Horn wore many hats at GMC, including commander of cadets, dean of students, adjunct professor of ethics, director of character education, executive vice president, and interim president.

But I commend him most for instilling the core values of honor, duty, and country into our students, and preparing the next generation for the challenges of the upcoming decades. He

has distinguished himself as a servant-leader of the highest character and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Colonel Fred Van Horn on his retirement, and for his diligent, effective, and ardent leadership to GMC and our Nation.

I am grateful to have him in the Tenth District of Georgia. I sincerely thank him for his service and unyielding commitment to our State, and I wish Fred and his family the best on his retirement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 16, 2016 at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 337.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. 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 bill, H.R. 4596.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 640, I call up the bill (H.R. 4596) to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 640, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Broadband Deployment Act”.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION TO ENHANCEMENT TO TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The enhancements to the transparency rule of the Federal Communications Commission under section 8.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as described in paragraphs 162 through 184 of the Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order of the Federal Communications Commission with regard to protecting and promoting the open Internet (adopted February 26, 2015) (FCC 15–24), shall not apply to any small business.

(b) *SUNSET.*—Subsection (a) shall not have any force or effect after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) *REPORT BY FCC.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that contains the recommendations of the Commission (and data supporting such recommendations) regarding—

(1) whether the exception provided by subsection (a) should be made permanent; and

(2) whether the definition of the term “small business” for purposes of such exception should be modified from the definition in subsection (d)(2).

(d) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.*—The term “broadband Internet access service” has the meaning given such term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) *SMALL BUSINESS.*—The term “small business” means any provider of broadband Internet access service that has not more than 250,000 subscribers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important responsibilities we have as a Congress, I think, is to protect and advocate for those who may not have the power themselves or the influence or the armies of lawyers to contend with the redtape that all too often is created by our own government.

The bill we are considering today helps them. It does just that. It relieves, we believe, an unnecessary regulatory burden on really small Internet service providers, the little ISPs out there all over our districts across the land that are struggling to compete in this marketplace.

By extending an exemption to the Federal Communications Commission’s enhanced transparency rules, this bill allows these small businesses to focus on their core mission which, by the way, is providing broadband Internet access to customers all across America.

Over the last few months, we have spent a great deal of time focused on this issue. We first raised concerns with the Federal Communications Commission itself in a November letter from the Republican members of the Communications and Technology Sub-

committee, as well as the Small Business Committee.

We urged the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Tom Wheeler, to not only make the exemption that they had already had in their rules permanent, but also to raise that threshold for defining what a small business is to bring it in line with the definitions previously blessed by the Small Business Administration itself.

Well, the FCC, instead, extended the exemption for just 1 year. That is hardly time enough from these very onerous reporting requirements to make a difference, a 1-year extension.

Despite the overwhelming support in the record for a permanent extension, it was clear that Congress needed to act because the FCC wouldn’t. So I introduced a discussion draft to get the conversation going that would permanently extend the exemption and would increase the threshold by defining a small business to match the definition used by the Small Business Administration itself.

We had a hearing in January on this draft. We heard from a small business, an Internet service provider from a small community, who shared the dilemma that I think was indicative of what other small ISPs face in these circumstances.

Should they put up new equipment and expand and improve their service?

Or if they have to comply with all these reporting requirements called for by the FCC, they said, look, I am going to have to spend the money, instead, on hiring lawyers and other compliance officers to meet a reporting requirement that is new.

Should they improve service for customers, or should they devote those financial resources to sifting through regulatory language and drafting expensive and extensive reports on esoteric metrics like “packet loss”?

Now, often these small Internet service providers provide service to areas in the country that are rural, very rural, remote, or may not be as easy to serve or provide competitive options to customers of larger ISPs.

We should be making all efforts to promote the viability of these upstarts, these businesses, these small entrepreneurs that are trying to fill the gaps, serve and compete in this very competitive marketplace.

We should not be saddling them with additional requirements designed to snuff them out, basically, and that would make it more difficult for them to do the business that they want to participate in.

While there was some initial disagreement about how to ease some of these regulatory burdens, Mr. Speaker, Representative LOEBSACK and I were able to come to a compromise through some very serious negotiations. It worked out well, the legislative process.

We both agreed there is a problem. We said, okay, I don’t really like this

number; what about that number? We kept a focus on the mission and on the goal, which was to prevent this overreach of the Federal Government in the regulatory realm.

So in our amended bill, we extend the exemption from this reporting requirement to 5 years. It seems like a reasonable number. This gives greater regulatory certainty to these very small Internet service providers looking for stability and predictability when they are making some, frankly, pretty expensive investment decisions on equipment and access and expansion.

In addition, we increased the threshold for what is defining a small business from what the FCC had, and required the Federal Communications Commission to report back to Congress on this exemption, along with data about small ISPs that is currently lacking.

They don’t have all the data we think they need, so as their overseer, we are telling the FCC, go look at this, tell us what it means, come back to us. And we put a sunset on this as well so that Congress will have the opportunity in a couple of years to come back and say this makes sense; does it still make sense; is it in the best interest of consumers and innovation and development of technology in the marketplace.

In the end, I think this legislation represents a really solid, thoughtful compromise that will relieve the burdens for our smallest Internet service providers while leaving in place really important protections for consumers, Mr. Speaker.

See, this does not wipe out what they have to do to serve customers, the laws they have to follow, all that. That stays. We just said, you don’t have to do this really burdensome, costly, technical reporting to the government.

It is important to note that this bill does not affect the bright-line rules for managing traffic or the transparency rules adopted in the FCC’s 2010 rules. Customers will continue to have access to those disclosures they have come to expect, with the information needed to make informed decisions about their Internet service.

So I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. ESHOO, as well as, certainly, Mr. LOEBSACK, for working well with us on this bill.

I would like to particularly thank Kelsey Guyselman, from the majority committee staff, and Ashley Shillingsburg from Representative LOEBSACK’s staff—I hope I said that right—for their hard work in getting together and working this out.

This bipartisan process has resulted in a strong piece of legislation, and I am confident it will actually protect many and promote continued network investment and build-out by small business so we have a more vibrant, competitive marketplace and more service into areas that otherwise might

not ever get access to high-speed broadband which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is really important in places like Tennessee and Oregon and Iowa.

This legislation represents a commonsense approach to a problem that directly impacts so many of our constituents, and this solution will enable our country to continue its leadership in broadband deployment.

So I would urge my colleagues to join us in this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, broadband development is a critical issue for my home State of Iowa, as it is for Congressman WALDEN's home State of Oregon, as it is for so many rural areas, in particular.

We all know how important Internet access is for our constituents. Our students need access to the Internet to do their homework. Our businesses need the Internet to participate in the global economy and engage in the ever-growing world of e-commerce. Our healthcare providers need Internet access to serve patients with innovative telemedicine tools.

□ 1230

Our constituents simply can't compete in the 21st century economy that we live in without access to the Internet. It is really that simple.

Broadband deployment is especially important in our country's rural areas. Less than half—only 47 percent—of Americans living in rural areas have access to broadband. We as legislators need to do what we can to get these essential services to our constituents.

This bill is a commonsense, bipartisan measure, and I thank Congressman WALDEN for working with me on this bill that will help small Internet service providers throughout the country deploy broadband and serve our constituents.

In my home State of Iowa, we have 134—that is 134. We have 99 counties but 134 individual small ISPs. The smallest provider in our State is based in my district and serves only 100 subscribers.

As a whole, these companies serve a median of only 750 subscribers. I am proud of the work done by these small businesses that serve the families and businesses that live on farms or in small towns that otherwise might not have any options.

Small ISPs do not have the resources that the bigger guys do, and that is the important thing to remember with this bill. I support the FCC's enhanced transparency rules, and I think that it is important to make sure that consumers have the information they need to make informed decisions and to make sure they are protected. It is also important that we find a balance between providing consumers with technical information about their Internet and making sure that consumers have access in the first place.

I have heard from small businesses in my district that these rules as pro-

posed by the FCC will pose a significant burden and consume critical resources, potentially limiting their ability to invest in broadband development. For example, they have told me they would have to buy special equipment to measure things like packet loss on their networks. These are companies that may have only one technician on staff, so you can imagine the burden.

To address these burdens, this bill would continue the FCC's exemption of small business from the enhanced transparency rules for 5 years. It also instructs the FCC to gather data to determine the impacts of these rules so that we can revisit this issue down the road. When we revisit the issue, we have the opportunity then to figure out the best way to implement these important consumer protections going forward.

This short-term exemption gives small ISPs some much-needed certainty, allowing them to focus their resources on broadband deployment and thus serving their consumers.

I am glad that Mr. WALDEN and I were able to work together on a bipartisan compromise, and I thank our respective staffs as well. They did a great job.

While the original bill would have permanently exempted companies from the FCC's rule, this bill sunsets after 5 years, giving companies time to comply and giving the FCC time to report back to Congress on the real impact of these rules on consumers.

The original bill would have also exempted companies with 500,000 subscribers and 1,500 employees. I and others on the subcommittee were concerned that this threshold was simply too high, and we were able to come to an agreement to exempt ISPs serving half that many subscribers.

So this bill before us will give the certainty that small ISPs need, and it will help us achieve what I think we are all working for here, which is both expanded broadband access and the consumer protections that are needed by our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA). He is a very capable and able vice chair of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology and a man from Ohio who has done incredible work on a whole range of these communications issues.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4596, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. This legislation limits the regulatory burden on small Internet service providers, ISPs, serving rural America, just like in my area, and allows them to focus on improving services for consumers.

The Federal Communications Commission's 2015 Open Internet Order in-

cluded enhanced transparency rules for ISPs, requiring disclosure of commercial terms for prices and other fees and a number of complicated performance metrics. The FCC recognized that the burden of compliance would fall disproportionately on smaller providers and offered regulatory relief by temporarily exempting ISPs with 100,000 subscribers or fewer.

Today's bipartisan action will extend the exemption to 5 years and expand the definition of small broadband providers to fewer than 250,000 subscribers. This commonsense proposal will help small and rural broadband providers across my district focus on investing in networks, deploying broadband, improving connectivity, and creating jobs.

I thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE, and Congressman LOEBSACK for working together on this bill. I am proud to support H.R. 4596 and believe it will protect vital small ISPs who serve all of our constituents.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4596, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. There has been a lot said about it, and anyone who tunes in, it is not as complicated as it sounds.

We know what the Internet represents. We know we want to expand broadband in our country. We know especially in the rural areas of our country that broadband and all that it represents has not reached everyone, and there are many small businesses that are working hard to bring broadband into the areas where people do not have access.

We also have some critical protections for the consumers of broadband, and we wanted to make sure that we could protect the consumer but also not burden the small businesses, and that is what this legislation represents.

I am pleased that the bill includes the 5-year sunset provision, which is going to provide the FCC more time to study whether or not the exemption should be made permanent and how a small ISP should be defined.

So, long story short, I think that this is a good bill. It represents a bipartisan effort, and I hope it works out the way the promises are being made about it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished and very effective majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, government policy is stuck in the past. Regulators from 20th century agencies are trying to manage and control a 21st century world—and it isn't working.

The world is too complex and individual situations are too unique for a big, bulky government to try to apply standards to everyone. And every time government tries to micromanage the markets or the free exchange of ideas or the development of new technology, our country and our people fall behind. We lose out on new companies, new jobs, and new services.

So, in the House, we want to free innovators from Silicon Valley to Boston by removing the obstacles that hold us back. We want breakthrough technologies and positive disruption that ensures American leadership around the world and brings government itself into the 21st century. It is our innovation initiative.

Today, thanks to GREG WALDEN, we have the first bill from the innovation initiative on the floor, protecting the Internet for hundreds of thousands of users.

The Internet is arguably the most dynamic contributor to a growing economy and higher quality of life in the world. It delivers information and education, supports new businesses and workers, and increases our ability to communicate and experience the world.

But right now, small Internet service providers that bring Internet to homes and businesses in less populated parts of the United States worry that the Washington bureaucracy will swoop in and impose regulations on them, and this will create a compliance burden that could put them out of business.

These small providers don't have enough resources to navigate the bureaucratic maze and bring broadband to communities at the same time. If these small Internet service providers go under, it could leave many people with limited Internet access or no access at all.

The administration delayed these rules once, but that was only temporary. These small Internet providers need permanent relief so they can focus on doing the job of delivering Internet to the American people. So we are passing a bill today that lifts these regulations on small providers for good.

We need to take every opportunity we can to create the space for innovation to thrive in this country. That is the purpose of our innovation initiative, and that is how we can make a more prosperous America that works for everyone.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), who brings extensive experience in all of this realm, of both elec-

tric and communications, based on his vast background on this during his days on the Public Utility Commission in North Dakota. He has been a huge asset on our subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALDEN for yielding the time and for his important leadership.

I think it is worth noting, as I know Representative LOEBSACK and several of us from rural districts often get involved in issues like this, and I always like to remind people that Representative WALDEN's district is actually larger than the State of North Dakota. That is how rural we are. We all know Iowa is a rural State. I think this bill is a great representation of what happens when a coalition of rural States and districts get together and try to do the right thing for the people we work for. So it is a pleasure to be part of that.

I will be brief because the leadership has already outlined the essence of the bill very effectively. I will spend just a minute or 2 talking about the reality of the importance of this to a place like North Dakota and to places like rural Oregon or Iowa and other places where distance is greater than the population, where the advantages of access to something as dynamic as the Internet makes all the difference in the world for education opportunities, for health care accessibility, and, of course, for individual use.

That is a challenge in rural America that, frankly, many of our small Internet service providers and communication and technology companies have been meeting all along with plenty of things going against them, not the least of which is: much of the deployment of broadband in rural America has been done, even when it is not necessarily economically advantageous to do it at the time, so that the burdensome regulations, intended or unintended, that came from the FCC rule just don't apply to everybody.

I think that the standards that we have set in the negotiation that have created the benchmarks for access deployment are appropriate. And 250,000 consumers and the size of the companies, I think, hits just right that sweet spot, not only because it was negotiated and it has got consensus, but because I think it is the right number. I think they are the right numbers.

So we don't want to stifle innovation. We want to expand innovation, especially in something as dynamic as the Internet. This act does that. I am honored to be a part of it, and I am honored to be a member of the committee.

I thank the Representative ESHOO as well as Representative LOEBSACK and certainly Chairman WALDEN for their leadership.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other speakers on our side of the aisle, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

I thank Chairman WALDEN for working on this, once again. Thanks to our staffs, again, for working on this compromise.

There is just one last thing. I would like to remind folks that transparency is a good thing, and the FCC has good intentions when they talk about transparency and making sure that consumers understand what they are getting for their money. So, as far as I am concerned, we have to continue to provide that transparency, but we have to make sure that we do it in the way that we are doing it in this particular legislation, to have that balance that those ISPs, those small-sized ISPs, can continue to provide that access in the first place, as I mentioned already in my remarks.

□ 1245

I thank everyone who has worked on this. It is a great compromise. I wish that we could do this more often here in this body and over in the Senate. I am not such a Pollyanna to believe that this is the beginning of great things to happen, but I think we made real progress here.

I again thank Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member ESHOO, and our staffs for working on this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Iowa who has been a great partner in finding the right sweet spot here as we move forward on more telecommunication policy that will help us allow these great innovators and inventors to go out and serve our constituents and offer competition in the marketplace and, not just because they are small, be snuffed out by a government that requires things they can't afford to do and takes money away from innovation.

They still have to, as you know, follow all of the laws and all of the protections and all of that. It is just this reporting requirement seemed pretty onerous. In fact, obviously, the FCC thought it was when they first came out with their rule. We concur with that and extend that exemption on out.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, I am really proud of the bipartisan work that Mr. LOEBSACK, myself, and others have done on our subcommittee.

This marks the fifth piece of legislation that we have brought to the House floor in this Congress in one capacity or another. We passed the FCC consolidated reporting legislation, Mr. Speaker, unanimously across this House floor.

This is designed to deal with the antiquated statutory requirements on reports that aren't needed, oftentimes aren't completed, and, yet, cost money to taxpayers and those who pay fees. So we have a consolidated report that is designed to simplify that process, save taxpayers money, and decrease

the Federal bureaucracy a bit. That is over in the Senate now, Mr. Speaker.

We passed FCC process reform legislation that we reached bipartisan agreement on as well. I think it passed unanimously through the House, Mr. Speaker.

This is really important because we are trying to shed a little light on the FCC's activities and bring fairness and transparency to the Federal Communications Commission so that the public, the consumers, the stakeholders, all have a better opportunity to see how policy that will affect them is being deliberated and considered or even what is proposed. That bill is over in the Senate.

Then we dealt with the issue of what we call the DOTCOM Act to make sure that, when the contract runs out on how the Internet naming agency and all works and all the IANA and ICANN pieces, that consumers are protected and will continue to have free Internet, free from government intrusion, free, as it has been, to innovate and create this enormous change. That passed the House I think with over 380 votes.

The Spectrum Pipeline legislation actually was part of the bipartisan budget agreement we passed at the end of last year. So that is now in law, as a matter of fact.

This marks, as I say, our fifth initiative to try to help this great sector of our economy continue to expand, that provides access to the world, and provides access to commerce and jobs in a rural setting.

I can't tell you how important this is in a district such as mine where people now can locate in a smaller community, in a rural environment, with a great lifestyle, connect into the Internet, and be able to conduct commerce and grow jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of legislation, represents really solid work, and is really important to a lot of start-up and small companies across our country that we need to help grow, expand, and be the next competitor and the next one to really move up and give all us consumers more competition and better service.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I ask Members on both sides of the aisle to join us in bipartisan support of this legislation, which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, is also supported by the administration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, we have built a proud, bipartisan record of success, and this legislation will help our nation's small businesses which are the lifeblood of Michigan's economy, and the American economy as a whole. A quick look at the stats reveals small businesses represent 99.7 percent of all employers in the United States, and they are true job creators, consistently accounting for 60 to 80 percent of net new jobs in each of the past ten years.

Small Internet providers in particular serve a unique role in connecting consumers across the country. They provide service to rural con-

stituents, to other small businesses, and to areas of the country that otherwise would lack any alternative. They often do so with very few resources, relying on a smaller number of employees to do a great deal of work. The bill that we will vote on today makes sure that they can continue to do so without being hampered by regulatory burdens and red tape.

The Small Business Broadband Deployment Act builds on the temporary steps taken by the Federal Communications Commission to exempt small providers from the enhanced transparency requirements adopted as part of the 2015 Open Internet Order. At the time, the Commission recognized that there could be a significant impact on smaller businesses, and rightfully exempted them from the requirements. However, the FCC's grant of a series of temporary exemptions does not give these businesses the certainty they need to make informed investment decisions.

H.R. 4596 is a bipartisan solution to this problem. By extending the exemption for five years, and raising the threshold for the definition at a small business, this legislation will protect small businesses and ultimately benefit consumers. Keeping these entrepreneurs focused on laying fiber, building towers, and improving service means a better Internet experience for their customers, and more jobs. This is what they set out to accomplish when they started their businesses—serving their communities, not spending hours or days complying with a maze of regulations and piles of paperwork.

Our committee spent a great deal of time considering this problem. In addition, the robust record at the FCC in support of the exemption confirmed our view that this extension was necessary. We heard directly from witnesses like the president of a small fixed wireless provider, a former FCC commissioner, and a public interest representative. Their input both on how important this bill is, and on how to improve our early draft bill, helped us to come to the final version we are considering today.

Subcommittee Chairman WALDEN and Representative LOEBSACK worked in a bipartisan way to come to a consensus on legislation that achieves all of our goals. The final product is a bill that we can all be proud to support, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-453.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 4, insert before the semicolon the following: “, including whether making such exception permanent would increase access to services provided by small businesses”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 640, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4596, which simply adds an additional component to the required report from the FCC.

My amendment requests the agency to also answer whether a permanent exemption from enhanced disclosure for small Internet providers, or ISPs, could increase access to the services offered by these small businesses. As many of you already know, these exemptions were created in the FCC's most recent update to the open Internet order.

As Congress considers modifying or making this exemption permanent, it is important to know the impact this would have for those people the order was intended to protect, in this case, the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the real purpose of a permanent exemption should not be to just lighten the load for these businesses, but also to increase access to broadband services in general.

Even in urban areas, like the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex that I represent, there is still an alarming number of people without access to all broadband services. Congress must work to enact evidence-based policy to expand Internet access.

My amendment would simply have the FCC provide additional information regarding the effects of a permanent extension on a small ISP's consumer base.

However, after speaking with my colleagues, including the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK), I am confident that the goal of my amendment will be achieved through the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his participation in this process and debate. I look forward to working with him on these issues. I share his concern, and I appreciate his participation. As I say, the door is always open and happy to continue. We all want the same outcome here for our consumers.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I failed to include in the RECORD a letter of support for our underlying bill signed by the heads of the American Cable Association; CCA; CTIA; United States Telecom Association; WISPA, the Wireless Internet Service Providers Association; WTA, Advocates for Rural Broadband, the rural broadband coalition; and the National Cable & Telecommunications Association, so I would like to include that in the RECORD in support of this effort.

MARCH 15, 2016.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce,
Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy & Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: We write to express our strong

support for H.R. 4596, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act, which is scheduled to be considered by the full House of Representatives tomorrow.

We commend you, and Communications & Technology Subcommittee Chairman Walden and Representative Loeb sack, for crafting a common-sense bill that provides small broadband providers with greater certainty than the Federal Communications Commission's temporary exemption from the enhanced transparency obligations adopted as part of the Open Internet Order. In multiple industry submissions to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), including filings regarding the Paperwork Reduction Act, small providers demonstrated that the enhanced requirements would impose time-consuming and costly compliance obligations; yet, the FCC only extended the existing temporary exemption for a limited time. After reviewing the record at the FCC and receiving testimony at its hearing on the legislation in January, the Communications & Technology Subcommittee found there was more than sufficient evidence to further expand and extend the exemption.

We are gratified that the Committee has produced a bipartisan bill that will enable small broadband providers to focus their financial and human resources on providing high-quality broadband service to their customers rather than dealing with new regulatory obligations. We urge support for H.R. 4596 and look forward to its approval tomorrow.

President and CEO of American Cable Association, President and CEO of CCA, President and CEO of CTIA, President and CEO of National Cable & Telecommunications Association, Chief Executive Officer of NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association, President and CEO of United States Telecom Association, Executive Vice President of WTA—Advocates for Rural Broadband, Legislative Committee Chair of WISPA.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1302

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 4596; Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4416; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4434.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 4596) to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—411

- Abraham, Bucshon, Cramer, Aderholt, Bustos, Crawford, Aguilari, Butterfield, Crenshaw, Allen, Byrne, Crowley, Amash, Cuellar, Jenkins (KS), Amodei, Capps, Culberson, Johnson (GA), Ashford, Capuano, Cummings, Johnson (OH), Babin, Cardenas, Curbelo (FL), Johnson, E. B., Barletta, Carney, Davis (CA), Johnson, Sam, Barr, Carson (IN), Davis, Danny, Jolly, Barton, Carter (GA), Davis, Rodney, Jones, Bass, Carter (TX), DeFazio, Jordan, Beatty, Cartwright, DeGette, Joyce, Becerra, Castor (FL), Delaney, Kaptur, Benishek, Castro (TX), DeLauro, Katko, Bera, Chabot, DelBene, Keating, Beyer, Chaffetz, Denham, Kelly (IL), Bilirakis, Chu, Judy, Dent, Kelly (MS), Bishop (GA), Cicilline, DeSantis, Kelly (PA), Bishop (MI), Clark (MA), DeSaulnier, Kennedy, Bishop (UT), Clarke (NY), Deutch, Kildee, Black, Clawson (FL), Diaz-Balart, Kilmer, Blum, Clay, Dingell, Kind, Blumenauer, Cleaver, Doggett, King (IA), Bonamici, Clyburn, Dold, King (NY), Bost, Cohen, Donovan, Kinzinger (IL), Boustany, Cole, Doyle, Michael, Kirkpatrick, Boyle, Brendan F., Collins (GA), Kline, F., Collins (NY), Duffy, Brady (PA), Comstock, Duncan (SC), Brady (TX), Conaway, Duncan (TN), Brat, Connolly, Edwards, LaHood, Bridenstine, Conyers, Ellison, Lamborn, Brooks (AL), Cook, Emmer (MN), Reed, Brown (FL), Cooper, Engel, Langevin, Brownley (CA), Costa, Eshoo, Larsen (WA), Ribble, Buchanan, Costello (PA), Esty, Larson (CT), Womack, Buck, Courtney, Farenthold, Latta

- Farr, Lawrence, Rice (SC), Fattah, Lee, Richmond, Fincher, Levin, Rigell, Fitzpatrick, Lewis, Roby, Fleischmann, Lieu, Ted, Roe (TN), Fleming, Lipinski, Rogers (AL), Flores, LoBiondo, Rogers (KY), Forbes, Loeb sack, Rohrabacher, Fortenberry, Lofgren, Rokita, Foster, Long, Rooney (FL), Foyx, Loudermilk, Ros-Lehtinen, Frankel (FL), Love, Roskam, Franks (AZ), Lowenthal, Ross, Frelinghuysen, Lucas, Rothfus, Fudge, Luettkemeyer, Rouzer, Gabbard, Lujan Grisham, Royal-Allard, Gallego, (NM), Royce, Garamendi, Lujan, Ben Ray, Ruiz, Garrett, (NM), Ruppersberger, Gibbs, Lummis, Russell, Gibson, Lynch, Ryan (OH), Gohmert, MacArthur, Salmon, Goodlatte, Maloney, Sanchez, Linda T., Gowdy, Carolyn, T. Graham, Maloney, Sean, Sanchez, Loretta, Graves (GA), Marchant, Sanford, Graves (LA), Marino, Sarbanes, Grayson, Massie, Schakowsky, Green, Al, Matsui, Schiff, Green, Gene, McCarthy, Schrader, Griffith, McCaul, Scott (VA), Grijalva, McClintock, Scott, Austin, Grothman, McCollum, Scott, David, Guinta, McDerrott, Sensenbrenner, Guthrie, McGovern, Serrano, Gutierrez, McHenry, Sessions, Hahn, McKinley, Sewell (AL), Hanna, McMorris, Sherman, Hardy, Rodgers, Shimkus, Harper, McNeerney, Shuster, Hartzler, McSally, Simpson, Hastings, Meadows, Sinema, Heck (NV), Meehan, Sires, Heck (WA), Meng, Slaughter, Hensarling, Messer, Smith (MO), Herrera Beutler, Mica, Smith (NE), Hice, Jody B., Miller (FL), Smith (NJ), Hill, Miller (MI), Smith (TX), Himes, Moolenaar, Speier, Hinojosa, Mooney (WV), Stefanik, Holding, Moore, Stewart, Honda, Moulton, Stivers, Hoyer, Mullin, Stutzman, Hudson, Mulvaney, Swalwell (CA), Huelskamp, Murphy (FL), Takai, Huffman, Murphy (PA), Takano, Huizenga (MI), Nadler, Thompson (CA), Hultgren, Napolitano, Thompson (MS), Hunter, Neal, Thompson (PA), Hurd (TX), Neugebauer, Thornberry, Hurt (VA), Newhouse, Tiberi, Israel, Noem, Tipton, Issa, Nolan, Titus, Jeffries, Norcross, Tonko, Jenkins (KS), Nugent, Torres, Jenkins (WV), Nunes, Trott, Johnson (GA), O'Rourke, Tsongas, Johnson (OH), Olson, Turner, Johnson, E. B., Palazzo, Upton, Johnson, Sam, Pallone, Valadao, Jolly, Palmer, Van Hollen, Jones, Pascrell, Vargas, Jordan, Paulsen, Veasey, DeFazio, Payne, Joyce, Pearce, Velazquez, Kaptur, Katko, Pelosi, Visclosky, Keating, Perlmutter, Wagner, Kelly (IL), Perry, Walberg, Kelly (MS), Peters, Walden, Kelly (PA), Peterson, Walker, Kennedy, Pingree, Walorski, Kildee, Pittenger, Walters, Mimi, Kilmer, Pitts, Walz, Kind, Pocan, Wasserman, King (IA), Poe (TX), Schultz, King (NY), Poliquin, Watson, Maxine, Kinzinger (IL), Polis, Watson Coleman, Kirkpatrick, Pompeo, Weber (FL), Kline, Posey, Webber (FL), Knight, Price (NC), Welch, Kuster, Price, Tom, Wenstrup, Labrador, Quigley, Westerman, LaHood, Rangel, Westmoreland, Lamborn, Ratchliffe, Whitfield, Lance, Reed, Williams, Langevin, Reichert, Wilson (FL), Larsen (WA), Renacci, Wilson (SC), Larson (CT), Ribble, Womack, Latta, Rice (NY), Woodall

Yarmuth Young (AK) Zeldin
Yoder Young (IA) Zinke
Yoho Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Adams Gosar Meeks
Blackburn Granger Rush
Brooks (IN) Graves (MO) Scalise
Burgess Harris Schweikert
Coffman Higgins Smith (WA)
DesJarlais Jackson Lee Wittman
Duckworth LaMalfa
Ellmers (NC) Lowey

□ 1322

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” 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 for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT NUMBERED 12715

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4416) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—418

Abraham Boustany Castor (FL)
Aderholt Boyle, Brendan Castro (TX)
Aguilar F. Chabot
Allen Brady (PA) Chaffetz
Amodei Brat Chu, Judy
Ashford Bridenstine Cicilline
Babin Brooks (AL) Clark (MA)
Barletta Brooks (IN) Clarke (NY)
Barr Brown (FL) Clawson (FL)
Barton Brownley (CA) Clay
Bass Buchanan Cleaver
Beatty Buck Clyburn
Becerra Bucshon Coffman
Benishek Burgess Cohen
Bera Bustos Cole
Beyer Byrne Collins (GA)
Bilirakis Calvert Collins (NY)
Bishop (GA) Capps Comstock
Bishop (MI) Capuano Conaway
Bishop (UT) Cárdenas Connolly
Black Carney Conyers
Blum Carson (IN) Cook
Blumenauer Carter (GA) Cooper
Bonamici Carter (TX) Costa
Bost Cartwright Costello (PA)

Courtney Huizenga (MI)
Cramer Hultgren
Crawford Hunter
Crenshaw Hurd (TX)
Crowley Hurt (VA)
Cuellar Israel
Culberson Issa
Cummings Jeffries
Curbelo (FL) Jenkins (KS)
Davis (CA) Jenkins (WV)
Davis, Danny Johnson (GA)
Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
DeGette Johnson, Sam
Delaney Jolly
DeLauro Jones
DeBene Jordan
Denham Joyce
Dent Kaptur
DeSantis Katko
DeSaulnier Keating
Deuch Kelly (IL)
Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS)
Dingell Kelly (PA)
Doggett Kennedy
Dold Kildee
Donovan Kilmer
Doyle, Michael Kind
F. King (IA)
Duffy King (NY)
Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL)
Duncan (TN) Kirkpatrick
Edwards Kline
Ellison Knight
Ellmers (NC) Kuster
Emmer (MN) Labrador
Engel LaHood
Eshoo LaMalfa
Esty Lamborn
Farenthold Lance
Farr Langevin
Fattah Larsen (WA)
Fincher Larson (CT)
Fitzpatrick Latta
Fleischmann Lawrence
Fleming Lee
Flores Levin
Forbes Lewis
Fortenberry Lieu, Ted
Foster Lipinski
Foxy LoBiondo
Frankel (FL) Loebsack
Franks (AZ) Lofgren
Frelinghuysen Long
Fudge Loudermilk
Gabbard Love
Gallego Lowenthal
Garamendi Lowey
Garrett Lucas
Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Gibson Lujan Grisham
Gohmert (NM)
Goodlatte Luján, Ben Ray
Gosar (NM)
Gowdy Lummis
Graham Lynch
Granger MacArthur
Graves (GA) Maloney
Graves (LA) Carolyn
Grayson Maloney, Sean
Green, Al Marchant
Green, Gene Marino
Griffith Massie
Grijalva Matsui
Grothman McCarthy
Guinta McCaul
Guthrie McClintock
Gutiérrez McCollum
Hahn McDermott
Hanna McGovern
Hardy McHenry
Harper McKinley
Harris McMorris
Hartzler Rodgers
Hastings McNerney
Heck (NV) McSally
Heck (WA) Meadows
Hensarling Meehan
Herrera Beutler Meeks
Hice, Jody B. Meng
Hill Messer
Himes Mica
Hinojosa Miller (FL)
Holding Miller (MI)
Black Moonenaar
Hoyer Mooney (WV)
Hudson Moore
Huelskamp Moulton
Huffman Mullin

Mulvaney Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL) Vargas
Murphy (PA) Veasey
Takano Vela
Thompson (CA) Velázquez
Thompson (MS) Visclosky
Thompson (PA) Wagner
Thornberry Walberg
Tiberi Walden
Tipton Walker
Titus Walorski
Tonko Walters, Mimi
Torres Walz
Trott Wasserman
Tsongas Schultz
Turner Waters, Maxine
Upton Weber (TX)
Valadao Webster (FL)
Van Hollen Welch

NAYS—2

Amash Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—13

Adams Duckworth Scalise
Blackburn Graves (MO) Schweikert
Brady (TX) Higgins Smith (WA)
Butterfield Jackson Lee
DesJarlais Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1329

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT NUMBERED 13287

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4434) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—417

Abraham Blumenauer Capps
Aderholt Bonamici Capuano
Aguilar Bost Cárdenas
Allen Boustany Carney
Amodei Boyle, Brendan Carson (IN)
Ashford F. Carter (GA)
Babin Brady (PA) Carter (TX)
Barletta Brady (TX) Cartwright
Barr Brat Castor (FL)
Barton Bridenstine Castro (TX)
Bass Brooks (AL) Chabot
Beatty Brooks (IN) Chaffetz
Becerra Brown (FL) Chu, Judy
Benishek Brownley (CA) Clark (MA)
Bera Buchanan Clarke (NY)
Beyer Buck Clawson (FL)
Bilirakis Bucshon Clay
Bishop (GA) Burgess Cleaver
Bishop (MI) Bustos Clyburn
Bishop (UT) Butterfield Coffman
Black Byrne Cohen
Blum Calvert Cole

Collins (GA) Hice, Jody B.
 Collins (NY) Hill
 Comstock Himes
 Conaway Hinojosa
 Connolly Holding (MI)
 Conyers Honda
 Cook Hoyer
 Cooper Hudson
 Costa Huelskamp
 Costello (PA) Huffman
 Courtney HuiZenga (MI)
 Cramer Hultgren
 Crawford Hunter
 Crenshaw Hurd (TX)
 Crowley Hurt (VA)
 Cuellar Israel
 Culberson Issa
 Cummings Jeffries
 Curbelo (FL) Jenkins (KS)
 Davis (CA) Jenkins (WV)
 Davis, Danny Johnson (GA)
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
 DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
 DeGette Johnson, Sam
 Delaney Jolly
 DeLauro Jones
 DelBene Jordan
 Denham Joyce
 Dent Kaptur
 DeSantis Katko
 DeSaulnier Keating
 Deutch Kelly (IL)
 Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS)
 Dingell Kelly (PA)
 Doggett Kennedy
 Dold Kildee
 Donovan Kilmer
 Doyle, Michael Kind
 F. King (IA)
 Duffy King (NY)
 Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL)
 Duncan (TN) Kirkpatrick
 Edwards Kline
 Ellison Knight
 Ellmers (NC) Kuster
 Emmer (MN) Labrador
 Engel LaHood
 Eshoo LaMalfa
 Esty Lamborn
 Farenthold Lance
 Farr Langevin
 Fattah Larsen (WA)
 Fincher Larson (CT)
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann Lawrence
 Fleming Lee
 Flores Levin
 Forbes Lewis
 Fortenberry Lieu, Ted
 Foster Lipinski
 Foxx LoBiondo
 Frankel (FL) LoebSack
 Franks (AZ) Lofgren
 Frelinghuysen Long
 Fudge Loudermilk
 Gabbard Love
 Gallego Lowenthal
 Garamendi Lowey
 Garrett Lucas
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gibson Lujan Grisham
 Gohmert (NM)
 Goodlatte Lujan, Ben Ray
 Gosar (NM)
 Gowdy Lummis
 Graham Lynch
 Granger MacArthur
 Graves (GA) Maloney,
 Graves (LA) Carolyn
 Grayson Maloney, Sean
 Green, Al Marchant
 Green, Gene Marino
 Griffith Massie
 Grijalva Matsui
 Grothman McCarthy
 Guinta McCaul
 Guthrie McClintock
 Gutierrez McCollum
 Hahn McDermott
 Hanna McGovern
 Hardy McHenry
 Harper McKinley
 Harris McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hastings McNeerney
 Heck (NV) McSally
 Heck (WA) Meadows
 Hensarling Meehan
 Herrera Beutler Meeks

Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moonenar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Swaiwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Trott

Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NAYS—2

Amash Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—14

Adams Graves (MO) Rush
 Blackburn Higgins Scalise
 Cicilline Jackson Lee Schweikert
 DesJarlais Norcross Smith (WA)
 Duckworth Nugent

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1335

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2016, I was unavoidably detained due to a family member's health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123, 124, 125, and 126, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, I would have voted "no."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S VISIT TO CUBA

(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, President Obama's trip to Cuba is ill-conceived and premature. A fun trip, the President labeled it. The visit comes on the heels of declarations by the Communist Party that it will "not give up a single inch in the defense of revolutionary and anti-imperialist ideals."

Harrumph. This translates to over 2,555 arbitrary detentions of peaceful

protesters between January and February of 2016 alone and over 8,000 arrests just last year.

The President's meeting with civil society is such a low benchmark, the official Cuban newspaper, Granma, stated that Obama's visit destroys the myth that Cuba violates human rights. The leader of the free world has chosen a legacy-shopping photo op enjoying a baseball game with a murderer and a thug.

In these critical moments for democracy on the island, we must support peaceful demonstrations like the one scheduled in south Florida at 11 a.m. on Sunday in front of the Bay of Pigs monument on 8th Street.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It will be led by Assembly of the Cuban Resistance from Exile, Forum for Democracy and Freedom in Cuba, and Organization for Foundation for the Judicial Rescue.

It will be led by La Asamblea de la Resistencia Cubana desde el exilio, el Foro por los Derechos y Libertades desde Cuba, y la organización Fundación Rescate Jurídico.

The exile community in Miami, who has welcomed many of Castro's former political prisoners, is painfully aware of the trampling of human rights still going on today. This is not a fun trip for peaceful dissidents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of her remarks.

IT IS TIME TO INVEST IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today Washington, D.C., was a little bit more of a mess than usual. The Metro is shut down. In part, it is a consequence of mismanagement for years; but more importantly, it is a statement about the deteriorated state of transit in America. There is an \$80 billion—B, billion—backlog of capital needed to bring existing transit—not new transit options to get people out of their cars and out of traffic and mitigate congestion—just to bring existing transit systems up to a state of good repair.

As I have been talking about this around the country for the last couple of years, I have been saying, you know, things are so bad that they are killing people in Washington, D.C., and that is what has been happening. It has deteriorated to the point where we had one accident that killed six people and a fire last year that killed one person.

We need to make these repairs. We need them made in America. We have the strongest Buy America requirements for transit of any part of the Federal Government. It will provide American jobs. It will give Americans better commuting opportunities. It will make our people safe on transit.

But this body has failed to bring forward or even allow a vote on additional

funding for transportation infrastructure in this country. It is a crisis. We are becoming third or maybe fourth world in our infrastructure. Bridges are falling down, potholes, and transit systems that are falling apart; it is time to invest in America.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS FAILURES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Administration failed to contact thousands of veterans who submitted applications for health care. Apparently, those applications were incomplete, but the VA did not tell the vets to correct the applications and re-submit them; so the applications were left pending on a shelf with no action by the VA and no health care for the veterans. Reports state that nearly 300,000 veterans died waiting for a resolution from the VA.

Of course, the VA blamed the veterans. This is a farce. The veterans never even received a follow-up call to finish their supposedly incomplete applications.

These mistakes are that of the VA, not the veterans. The VA should be ashamed. Government bungling stood in the way of these warriors receiving health care and broke a promise the Nation gave to them.

The VA's dysfunctional bureaucrats need to be removed, and veterans should be allowed to have a voucher that gives them the privilege to go to their own doctors, doctors who are more concerned about health care than paperwork.

And that is just the way it is.

REMEMBERING MARTIN OLAV
SABO

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the floor today to pay homage and honor to a great Minnesotan and a Member of this body, Martin Olav Sabo. He was the Congressperson who preceded me to represent the Fifth Congressional District.

I can say without any reservation that very, very few people can boast to be greater public servants than Martin Sabo in my State of Minnesota or in America.

Martin Sabo served for more than 40 years in public life, 28 years in Congress. He was the chair of the Committee on the Budget, and he was also a good friend to all. I will say that he was always gracious and well-mannered. He was a helpful person, and he was available to mentor literally hundreds of Minnesota politicians, public activists, and servants.

It is with a heavy heart that I give these remarks because, of course, it

would be wonderful to have all of our friends, including Martin Sabo, be with us for a long, long time; but, of course, every one of us does leave this world, and when they do, they would be very, very lucky to make the mark that Martin Sabo did—a great man, a great Minnesotan.

□ 1345

CHANGE NEEDED AT WMATA

(Mrs. COMSTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, our Metro system, informed us that they would be suspending operations all day today and into tonight.

While I appreciate that the new general manager had to make this decision to keep our riders safe, what this does is highlight many more widespread problems throughout the system that have been present for years that we need to address. We know a culture change in management needs to happen.

When our delegation met with the new manager at the end of last year, we told him we needed to have a management change and that we needed to see some action taken quickly. I am appreciative the Transportation chairman is going to have hearings on this.

I want to read to you an example of why we need changes here. A trainee at Metro talked about the incompetence there. He said:

I'll be honest with you. I studied harder for fast-food jobs and waiter jobs when I was in college than I did for their training program at Metro. Their testing program is a joke.

This is from a Washingtonian article in December of last year.

WMATA and Metro lifers who haven't left for years need to start leaving so that we can have a new management culture there.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. 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 subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleagues for a Special Order about Women's History Month.

This month of March we are blessed with the opportunity to discuss the opportunities particularly presented by

the Republican Party and the philosophies of the Republican Party as they relate to women, women's history and women's future and the opportunity to be involved in building women up and providing opportunities in the future, an opportunity culture that is shared by men and women to make sure that our homeland is safe and secure, to make sure that our families are in an environment that will be uplifting. These are some of the topics we will be discussing today.

I am joined by several colleagues, one of whom I would like to call on first. Incidentally, the first colleague I am calling on is a Republican man with whom I graduated from law school as a student at the University of Wyoming College of Law.

My own home State of Wyoming is the first government in the world to continuously grant women the right to vote. That occurred in 1869. Colorado, the home State of this gentleman, is the first State to grant women the right to vote.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming, my friend and law school classmate, for her great leadership on this issue.

I am proud to come from a State that was not only the first to give women the right to vote, but the first to elect women to the State legislature. My wife Perry is continuing that great tradition as a member of the Colorado General Assembly.

Many women have impacted our neighborhoods, our communities, and our Nation. But I want to speak briefly today about the many women who will impact our world.

They have ideas and ambitions and callings. They have machines to invent, deals to negotiate, people to heal, diseases to cure, and legislation to pass.

Republicans are advancing an agenda to help these women impact our future. We are focused on making the country more secure, on creating jobs, on replacing ObamaCare with a patient-centered alternative, on extending opportunity to all children, and on protecting the freedom at the heart of our prosperity.

Women don't need government getting in their way. That is why the efforts of Congress to reassert its authority and roll back executive overreach are so vital.

Congress has the responsibility to create an environment where women thrive. In 100 years, I hope we are celebrating the women who made this country great, not lamenting the government that stopped them.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for being here today and acknowledging the importance of Women's History Month and the involvement of women in politics and government and for his leadership in his home State of Colorado.

Next I would like to yield to a long-standing colleague who is well known

to the House of Representatives. VIRGINIA FOXX has done more on workforce development issues in the last couple of years than have been done in many, many years in the House of Representatives.

She is the first in her family to graduate from college, earn a master's and doctorate degree, and then went on to be the president of an institute of higher learning, a community college.

Her presidency there also lifted education in her home State. She is the chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina's Fifth District (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LUMMIS for her leadership in this Special Order this afternoon and for all the great work that she has done.

She is a wonderful role model for women. She has lent her expertise as the former treasurer of her State, and has brought much, much talent to the House of Representatives. I appreciate all that she has done since she has been here.

We all know, I think, that March is Women's History Month, which honors and celebrates the struggles and achievements of American women throughout the history of the United States.

Since 1917, when Republican Jeannette Rankin of Montana became the first woman to serve in Congress, 313 women have served as U.S. Representatives, Senators, or Delegates.

Many Americans might assume that their congressional Representatives come from exclusive and rarified backgrounds. Well, my story could hardly be less rarified.

As a child, my family's home didn't have electricity or running water. My parents, while dedicated and hard-working, were very poor, with little formal education. Girls with my background weren't likely to end up in Congress.

Fortunately, I was pushed by the right people, teachers and administrators who wouldn't let me settle for less than my best.

In the mountains of North Carolina, I learned firsthand the power of education and its vital role in the success of every American. Although it took me 7 years while working full-time, I became the first in my family to go to college and earn a degree.

In the 1970s, I was a member of the League of Women Voters. Through the League, I attended school board meetings in my county as a public observer to encourage accountability of elected officials. I went to countless meetings, many times as the only person representing the general public.

During one meeting of an all-male school board, a local reporter leaned over and said: These guys are incompetent. Why don't you run for the school board?

My instinctive response was: I am not qualified.

I think many women fall prey to this attitude of self-disqualification and underestimate their abilities. I took another look at those board members and changed my mind.

Eventually, I ran for the school board. While I lost that first race, I won the next election for school board, and I haven't lost an election since.

So while I may not have had wealthy parents or an Ivy League education, I did have what every single American has: opportunity.

A few weeks ago I spoke to a local Girl Scout troop about Congress and its role in our government. As the group was leaving my office, one of the parents pulled me aside and said how glad she was that the girls had the opportunity to hear from a woman in my position.

Women are a stronger presence than ever before on Capitol Hill. We have rich and varied perspectives and a commitment to good ideas and teamwork. The women of the 114th Congress are shaping our Nation, and it is an opportunity and responsibility that we take seriously.

Although I am now serving in my sixth term as a Representative from North Carolina, I am still really a teacher at heart, having spent the lion's share of my life working as an educator and administrator in North Carolina colleges and universities.

I believe confronting the challenges facing American schools and workplaces is critical to providing opportunity for every individual to get ahead.

That is why, as chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I have led efforts to modernize and reform the Nation's workforce development system. I appreciate very much my colleague mentioning that.

In 2014, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act was signed into law. This bipartisan, bicameral compromise between the SKILLS Act that I authored and the Senate's Workforce Investment Act of 2013 streamlines and improves existing Federal workforce development programs and fosters a modern workforce that American businesses can rely on to compete.

House Republicans have also fought to limit one-size-fits-all Federal dictates that hamper innovation and limit the ability of States and local schools to address their students' needs.

Last fall we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, which reverses Washington's micromanagement of classrooms and gives parents, teachers, and local education leaders the tools they need to repair a broken system and help all children reach their potential.

Unfortunately, many Americans still struggle to realize the dream of higher education because our current system is often expensive, inflexible, and outdated. Too many students are unable

to complete college, saddled with loan debt and ill-equipped to compete in our modern economy.

The United States is the world's summit of opportunity, and we have a responsibility to act now to preserve that role. House Republicans are pursuing reforms that will help all individuals, regardless of age, location, or background, access and complete higher education, if they choose.

We are working to empower students and families to make informed decisions. We want to simplify and improve student aid as well as promote innovation access and completion. We are committed to ensuring strong accountability and a limited Federal role.

By keeping college within reach for students and preserving the excellence in diversity that has always set America's colleges and universities apart, our country and our economy stand to benefit.

While Women's History Month celebrates the incredible accomplishments of women throughout America's history, the most lasting tribute we can pay is our efforts to improve this Nation for the next generation of women.

Rather than simply being discouraged by the many problems facing our country and our world, I have learned to be an agent of change focused on the problems that can be solved and the people who can be helped.

I thank my friend who encouraged me back in the 1970s to run for the school board because of the opportunities it has provided me to help other people throughout my life.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We are tackling five big priorities that women care about this year: national security, jobs, health care, upward mobility, and balance of power.

You just heard from Congresswoman Foxx about jobs, about education, and upward mobility that comes through those avenues.

The other areas we are talking about include national security and health care. No one in Congress is better prepared to address those issues than our next speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the first woman to represent the Second District of North Carolina, which includes all of Fort Bragg, home of the airborne and Special Operations Forces.

She has served on the House Energy and Commerce Committee since 2012 and currently serves as chairman of the Republican Women's Policy Committee.

Prior to running for office, she worked as a registered nurse for over 21 years and owned a general surgery practice with her husband Brent in Dunn, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), someone with real life experience in the areas of health care and who represents a district that is so profoundly influential in this Nation's national security.

□ 1400

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank my friend and colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS). I just want to say how much I appreciate her leadership, especially today, as we are talking about Women's History Month and the different roles that we, as women in Congress, are playing, and how we want to formulate and build the structure into the future for all women. I thank her for her service to all of us in representing Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, this month is Women's History Month. It is an opportunity to highlight the various ways women in America are pushing the envelope to leave a positive and lasting imprint on society.

As the first woman to represent North Carolina's Second District, and the first woman in our State to represent Fort Bragg, national security remains one of my utmost priorities.

So when I learned of a proposal to deactivate the 440th Airlift Wing located at Pope Army Airfield in Fort Bragg, I rallied my North Carolina colleagues. For nearly 2 years, we went toe-to-toe with the Air Force on this misguided decision.

The 440th is known for its ability to rapidly mobilize and execute last-minute exercises. It is unique in its mission and provides unparalleled levels of training to paratroopers of the 18th Airborne Corps.

Deactivation of the Airlift Wing would undoubtedly affect our military readiness and it could jeopardize the safety of our paratroopers. Given the global uncertainty abroad right now, this decision just doesn't make sense.

To fight this ill-conceived decision, I coordinated with my North Carolina colleagues to question top military leaders here at the Capitol. During these same meetings, we sought answers to tough questions and asked for data to back up their justification for the Wing's closure.

As a woman representing the military base, I have remained unwavering in my work to acquire answers. I have asked for meetings with the Air Force Reserve, the Army, the Pentagon, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and local Fort Bragg commanders.

The threat of terrorism abroad and the growth of radical groups like ISIS makes the decision to deactivate even more baffling. Constituents back home in North Carolina feel the same way, so I have charged forward in my efforts to prevent its closure.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reiterate that the Republican women in Congress are making history in a variety of ways. As women, we are working to create new opportunities, restore a confident America, and ensure the safety and security of every family living in our country.

Again I thank my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS, for hosting today's Special Order, for being the person that she is, representing Wyoming,

being a leader amongst all of us, as women in Congress, and allowing us to speak about the individual initiatives that we are tackling as women.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentlewoman and acknowledge her expertise on health care, and want to raise an issue that I would love to hear her comments on.

One of the bills that I am cosponsoring is a bill called the Research for All Act, and it would acknowledge that most medical research focuses on men, and studying women is suggested, but not required.

Now, sometimes different drugs have different effects on women than they do on men, and vice versa. For example, there is a diabetes drug study that shows that their drug may lower women's risk of heart failure, but increase a man's; and unless we have adequate studies done on both men and women, we won't recognize those differences or nuances in treatment options that should be tailored differently to men and women.

Based on your experience in nursing, your lifelong career there, do you have any comments about other healthcare initiatives that women are working on here in Congress?

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. First of all, I thank the gentlewoman for her piece of legislation on that particular issue because it shows the importance and how incredibly accurate you are when you are saying that there are so many differences in treatments geared towards women and geared towards men.

When you highlight heart conditions, that is the number one killer of women in this country, when we look at disease. Heart disease is the number one. When we look at this, we know that women respond differently to symptoms of heart disease than men do, and so do the drugs. So that is a perfect example of why we have to be focusing from a perspective where we consider both genders.

There are so many things that are being worked on here in Washington by the women leaders that we have. For instance, some of the things that we have been able to pass on a large bipartisan scale have to do with breast cancer.

The USPSTF came out with a decision saying that women between the ages 40-49 don't necessarily have to have mammograms, and so, therefore, their insurance companies shouldn't have to pay for it.

I worked across the aisle on legislation to stop that from moving forward, and we were able to put a 2-year moratorium on that decision so that we can actually bring a consensus together.

The last thing we want to do for women in this country is send out more mixed messages on breast cancer and the treatment of and the prevention of. So we are working with our colleagues, as Republicans and Democrats.

Another perfect example of a healthcare decision that is being made

by the USPSTF right now is essentially interrupting the process for men to get a PSA test, which is the only way we can diagnose prostate cancer. It is a simple blood test, and right now they are making decisions as to whether or not insurance companies should have to pay for that. I think that is devastating.

And then, of course, I will just say, Medicare remains one of the major issues that we are working on. I will tell you that all of the women in the Republican conference are dedicated to this effort.

There are some new rule changes that are coming out from CMS now that we are all targeting, and we have got to do that for every senior in this country who is receiving Medicare. They need the health care that they deserve, and we have got to do everything we can to make sure that it is accessible to them.

But, obviously, the largest—the elephant in the room, if you will, is, of course, the Affordable Care Act, and we continue to be dedicated to this issue.

In North Carolina, I can tell you it is a mess with the insurance plans. The individual plans themselves have skyrocketed from 30 to 40 to 50 percent increase in premiums, with an equal increase on the deductible.

The out-of-pocket costs that families in North Carolina now are spending is outrageous. They are literally making decisions to not go to the doctor when they need health care because they don't want to have to pay extra.

This is unacceptable. It certainly was not the intention of the Affordable Care Act.

As you know, my dear colleague, we have had many of the solutions to this problem, and I believe that the women in our conference are going to lead and be a strong voice to our leadership for us to move forward so that we can show the American people that we have alternatives to the Affordable Care Act that will continue to give them good coverage, but also continue to support good health care.

The 21st Century Cures Act we passed in 2015 is another perfect example of all of us coming together to ensure the American people get the coverage, the cures.

What better way to save dollars in health care than to come up with cures?

If we could just find one on Alzheimer's alone, we would save incredible amounts of money.

Listen, I am just proud and honored to be able to have a voice, especially when it comes to health care because, as we know, health care touches every life, and we have to do everything as Members of Congress, as mothers, as sisters, to do everything we can for the American people.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Alzheimer's, which you mentioned, is a disease where two-thirds of the patients are women, which also means that men are 50 percent less likely to get it. So the importance of having women making policy

on these issues is very high because we are the ones who are dealing with frequently female relatives, be they mothers, sisters, aunts, who are suffering from Alzheimer's.

When we have people like Congresswoman ELLMERS, who has a nursing background, a medical professional background, we have the opportunity to use that expertise that she has gained in her prior career, in her capacity as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, where much of the healthcare-related legislation originates in this Congress.

In addition, our new Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN, has put together several idea-gathering groups to make sure that we are building an agenda for the next Congress that will address these issues that have festered during the last 8 years; among them, the unacceptable consequences of ObamaCare that have created the situations which you described in your home State.

Can you give us a sneak preview about what some of these idea meetings are bringing to light about the direction of healthcare policy, as crafted by the Republican Party, about your role in those idea sessions, and how we intend to roll out health care that truly is affordable?

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Well, I will just say that I have had the honor of being part of the Republican Study Committee group that has worked on alternatives to the Affordable Care Act, and we have come up with about 10 or 12 different issue-based sections that are good policy that really have been there for a while, that many of our members have had; and we have actually culminated it into a plan of action that would take care of the issue and cover those things that the Affordable Care Act is leaving the American people behind.

One of the issues is choice, being able to choose a plan for your family that you feel is appropriate. Unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act, it was promoted as something that provided incredible choice. You were going to be able to go to your doctor. You were going to be able to go to the hospital you wanted. It was going to bring down the cost. And none of those things have come to be true. So now we have to go in and we have to change that.

You should be able to buy insurance across State lines or from a different perspective rather than what you have within your own State. You should be able to have a healthcare savings plan where you can put dollars away and be responsible for yourself.

Young people are in a different situation. They shouldn't have to spend hundreds and hundreds of dollars every month on a healthcare plan that they cannot afford when they can have a much more economical issue there, another situation that they can deal with.

Another big issue is tort reform at the national level. I think this is something that will also save dollars. There

are many, many ideas from the business side of it, with small businesses to larger businesses having better choices, being able to negotiate healthcare plans.

So when we are talking about health care and we are talking about the affordable care, what we really are talking about is healthcare coverage. And I think that is one of the most important parts of this discussion that many times, I think, gets confused.

We are talking about healthcare coverage, which leads to better health care. We should be doing everything we can to make sure that it is accessible to every American, and to take care of those who cannot take care of themselves.

Pre-existing conditions is a huge issue. We have to be able to deal with that. We know that we cannot leave the American people hanging. In other words, when we talk about wanting to repeal it, we know that there has to be a process in place to make sure that there is a safety net for all of those families who have been forced off of their insurance plans and on to an affordable care plan that was not their choice, only they were forced to do it because it became law.

Now we have to make sure that we are providing an option for them, one that will move them from one place to another, a much better place.

I will just say again that we are dedicated to this issue. It is the main reason I ran for Congress to begin with. I will not let up on this until we actually have the solutions that we are looking for.

□ 1415

I am looking forward to our working together over this next year on this issue and just moving health care forward in so many different ways. Unfortunately, the Federal Government does have a lot to do with what is working and what is not working, and I am just very happy to be part of that conversation.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank our colleague for her dedication and commitment to health care for Americans that will truly work for them.

Speaking of which, and in recognition of a wonderful woman who is an example of the types of healthcare issues that we are addressing this afternoon as part of our focus on Women's History Month, we have been joined by the good gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), who would like to pay tribute to a woman from his great State of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman MATT SALMON.

Mr. SALMON. First, before I start honoring this wonderful woman, I would like to say that I learned early in my life, in my church, that if you want to talk about something, you convene a meeting with a bunch of men; if you want to solve something, you convene a meeting with women.

Mrs. LUMMIS. My former Senator, Alan Simpson, used to say: "The cock croweth, but the hen delivereth the goods."

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak very, very lovingly and admiringly about one of the most wonderful people I have ever gotten a chance to know in my life. Her name is Laura Knaperek.

I first met Laura when I was a State legislator. I was assigned to be on the health committee, and Laura was a citizen activist that came down to champion the cause of families, and specifically families with children with developmental disabilities. I was amazed then at her passion, and I remember telling her: You ought to run for office some day.

She was a beloved member of the Arizona community and a tireless champion for those with developmental disabilities and one of the strongest advocates for families I have ever met in my life. She sought to lift people's lives around her.

She was first elected to the State legislature in 1994. She set herself apart as a selfless public servant. A few weeks ago, our Speaker, in talking to the Conference, mentioned that there are two types of people in politics: there are doers, and there are be-ers. Laura Knaperek was a doer. She was not interested in having the title of being a State legislator; she was interested in solving the problems of the day.

She was diagnosed, in 2012, with ovarian cancer. I remember seeing her shortly after that diagnosis, and there was no despair and no concern. Without missing a beat, she just wanted to talk about how she could uplift other people's lives.

I remember Laura decided to champion an idea in Arizona, which I believe is an idea whose time has come. It is the right called the Right to Try. I think it was one of the very first States in the country that has tried to pass this by referendum. Laura was successful in doing this.

It basically allows individuals with terminal diseases access to things that aren't necessarily approved by the FDA yet. If it is their last-ditch chance, they ought to have a shot at life, and that was Laura's contention. She championed this idea, and it passed overwhelmingly at the ballot.

I am sad to say that, 4 years after her diagnosis, she succumbed to this dread disease.

I was shocked because Laura was on Facebook and every other social media outlet constantly championing ideas and thoughts of others, and she never said anything about herself. She never wallowed in self-pity. She was the kind of person that realized that the greatest service that we can do is serving other people.

In my church, there is a saying that, when you are in the service of your fellow being, you are in the service of God. I think Laura understood that better than anybody.

Because of Laura, I introduced H.R. 3012, the Right to Try Act, introduced the last session of Congress. I think that Americans deserve the same opportunity that Arizonans have to be able to try to save their life and do whatever is necessary to save their life if they are terminally ill and they have no other options, no hope.

I think that we can honor Laura and others like her by allowing everybody across the United States who suffers from a terminal illness the access to every tool available to help them fight for their precious life. The Right to Try, to me, is, in reality, a component of the God-given right to life. The Right to Try offers hope to those who have nowhere else to turn.

Laura Knaperek passed away at the age of 60, leaving behind her husband, Robert, their 6 children, 19 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandchild.

I ask my colleagues to join with me today in honoring Laura's life and pray that we continue Laura's fight to allow those with terminal illnesses another chance at life.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for that warm tribute to a woman who selflessly provided an option that women and men can use in the event that they are terminally ill where a possible drug treatment or other type of treatment has been identified that has not yet cleared the FDA drug analysis and has not yet been approved but may be tremendously helpful to preserving these lives that will be otherwise cut short so early, especially a woman of Laura's caliber, who, at 60 years of age, died, leaving such a wonderful family.

I thank the gentleman for sponsoring the legislation giving people the same opportunities that Arizonans have.

Have you reintroduced that piece of legislation in this Congress?

Mr. SALMON. Actually, we are going to be reintroducing it, and we are probably going to rename it Laura's Law in honor of Laura Knaperek.

There are very few times in your life that you meet somebody that you think they got the memo mixed up in Heaven, that God sent a memo that said that this person that is supposed to be an angel actually got to come down to Earth. That was Laura. She was an angel, a living angel, and somebody that gave a lot of people reason for hope through the course of her life, and she never, ever sought recognition. All she sought was helping others and changing other people's lives.

Do you know what? That is the standard I think we all aspire to, but there are rare occasions where we find somebody that just embodies everything that is good.

Mrs. LUMMIS. As we celebrate Women's History Month, we look for that junction between women who have done historic things, women such as Laura, and the way that they have paved the way for policies that can be implemented that provide opportuni-

ties for people that are in a similar condition as hers to have some hope and a chance at a longer life.

We are grateful that Congressman SALMON has been willing to pick up the torch of her good work and bring it to the attention of, and hopefully the approval of, this Congress.

I thank the gentleman for his role in this Congress, for acknowledging the importance of Laura's life for today's Special Order on Women's History Month, and for carrying on her fine work in his capacity as a fine gentleman who is doing the best to represent his State, and in doing so, enhances the opportunity for every American in this Nation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SALMON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. I do want to say one other thing.

I know that the gentlewoman is going to be retiring after the end of this term, and I just want to say what a true honor it has been to serve with a statesman such as yourself. You are truly one of the bright spots in this place.

There have been a lot of times when I feel like I kind of had to kick myself extra hard to get motivated to come back and get on that plane and come to Washington, D.C., and leave my family behind; but there are people that give me hope, and you are one of those people. You will be sorely missed. It doesn't matter whether you are a woman or not a woman. You happen to be. You are a fine, fine individual, and I am proud to know you.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman. It is an honor to serve with you.

I know you are completing your second tour of duty in this Congress as well and will be returning to a lovely family in Arizona. Those of us who are from the West are blessed to live in beautiful places with people that create a society that matches the scenery, and you are an important part of that society.

Clearly, Laura was an important part of that society. She enhanced your life; and you, in turn, enhance ours.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his service.

Here, in Women's History Month, I can't help but toot the horn of my great State of Wyoming, the first government in the world to grant women the right to vote. We also had the first woman Governor, the first woman justice of the peace, the first woman grand juror, the first woman who were elected delegates to the Republican and Democratic National Conventions, and the first woman elected official in the country, who happened to be the State superintendent of public instruction, Estelle Reel.

All of these women were trailblazers. This all happened 50 years before the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitu-

tion granted all American women the right to vote.

Wyoming territory, in 1869, became the first government in the world to continuously grant women the right to vote, and it has been my privilege as a woman from the great State of Wyoming to follow a woman colleague, Congresswoman Barbara Cubin, who served 14 years in this body. I now, in my eighth term, make a combined total of 22 consecutive years where our beloved State of Wyoming has been represented in this House of Representatives by women. And that is really saying something, since Wyoming only has one Member of Congress. It is, indeed, a great honor.

These women, however, we cannot just celebrate their past, our past, and the opportunities that we enjoy in this great Nation. We have to use what we have learned as American women to enhance the lives of our fellow Americans as we serve here, which is one of the reasons that we are both celebrating Women's History Month and discussing specifically, today, what the Republican Party is doing.

Women's History Month is our opportunity to celebrate the incredible accomplishments women have made to America. But the most lasting tribute we can pay this month is our effort to make history for the next generation of women. That is why House Republicans are building an agenda to restore a confident America where every American feels secure in their lives and their futures.

The five big priorities that women care about that we are working on together this year include: national security, which was discussed by RENEE ELLMERS; jobs, which was discussed, of course, by VIRGINIA FOXX; health care, where we have several nurses and medical practitioners that are women that are deeply involved in this legislative project; and upward mobility, something that is important to all Americans, but especially women.

When you consider how many women heads of household there are; when you consider that a rising tide lifts all boats, and when women earn more money, families do better, children do better, women do better, and men do better, it is very important, when we are talking about upward mobility, that opportunities are provided for women by having a Tax Code that does not burden them and by having jobs that come back to this country that have previously left this country.

We can do that by changing our Tax Code in a way that allows us to bring jobs back to this country so those employers and their employees are not penalized by higher taxes that we have through a Tax Code that makes sure that corporations pay more taxes here than they do in other countries. That is why we have what are called inversions. That is why people are leaving this country to take their jobs to other countries. We need to bring them back, providing more opportunities to have

great jobs here in this country for women, heads of household, and for all members of our society and culture.

With women making the majority of healthcare decisions in this country, we need to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act with an act that will provide opportunities for a marketplace for insurance that acknowledges that some people have preexisting conditions and you will not be penalized for such, that acknowledges that some people just want catastrophic coverage and later in their life can move into a system that maybe provides more specific coverage, and that allows you to shop for insurance across State lines. You can find a product that works specifically for you and that has a pool of participants large enough so that a very small population State like mine can be involved in a bigger pool, thereby bringing down the risk and bringing down the costs for those of us in very small States.

□ 1430

We have to be looking also at specific healthcare issues. Multiple sclerosis is much more prevalent in the Intermountain West than it is in a lot of other areas.

Research being done right now at Cornell University is showing that there is a possible connection between multiple sclerosis and a fungus in the soils.

These are the kinds of unusual connections when research is done that will allow us to address certain healthcare issues that may be more prevalent in one region than another, a healthcare system that is flexible and affordable and recognizes that not all healthcare issues are the same for men or women, for the Intermountain West versus the coastal States, for the African American population, for the Hispanic American population, for the White population.

These are all things that need to be discussed in the context of an affordable healthcare system that recognizes the tremendous scientific advantages that we enjoy by virtue of having a first-class higher education system.

We have to make sure that that higher education system continues to advance opportunities for all people that can contribute to the body of knowledge that have made America the greatest country in the world.

Women currently making up the largest component of the higher education population will be leading the way among them.

Mr. Speaker, before I wrap up this Special Order that has acknowledged women's history in this country and acknowledges the work that is being done here in Congress to make sure the future for American women is brighter, better, more prosperous, and more fulfilling than ever, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a champion of healthcare revision that will benefit both men and women.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming

for yielding to me on this important topic. I am privileged to be here on the floor listening to this discussion that we have today.

I think of the many, many hours that roll back as far back as 2009, when the healthcare debate began to get intensified here in this Congress. From the beginning, for me, it was about freedom.

I often say to people that the most sovereign thing that we have is our soul. We are in charge of that. We are in control of that. With God's help, we are in the management of our own soul. The Federal Government hasn't figured out how to tax it, how to nationalize it, or how to manage it.

That may be a point of profundity, but what is the second most sovereign thing that we have, aside from our soul? Number two is our skin and everything inside it, our bodies.

The Federal Government has figured out under ObamaCare how to nationalize that, how to do—I call it a hostile takeover of our skin and everything inside it—and tell us: We are going to tax your paycheck and we are going to command you to take that money and pay a health insurance premium, not the policy of your choice, but the policy of Uncle Sam's choice.

Then that policy, the rules written within it and the thousands of pages of rules that have been written on ObamaCare since, will determine whether you get health care or at least whether you get it paid for out of your health insurance policy or not. That I call a hostile takeover of my skin and everything inside it.

It is abhorrent to me for a free people to be subjugated to such a law. Yet, the other side of this is that we have had elections in 2010, 2012, 2014, and now an election coming up in 2016.

The results of this upcoming election might be the one where we finally set the full 100 percent "rip it out by the roots as if it had never been enacted" ObamaCare.

"Repeal it completely and entirely as if it had never been enacted" actually are the last words of the repeal bill that I wrote in the middle of the night after it passed here on March 22, 2010, a sleepless night, I might add.

The question was: What is the other side of the glorious repeal of ObamaCare? A number of really good things that we would have done by now if it weren't obstructed by the policy that exists in front of us that is named after our President.

The first and I think most important one is to provide for selling insurance across State lines. There is legislation there that has existed for years called the McCarran-Ferguson Act.

It is legislation that enables the States to write the mandates and the specifications in such a way that the States can be lobbied by large health insurance companies whose goal is to have a monopoly within each of those States.

That is trade protectionism that is allowed. It is in violation of the Com-

merce Clause in the Constitution, I might add. But the McCarran-Ferguson Act enables that.

We need to repeal the components of the McCarran-Ferguson Act so that a young man, while at the beginning of this dialogue in 2009 or 2010—a 23-year-old young man would be paying about \$6,000 a year for a typical health insurance policy in New Jersey, but a young man, same age, similarly situated in Kentucky, would be paying about \$1,000 a year.

This would let the young man from New Jersey buy the policy from Kentucky, which, eventually, the competition would bring the price down in New Jersey, probably wouldn't bring it up in Kentucky, and we would see that the opportunities we would have as Americans we could trade for health insurance in any State.

Free trade zones on health insurance, what a wonderful thing. Then the Federal mandates would be gone. They would be away.

That would mean that especially young people that could wisely manage their investments would be able to buy a health savings account. The way they were set up in 2003, a couple at age 20 could have invested \$5,150 a year. That was the max-out in an HSA.

If they spent about \$2,000 a year for normal medical costs and accrued the balance of that at the 40-year average of interest rate, they would arrive at 65 Medicare eligibility with approximately \$950,000 in their health savings account.

Uncle Sam's interest in that HSA at that point, that nearly \$1 million, would be to tax it as real income when it comes out of the HSA.

Well, I would say instead, if you could buy a Medicare replacement policy in the dollars, when we did the math on this, for the couple for \$144,000, the government would tax the balance. I would say keep the change tax free.

If you take yourself off of the Medicare rolls, the entitlement rolls, by buying a replacement annuitized, paid-up-for-life policy to replace the Medicare liability, keep the change tax free, say, \$150,000, around \$800,000 tax free, that becomes your retirement account.

The HSA has become now a life management account where you would be planning your health insurance. The more money you had in your HSA, the more deductible you could sustain, the higher deductible and the higher co-payment.

With that nest egg of an HSA, you could negotiate the health insurance premiums down. You would manage your way, get your exercise, get your check-ups, because you would want to be able to live long and healthy to spend all of that mad money, if you choose, that balance of \$800,000.

That is the kind of thing that is in front of us if we can get ObamaCare out of the way. Sell insurance across State lines, expand HSAs, address the

tort reform piece of this, which is billions of dollars a year that is unnecessarily spent on tests that are done to protect from the liability that is there.

With these packages, other good ideas that come from other Members doing this in the fashion and vision by our Founding Fathers, we go out to where all of the solutions are, out to the voices and ideas of the people, bring those ideas here.

Each of us, our job, the gentlewoman from Wyoming's job and mine, is to sort through the good ideas, bring the best ideas here to Washington, let our best ideas compete with the other good ideas, and put that out on the President's desk for the solutions that we really need.

I appreciate the attention and the opportunity to speak.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his leadership on this issue, for being a devoted husband, father, and father-in-law.

I know that the women in his life have influenced his perspective on these healthcare issues, as have so many of us. I thank him for participating in this discussion, this Special Order, celebrating Women's History Month.

I want to conclude the Special Order by highlighting two Republican women with whom I serve in Congress who are truly doing courageous things in their lives with their families.

First of all, Congresswoman CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, who is the highest ranking Republican woman in this conference, is our conference leader. She is the mother of three children.

One is a special needs child, a friend to all of us, a delightful young man who was born while she was serving in Congress, as were her other two children.

The devotion that CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS has to her family and to parents of special needs children has brought about important legislation that is good for parents and special needs children all over this country.

As we celebrate this Women's History Month, I want to acknowledge our colleague CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS for her important role in this Congress as a leader on this issue and many others.

I also want to acknowledge our colleague JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, who is from the State of Washington. JAIME, during a pregnancy which occurred while she also was serving as a Member of this Congress, as she still does, experienced a pregnancy that would have brought about the death of her child.

But because she was courageous enough to test and, like Laura's Law, allow a rather experimental treatment where she was injected with a saline solution in utero that allowed that baby to continue to mature until its birth, at which point it was allowed to grow and had dialysis, and then, at a point at which that child had become big enough and healthy enough, received an organ transplant from JAIME

HERRERA BEUTLER's husband, the father of the child.

That child and that father and that mother, who we continue to serve with here in this Congress, are all doing well. This is the first known child to survive, given the condition that that child was identified as having before it was born.

Most doctors recommend that a parent terminate that pregnancy or, in many cases, that pregnancy will be terminated on its own without any involvement outside of the womb.

But in JAIME'S case, she took the extraordinary step of having a saline injection to allow that child to continue to grow and mature in a way that allowed it to be born.

This is a lovely child, another friend of all of ours, because, occasionally, that child visits us here in the Cloakroom behind this floor of the House.

What an honor to serve with these two courageous mothers who, while having these children and going through these extraordinary issues, are serving their States, their districts, their Nations in this Congress, and contributing to uplifting women in this country through their service to this Congress.

As I conclude this tribute to Women's History Month, I want to remind people that women in this Congress are making a difference with regard to legislation that affects all of us, whether they are in the avenues of natural resources, water, air—the areas that I spend most of my time on—whether they are in the areas of health care, jobs, or higher education.

The areas that women in Congress are interested in are as diverse as the areas that men are interested in, but women bring a different perspective to those same issues. Women look out into the future.

When I served in the Wyoming Legislature, our chief clerk, who sits up there just as these folks do and observes what is happening, was one day asked: Can you tell a difference between the way men and women legislate, regardless of whether they are Democrats or Republicans?

He said: Absolutely. Women are looking to the future. They are not focused on the next election. They are focused beyond the next election for what will be good for their children, their grandchildren, and future of the Nation.

□ 1445

As I observed his comments throughout my legislative years in Wyoming and now throughout my legislative years here, I think there is some truth to that. That is why I think it is so important that women be involved in the legislative process and participate in this great institution, which is the Congress of the United States, for the betterment of future generations.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, we got word of a decision that may be the death knell for the budget proposal made by the majority of this body. The members of the self-styled Freedom Caucus have announced their refusal to support the plan that their own leadership has put forward. I am truly afraid of what they would offer as an alternative, because the budget being considered in committee this week is a far cry from what American families need.

Mr. Speaker, at its most fundamental level, a budget is two things: a guiding document and a statement of values. The budget that the House Republicans have put forward—the budget that is not enough for the Freedom Caucus—makes it clear that they value special interests more than working families. It is a guiding document to an America that is bereft of opportunity for those who have worked or have studied or have fought for it.

My colleagues and I are here on the floor tonight to support a very different plan—a budget that seeks to give everyday Americans the only opportunity they have ever asked for—the opportunity to work hard, to play by the rules, and to get ahead. It is a budget for the people, so it shouldn't come as a surprise that we call it The People's Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget would invest in our schools, our roads, our bridges, our workers, and our environment to put us back on the path to prosperity in a way that austerity never will, because the cuts of the past few years should have made one thing clear: trimming our spending does little to impact the long-term deficit, but it destroys working families, hinders the most vulnerable Americans, and threatens the future of our Nation.

The People's Budget would invest \$1 trillion in our bridges, roads, railways, and other infrastructure facilities to prevent the kind of devastating failures we have witnessed in Flint, Michigan.

The People's Budget would fully fund Head Start, capitalizing on one of the best opportunities to give our young

people a leg up in an increasingly global economy.

The People's Budget would take steps to make debt-free college a reality for students, keeping higher education as a ladder into economic prosperity rather than making it a privilege for top earners.

The People's Budget would fully fund affordable housing programs, and it would end persistent family homelessness with an investment of \$11 billion.

The People's Budget would take a stand on protecting our environment from further damage by investing in clean and renewable energy resources and ending subsidies for oil, gas, and coal once and for all. And that is just the beginning.

Our economy may be rebounding from the Great Recession, but there are plenty of Americans who have been left behind—stuck in roles with low wages, in long-term unemployment, in the gender and racial pay gaps that persist in this Nation, or in debt that keeps them from progressing in their lives. We can't afford to let this stand. We need a budget for the people, and we need it now.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that was announced by the majority yesterday is truly a roadmap to ruin. It would leave seniors out in the cold by ending the Medicare guarantee. It would gut domestic programming with \$6.5 trillion in cuts—the most outrageous and threatening action ever proposed by the majority on the Budget Committee. It would make the gap between average Americans and the wealthy few too great to bridge, taking away any chance at restoring the vibrant middle class our economy relies on. It would do the same thing that my colleagues have tried to do for some time, which would be to stack the deck for top earners and the well-connected at the expense of everyone else.

The people need change. The people need a plan that levels the playing field, that gives them opportunities to succeed, and that puts their interests above the interests of corporations and the wealthy. The people need salaries to let them do more than just make ends meet. The people need a way to pay for affordable child care while they are at their jobs. The people need education for their children and teachers who are trained to give students the tools to succeed. They need roads that aren't crumbling and trains that stay on the tracks; they need bridges and tunnels that connect them with their jobs without their having to spend hours in traffic; and they need job training to find employment in a changing economy.

The people, Mr. Speaker, need The People's Budget.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), my colleague and the chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the Representative WATSON COLEMAN. I appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership

during the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. Every week, she helps give the world the progressive message, and I am so grateful that she does.

Mr. Speaker, let me mention that The People's Budget is really not just some document that members of the Progressive Caucus, when huddled in a room, drafted up. We actually believed that the people ought to participate in the writing of The People's Budget, so we engaged not only the ideas of constituents from our districts but also those from other people, like from the Economic Policy Institute, the people in the labor community, and others, who all had great ideas about how to formulate our budget. Altogether, we included the ideas of 44 different groups and of many, many individuals beyond that to support and help us draft The People's Budget. We want to thank all of them.

This really is a People's Budget because it puts forward the main thing that any budget ought to put forward in a budget from Congress, and that is the promotion of good-paying jobs.

Now, just because the unemployment rate has gotten to a lower level doesn't mean that we have got a great jobs picture for working Americans. The People's Budget would increase good-paying jobs by 3.6 million, and we are very proud of that. While Republicans may think that the best way to judge a budget is by how many dollars from the Federal budget they cut, we believe that the main way to judge a budget is by how many Americans are put to work in good-paying jobs.

How do we create these jobs?

One, by investing in our infrastructure. The People's Budget invests in \$1 trillion so that we can rebuild our roads, bridges, railways, water systems, and grids. We make sure that the crumbling infrastructure that faces us right now gets fixed. That includes infrastructure in Flint, Michigan, and in other cities around this country where water infrastructure is so hard-pressed.

Beyond that, we will provide the protections that American workers need. The People's Budget calls for the protection of collective bargaining; it works to close the pay equity gap; it increases funding for worker protection agencies that crack down on wage theft and overtime abuses—but that \$1 trillion will also save American lives.

Two weeks ago, I and many members of the Congressional Progressive and Black Caucuses traveled to Flint, Michigan, and I saw firsthand what happens when governments are run like a business. When money is the only consideration and when the Governor thinks that passing an emergency manager law just to cut costs at the expense of children's health and clean water, we see what the results of that kind of thinking are and that it is penny-wise, but incredibly pound-foolish. I met dozens of families who were exposed to dangerous levels of lead, but also people who were touched by the evils of Legionnaires' disease because of waterborne illness.

The People's Budget includes \$765 million for the city of Flint so that we can replace toxic pipelines and provide health and education services for residents. Flint isn't the only city that is exposing residents to lead; so The People's Budget also includes \$150 billion for waterlines nationwide.

We can never allow a tragedy like Flint's to happen again, but we have to make the investments right now. It is a simple choice: Do we believe that we should have a State's tax cuts go to the richest dead people? Should we cut their taxes? Should we cut the taxes of multinational, giant, profitable corporations? Or should we spend the money to help ensure the health and welfare of American children and other citizens?

I think we should look out for the American people. The People's Budget does that. We are glad to have the support of so many organizations, and we look forward to a very strong vote when the day arrives.

STOP VIOLENCE IN HONDURAS

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make another statement which is unrelated to our budget, but it is still very important.

I am profoundly saddened and angered by the murders of Berta Caceres and Nelson Garcia, two leading environmental activists in the nation of Honduras. These two murders were less than 2 weeks apart. It is an ongoing challenge that must be addressed immediately.

Ms. Caceres spent decades fighting for the rights of Honduras' indigenous community, winning the Goldman Environmental Prize—an internationally recognized award—for her work. She was assassinated in her home while she was supposed to be under special protection by government security forces.

Mr. Garcia was a member of Ms. Caceres' organization, the Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras. He was shot yesterday in front of his mother-in-law's home.

Honduras and the world have lost two extraordinary advocates for environmental and indigenous rights, and also for social justice.

We need to do more than mourn their losses. It is time to act. It is time to suspend assistance to the Honduras security forces until such time as we know they are not penetrated by illegal actors; until such time as we can be assured when they say they are going to protect somebody, those people are protected; and until we know and have confidence that American taxpayers' dollars are not being used to assassinate leaders who are doing nothing more than trying to improve the environment and increase the rights of indigenous people.

These assassinations fit into a pattern of attacks that has taken place against Honduran activists since the 2009 military coup. The NGO Global

Witness calls Honduras the most dangerous place in the world for environmental activists. More than 100 environmental activists have been killed in the last 5 years there, and many activists and community leaders remain at risk. We must do everything in our power to stop this violence and harassment in Honduras.

Please rest in peace, Berta Caceres and Nelson Garcia. The people who remain behind will continue to fight for environmental justice and indigenous rights, and we here in the United States join that fight.

U.S. SUPREME COURT NOMINEE MERRICK GARLAND

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to spend a few minutes on another important topic as well.

Today, President Obama nominated Chief Justice Merrick Garland to fill the vacancy that has been left on the Supreme Court by Associate Justice Antonin Scalia.

Judge Garland has more Federal judicial experience than any Supreme Court nominee in history. His work on the D.C. circuit court, an appointment to which he was confirmed with strong bipartisan support, has earned praise from Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. He is qualified. He is competent. He is not the ultraliberal that many of my conservative colleagues feared.

□ 1500

Yet, following up on his promise that the Senate would consider absolutely no one that President Obama put forward, Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said today: "It is a president's constitutional right to nominate a Supreme Court justice, and it is the Senate's constitutional right to act as a check on a president and withhold its consent."

I beg to differ. I think it is the President's constitutional responsibility, not just a prerogative, to fill the bench of the Supreme Court. Withholding consent, something that is typically done when a candidate is underqualified or inappropriate, is far different than just ignoring the process altogether.

This is a political decision made about the only body that shouldn't be exposed to such things. It goes beyond just a filibuster or commentary from a few outliers.

And if Republicans follow through with their plan, it would constitute the longest vacancy with no vote on a nominee ever. There is no precedent for this. There have been appointments, nominations, and, above all, hearings during Presidential election years.

It is flat out ridiculous to refuse a man as qualified as Judge Garland even hearings. This is a dereliction of duty that surpasses the sadly run-of-the-mill inability of the majority to get anything done, from funding the government until the eleventh hour to

passing a budget, to actually governing.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I came to the floor without taking the time to say this: The Senate must change course and consider Judge Garland on his merits. He has earned bipartisan support before, and he deserves it again.

I need to remind this body and the Senate that the President of the United States was elected for a second term and that term includes four full years.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my Special Order hour.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week there were a few very important votes that occurred on complex issues that I would like to discuss here today. They were with regards to H. Con. Res. 75 and H. Con. Res. 121, which is the one I will discuss now.

Make no mistake. H. Con. Res. 121 is a war bill. It is a thinly veiled attempt to use the rationale of humanitarianism as a justification for overthrowing the Syrian Government of Assad.

Similar resolutions were used in the past to legitimize the regime-change wars to overthrow the governments of Iraq and Libya. I will have no part of it. I voted "no" on H. Con. Res. 121. I voted "no" against more unnecessary interventionist regime-change wars.

We all know that Bashar al-Assad, President of Syria, is a brutal dictator. But this resolution's purpose is not merely to recognize him as such. Rather, it was a call to action. Specifically, it is a call to escalate our war to overthrow the Syrian Government of Assad.

For the last 5 years, the United States, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and others have been working hand in hand in that war to overthrow the Assad Government, supposedly for humanitarian reasons. But I ask: How has this war to overthrow Assad actually helped humanity?

Hundreds of thousands of Syrians have been killed. Millions have become homeless refugees. Much of the country's infrastructure has been destroyed.

Terrorist organizations like ISIS, al Qaeda, and others have taken over large areas of the country and are engaging in genocide.

Now the same people who are behind this war to overthrow Assad want to escalate that war, and this resolution is an attempt to gin up public support for that escalation.

This resolution urges the administration to create "additional mechanisms

for the protection of civilians," which is really coded language for the creation of a so-called no-fly zone or safe zone.

The creation of this no-fly zone or safe zone in Syria would be a major escalation of the war. Doing this would cost billions of dollars, require tens of thousands of ground troops, and a massive U.S. air presence. It won't work.

Furthermore, it will likely result in a direct confrontation between the United States and Russia. Fortunately, President Obama has thus far opposed implementing such a so-called no-fly zone and has resisted pressure to escalate this war in this way.

The fact is that the main areas currently in Syria where Christian, Alawites, Druze, Yazidis, and other religious minorities can practice their faith without fear of persecution are in the Syrian territories where Assad maintains control.

Therefore, the overthrow of Assad would worsen the genocidal activities by ISIS and al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations against Christians, Alawites, and other Syrian religious minorities.

If the U.S. has learned nothing else from Iraq and Libya, we should have learned that toppling ruthless dictators in the Middle East creates even more human suffering and strengthens our enemy, groups like ISIS and other terrorist organizations in those countries.

It is undeniable that, in both Iraq and Libya, humanitarian conditions today are far worse than they were before those governments were toppled and ISIS and other terrorist organizations are far more powerful with greater strongholds, causing even more suffering.

If the U.S. is successful in its current efforts to overthrow the Syrian Government of Assad, allowing groups like ISIS and al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations to take over all of Syria, which is what will happen, including those Assad-controlled areas where Christians and other religious minorities remain protected, the United States will be morally culpable for the genocide that will occur as a result.

This is exactly what happened when we overthrew Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It is what happened in Libya when we overthrew Muammar Gaddafi. To do the same thing over and over and expect a different result is the definition of insanity.

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

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives

and to continue the deliberation here that makes this the most deliberative body anywhere in the world.

I understand that the Senate might take issue with that. However, I am always happy to engage in debate with the Senators as well.

I came to the floor because I wanted to speak, Mr. Speaker, about an issue that has cost scores and scores of American lives.

Since the time I came into this Congress, I was surprised and, you might say, shocked and appalled that so few Members were paying attention to the reality of what is happening in the streets of America over the years.

I think of a school bus that was run off the road up in Cottonwood, Minnesota, a few years ago. Four of the children in that school bus were killed. Two of them were siblings. Three families were hit with that terrible tragedy.

The cause of that accident was a vehicle that ran the bus off the road that was driven by an illegal alien that had been interdicted multiple times and turned loose on the streets to recommit again and again.

I recall that discussion. It brought home to me something that I knew logically, but I hadn't felt emotionally at that point, Mr. Speaker.

If there are people in this country who are unlawfully present and the law directs that, when encountered by law enforcement, they shall be placed into removal proceedings, if we enforce the law when we encounter people that are illegally in America, then, by the very definition of following the law that requires that they are placed in removal proceedings, they are no longer on the streets of America, they are no longer driving vehicles that are running school buses off the road or bringing about head-on crashes or being involved in vehicular homicide or driving while under the influence because, by definition of enforcement of the law, they are not here to do that.

They might commit these crimes in other countries, in their home country. That is the issue for the countries that they can be lawfully present in.

But here, when I see the funerals of four children that come about because we had an opportunity to enforce the law and, instead, we decided that our compassion for the law breaker was greater than our compassion for the victim of the crime, you end up with four funerals of children that were riding home from school in a school bus that day.

Now, it shouldn't take very much for people who are professionals that deal with this every day to understand that, that if the law says that they shall be placed in removal proceedings—you have a President who says to them instead, through Jeh Johnson, who is now the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, to the law enforcement officers who have pledged and take an oath to support and defend the Constitution—which, by the way, the President takes an oath to pre-

serve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

The very definition in the Take Care Clause of the Constitution is that he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Well, instead, the President has decided to essentially execute some of the immigration law that exists. That doesn't mean enforce it. When I say that, I say that facetiously, Mr. Speaker. He has ordered the law enforcement officers to not enforce the law.

And the advice that came from Jeh Johnson to the law enforcement officers of the Border Patrol was, if you came into this job and put on this uniform and took your oath to support and defend the Constitution and you thought that it meant that you are going to enforce immigration law, if you think that is what you are going to do, you had better get another job.

That was the message to them that came out here about 10 days ago—get another job if you came here to enforce the law—if you are working for the Border Patrol or for ICE or for Customs and Border Protection.

It is an appalling thing, Mr. Speaker, to think that we have a President who has taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and, instead, he is taking care that they not be enforced in case after case after case. And this poster I have, Mr. Speaker, is the bloody result.

The title says "Free to Kill: 124 Criminal Aliens Released By Obama Policies Charged With Homicide Since 2010." Now, that is not all of the homicides.

Here is where they are. A lot of them are in California. A good number of them are in Arizona, Texas, and up along the East Coast. They are in Council Bluffs, Iowa, or in Omaha. Yes, they are in my neighborhood as well, Mr. Speaker.

Now, that is 124 killers. These are criminals that had already been prosecuted, already been convicted. These are felons that had been released on the streets of America because of a policy that the President seems to think is a discretionary policy.

That is not 124 graves only. That is at least 135 graves because of the multiple murders that have taken place after they are convicted. At least two of them that were released on the streets in the past were already convicted of homicide-related charges. That is how bad this is.

The idea that we shouldn't enforce our laws even against people that are illegal in the United States, unlawfully present in America, out of some sense of compassion, and they might say that they don't have the room and they don't have the budget, well, that is not so either.

I would just note some of the statistics that I have pulled down here over time. In 2012, ICE reported that there were 850,000 aliens present in the coun-

try who had been ordered removed or excluded, but who had not departed. That is 850,000.

Now, they tell us that there are 11.2 million illegal aliens in America. Well, I don't actually accept that number. That is a number that has been constantly and commonly used here.

I arrived here in 2003. I swore in here in January of 2003. At that time, the immigration debate was talking about 12 million illegals in America. 12 million. 12 million. The drum of 12 million was beat for several years. Then it drifted down to 11.5. Now it is 11.2 million.

We are thinking that we have a crisis with illegal immigration coming into America. But the number hasn't increased? Have that many gone back home? Have that many died?

If not, that number is growing, and I think it has grown substantially more. The data we are looking at is 11.2 million, and that is from the Pew Research Center. I think they do a good job. I do disagree with them on that number.

If that is the case, out of 11.2 million illegals in America, 850,000 aliens are present in the United States of America who had already been ordered removed. We call that law enforcement?

Just about anybody in the world that has ever looked across and thought about coming to America knows that your chances of being sent back to your home country, if you succeed in getting into America, are nil. They are almost nothing.

If you embarrass the administration, if you are such a violent criminal, perhaps they will find a way to send you back. But even this administration, when they want to send them back, the few that they do, doesn't push hard on those other countries to take them back.

Now, every country in the world that refuses to take their illegals back, we have the leverage to convince them, I believe, to take those illegal aliens back, 850,000 of them.

□ 1515

I didn't divide that out, but it is roughly 1 in 12 of the illegal aliens in America have already been adjudicated for deportation, but they don't go, and we don't do anything about it.

Here is another statistic. For every 10 Americans detained in Federal court—that's Americans—173 illegal aliens are detained by a Federal court. So I don't know why they gave me 10 of 173, but I can divide that out in my head. Federal court deals with 17.3 illegal aliens for each American—that would be an American, lawful, permanent resident or an American citizen that they deal with. That is a high, high volume of illegal aliens going through our Federal court system.

Here is another piece of data that emerged from a study that I requested in 2005. This was a GAO study that shows that 27 percent of our Federal prison population is criminal aliens—27

percent. So more than a fourth of the inmates that are housed in Federal penitentiaries are criminal aliens. That is a huge percentage.

If you would think that they are in there for immigration crimes, for overstaying their visa, or for crossing the border, no. That is highly, highly unlikely that they are incarcerated for what this administration would call minimal offenses. They are in there for other things.

Here is another example. The illegal aliens represent 5 percent of the population, 27 percent of the Federal prison population, and presumably 27 percent of the Federal crimes that are committed as well. So that is a proportion of more than five times their representation in the population they are represented in prison and they are represented by the crimes that are committed.

Now, we should not think that these are just data, Mr. Speaker. Crimes aren't just data, because for every crime, there is at least one victim. The victims pay a huge, huge price that is not compensated by the taxpayer.

For example, our criminal laws are descended from old English common law, and old English common law recognizes this, that everything was the product, the property, of the sovereign, the king. If you went out and poached a deer, the crime was against the crown, because the king owned the deer. The king owned everything. So if you poached a deer, you killed the king's deer, and the king is going to have his justice. If you killed one of his subjects, one of his serfs, if you committed murder, the crime was against the crown.

That is why, today, the crimes that we have are against the State, whether it be the nation-state or whether it be the State that we happen to be abiding in. So when you go to criminal court, they will say this is the case of the State versus whoever has the charges brought against them, John Doe, criminal. You will hear that announced at the beginning of the criminal case: This is the case of the State of, say, Iowa, against John Doe, criminal.

The victim, if the victim is alive and survives and is in that criminal courtroom, they are going to be looking back and forth listening to the prosecution and then the defense go back and forth, and they are going to be wondering: Where am I in this equation? The victim is not in the equation because, if the State believes that they get justice, then justice is served, and the victim is essentially out of that equation with the exception of a few little things we have done such as to allow for and provide that the victim or the victim's family have an opportunity to face the accused and, actually, face the convicted.

So we are descendants from that, Mr. Speaker. When the crimes are committed against individuals, the victims of these crimes are paying the price. They are paying the price with their

lives. They are paying the price with their bodies. They are paying the price with whatever their treasured products might be.

If they are a victim of assault and battery and grand larceny, then they have been beaten up, they have been pounded, they have been bruised and bloodied and maybe bones broken. Maybe they have survived an attempted homicide, and maybe their wallet was lifted and their credit cards or their car. The things that they owned, the things that they cherished are lost, and they have to heal up. We don't compensate them for their loss even though the State is an intervenor in a criminal crime.

So the case of the State v. John Doe, criminal, should tell us that the loss of life is not compensated either. It is not measured. It is not quantified. The 124 criminal aliens released who have committed murders during this period of time is a small portion of the overall number of criminal aliens who were released who did commit homicides.

But what are those lives worth?

We just heard the gentleman from Minnesota lament the loss of two lives. It is tragic. I am sorry he comes here to this floor. I am sorry that he feels that pain. I am sure the families feel the pain. But these are mostly anonymous victims, the four children in Cottonwood, Minnesota.

Kate Steinle—the story that I pulled here, her name is now a household name, Mr. Speaker—was murdered in San Francisco on July 1, 2015. Now when I see an attractive young lady with brown hair, immediately the picture of Kate Steinle flashes into my mind's eye, standing there innocently and shot and killed by a criminal alien who had been ordered deported, I believe the number would be at least twice before, on the streets because San Francisco is a sanctuary city.

Well, the sanctuary city isn't just exclusive to San Francisco. All over this country there are sanctuary jurisdictions. There are sanctuary jurisdictions in Iowa, at least 25 of them that I can identify, and they exist across the country, local jurisdictions that have decided they are not going to cooperate with Federal law enforcement officers.

And furthermore, when ICE puts out a detainer order, Federal law requires that an ICE detainer order is mandatory. The statute that was passed directed the rules to be written in such a way that the detainer orders are mandatory.

A year ago, February 25, I believe that day would be—I remember my date is right, but I am not certain on my year. It could be 2014 rather than 2015. But the ICE Acting Deputy Director, Dan Ragsdale, sent a letter out to hundreds of political jurisdictions, law enforcement jurisdictions, and said to them: This ICE detainer order that you have been getting, that you have been complying with because it is an order, it is really not an order. It is just a

suggestion. So we are not going to enforce that, and neither are we going to protect you if you are sued for detaining someone that ICE has put a detainer order on.

They essentially said: We don't have your back at the Justice Department, even though the law directs that we do have. And so that brought about more sanctuary cities, more sanctuary jurisdictions, entire counties that have decided they are not going to cooperate with ICE. So when ICE sends an ICE detainer order to a sanctuary jurisdiction—often, a city—their policy is: We aren't going to turn this criminal over to ICE. We are going to turn him loose instead.

Well, when they turn them loose instead, they do so by the tens of thousands. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, that Americans are the victims of homicide as a result, some of it first-degree murder, second-degree murder, negligent homicide, vehicular homicide. Americans' graves are scattered all over this country at the hands of illegal aliens, criminal aliens, not only those that came across the border illegally—that makes them criminals, Mr. Speaker—but those who are in this country even legally. When they commit a crime, they become a criminal alien.

There are graves in every single State in this country, multiple graves in every single State in this country that didn't need to be. There are grieving families all over this country in every single State that didn't need to grieve. They didn't need to see their loved one killed, whether it was a car accident, whether it was a bullet, whether they were bludgeoned, however it might have been. Those lives could have been saved by enforcing the law. But, instead, the Obama administration does the opposite. They set up an affirmative plan to start turning loose illegal aliens who are felons, who are criminals.

Here is some more data. In 2014, according to a U.S. Sentencing Commission report, it shows illegal immigrants represented 36.7 percent of Federal sentences, 36.7 percent of their sentences. I have already said that 27 percent of the inmates are criminal aliens. Then, again, it is about roughly half or a little bit more of them are from Mexico.

The Obama administration, in 2013, released—and this number has been committed to my memory for some time—36,007 criminal aliens turned loose on the streets, and that represented 88,000 convictions, more than 88,000 convictions among those 36,007 criminal aliens. Of that, 193 had been convicted of homicide.

Now, when do you turn murderers loose on the streets of America, especially if they are deportable? If they serve their time—they might be second-degree murder, maybe they serve their time, maybe they get an early out—they go home to their home country. They are deported at the end of

their sentence. That is how our law reads.

But the Obama administration said: No, we are going to turn 36,007 of them loose: 193 homicides represented by them, 426 sexual assaults, 303 kidnappings, 1,075 aggravated assaults, all of that packaged up in the 36,007. That was just 2013. That was the beginning of this mass release of criminals who are criminal aliens, deportable criminal aliens out of our prisons.

In 2014, they slacked off a little bit. They only released 30,558 criminal aliens, and they represented 79,059 convictions. That is the work that is being done by the Obama administration. I could go on with data after data.

Here is one. ICE had been claiming to have removed record numbers of unlawful or otherwise removable aliens from the United States. Well, they counted their deportations differently than any administration before. So those that said they will accept a voluntary return when they are caught at the border, they will say: Well, we can put you in the van and haul you back to the port of entry and turn you loose to walk back across the bridge. If you will do that, we will count you as deported.

That used to be just voluntary return. Now the Obama administration has admitted that they have essentially jiggered the numbers and changed the category.

But even still, even if this isn't accurate in comparison to previous administrations, those numbers have gone down, from along the way, 389,834, fiscal year 2009. It did go up a little bit the next year, 392,000 and change, then up to 396,000, and then going back. The number in 2012 was almost 410,000.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that number has dropped off by tens of thousands. Then ICE has since admitted to dropping in removals clear down to 368,000 in 2013, 315,000 in 2014.

This number continues to go down, from up to nearly 410,000 down to 315,000, almost 100,000 fewer deportations when they are counting the voluntary returns in that list. That means we don't have a lot of immigration enforcement going on, and the message and the signal is: Come try to get into America. We are not going to do a lot about that in this Obama administration.

And what happens? Well, what happens is we have a Presidential nomination process that has emerged. Out of it comes, who got the first big bounce and spark off of making the pledge that he would build a wall, a beautiful wall, and he would return the people and end illegal immigration residence in America and put them the other side of the wall? That was Donald Trump. If Donald Trump doesn't have that issue, Donald Trump doesn't probably have a campaign. I am sure that it is a big part of what motivated him to run for President.

TED CRUZ also, Mr. Speaker, has the most solid and cleanest record on im-

migration policy. It is complete; it is inclusive; it is anti-amnesty all the way. And, by the way, he doesn't make provisions for inviting people back in after they are removed. I don't think that takes a whole lot of prudence to hold that position.

Why would you reward somebody that you needed to go to the trouble to adjudicate them for removal, deport them back to their home country, and then do as they said in the Gang of Eight bill? They have a provision in that bill that thankfully the House didn't take up. It is the "we really didn't mean it" clause in which they say, written into the Gang of Eight's bill, if you have been deported in the past and you are in your home country today, after the Gang of Eight bill presumably passed, you can apply to come to the United States.

□ 1530

We deported you before, but we really didn't mean it. We can bring you back in here. If we hadn't caught you in America and you had been here when the Gang of Eight bill would potentially become law, then, if you get to stay under those provisions, then you get to come back to America if you have previously been deported.

I think that is lunacy, Mr. Speaker, to be going to all the trouble to enforce the law and then to reverse course with that and provide the "we didn't really mean it" clause.

That bill, by the way, had in it prospective amnesty. In other words, it didn't deal with people who would come in after it became law, so, presumably, they would be treated with the same kind of amnesty or pass for those who were in America; and those that had been deported from America get to come back to America, too, with some exceptions if you are a bad enough criminal.

The logic of this is beyond my ability to reason with it, Mr. Speaker, but the logic that this country needs to reason with is the logic of the rule of law. We have to be a Nation of laws—not of men—and the laws need to apply to everyone equally, not applied differently to different people.

There has to be an expectation that the law will be enforced. If we don't have that, then we devolve into a Third World country. In a Third World country, you can get pulled over not even for not speeding, but you might have to pay off the officer in order to be able to drive on down the road. In this country, if that ever happens—I wouldn't say it never happens, but where I come from, it doesn't happen and I never hear of it—that would show a digression from the rule of law.

We have to all respect the law. The law has got to be enforced against everybody equally. There has to be an expectation that the law will be enforced. Any country that has any value to protecting its own sovereignty has to have borders.

We have borders. We know what they are: 2,000 miles on the southern border,

roughly 4,000 miles on the northern border, oceans on the east and on the west. Those are the borders of the United States of America. We have water all the way around Hawaii. We know the lines in Alaska. We don't dispute them with Canada. We get along just fine agreeing on what our borders are. But if we don't enforce them, if we don't protect them, we are no longer a sovereign Nation.

We allow people to stream across the border. We have had Border Patrol testimony here in this Congress within the last decade where they testified that they believed that they interdicted perhaps 25 percent of those that attempted to cross the border. When you looked at the numbers of those interdictions and did the math on that, it turned out to be 4 million illegal border crossing attempts in a single year. That is roughly at the peak of this. That has diminished by a few million.

But think of that: 365 divided into 4 million works out to about 11,000 a night. About 11,000 illegal aliens come across our southern border at night. Maybe that number could be as far down as perhaps 6,000 or so, but that is still the size of Santa Anna's army. The size of Santa Anna's army comes across every night.

Coming across, sure, there are some decent people that are looking for a better life—maybe a lot of them—but 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs that are consumed in America come from or through Mexico. It is the demand in the United States that brings those drugs in here. We have a culpability in this, too.

But just the same, the violence in Mexico, the murders—over 100,000 people have been killed in the drug wars in Mexico—is all part of an open border situation that we have here in the United States, costing Mexican lives, costing American lives. Graves are scattered in every single State in the Union because we have an administration that decided not to enforce the law, even though the President takes an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and take care that the laws be faithfully executed. We have got executive overreach time after time after time. He has reached into the constitutional authority of this Congress.

Time after time, I brought an amendment to this floor, Mr. Speaker, that has cut off all funding to implement or enforce the President's lawless, unconstitutional amnesty actions, to cut off all funding under the Morton Memos, to cut off all funding to DACA, to cut off all funding to DAPA and shut down those operations that are outside the constitutional authority of the President, by my definition, by the definition of the majority vote in this Congress, and also by the definition of the President himself, who said multiple times—and we have him on videotape at least 22 times saying he didn't have constitutional authority to—I will put it in shorthand—grant amnesty. He

didn't use those words, but it certainly is the paraphrase of what he had to say. After multiple times of telling us all the proper constitutional interpretation, he decided to do it anyway.

The President of the United States' restraint factor is not giving his word, putting his hand on the Bible, and raising his right hand and taking an oath to the Constitution. His restraining factor is not his word. It is what he can get away with.

He demanded that Congress pass the Gang of Eight amnesty bill, and Congress said: Nuts, we are not doing that. We are not going to see the demographics of America forever altered by bringing in millions of undocumented Democrats in order to play into the hands of Barack Obama and the Democrats in the Senate and the House.

We have a responsibility to the American people. We the people need to decide. That is why our Founding Fathers wrote in the enumerated powers in the Constitution the responsibility of Congress to establish the naturalization laws and, by inference, to write the immigration laws. That immigration policy is not to be set by the President of the United States. It is to be set by Congress.

Congress wrote the law in 1996, the Immigration Reform Act, which LAMAR SMITH of Texas was so instrumental in, as a large body of the immigration law that we have to follow. That was the considered will of the people. It was the bipartisan, considered will of the people, signed by the President of the United States. Gee, that would be Bill Clinton back then, wouldn't it?

So we have a country that is the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. We have a lot to be proud of. We have a destiny, an arc of history that has been flattened. It has been descending for a lot of reasons—economic reasons, cultural reasons, failure to adhere to our oaths to uphold the Constitution reasons—but in a large way, it is diminished because we have so little respect for the rule of law.

Of all of the things we can talk about with regard to immigration policy—securing our borders, ending sanctuary cities, making sure that local law enforcement works again in cooperation with Federal immigration officials, ending this idea that detainer orders are voluntary, not mandatory—piece after piece of this—an entry/exit system that tracks the people in the country and when they leave so we know what the balance is of those visitors who are here, and an E-Verify system that I will say the New IDEA Act, my bill—all of that put together brings America to the right place. We have an obligation to turn this into an upending arc of history, not descending.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1733

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 639, AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE ON BEHALF OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-458) on the resolution (H. Res. 649) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 639) authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15-674, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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, March 16, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 16, 2016, at 4:40 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a copy of an Executive Order he has issued, with respect to North Korea.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA AND THE WORKERS' PARTY OF KOREA, AND PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-117)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C.

1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") with respect to North Korea. The order takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, relied upon for additional steps in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, and further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015. The order also facilitates implementation of certain provisions of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122), which I signed on February 18, 2016, and ensures the implementation of certain provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 2270 of March 2, 2016.

In 2008, upon terminating the exercise of certain authorities under the Trading With the Enemy Act (TWEA) with respect to North Korea, the President issued Executive Order 13466 and declared a national emergency pursuant to IEEPA to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the existence and risk of the proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula. Executive Order 13466 continued certain restrictions on North Korea and North Korean nationals that had been in place under TWEA.

In 2010, I issued Executive Order 13551. In that order, I determined that the Government of North Korea's continued provocative actions destabilized the Korean peninsula and imperiled U.S. Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region and warranted the imposition of additional sanctions, and I expanded the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466. In Executive Order 13551, I ordered blocked the property and interests in property of three North Korean entities and one individual listed in the Annex to that order and provided criteria under which the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may designate additional persons whose property and interests in property shall be blocked.

In 2011, I issued Executive Order 13570 to further address the national emergency with respect to North Korea and to strengthen the implementation of UNSCRs 1718 and 1874. That Executive Order prohibited the direct or indirect importation of goods, services, and technology from North Korea.

In 2015, I issued Executive Order 13687, in which I determined that the provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea constitute a continuing threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and further expanded the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466. In Executive Order 13687 I provided additional criteria under which the Secretary of the

Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may designate additional persons whose property and interests in property shall be blocked.

I have now determined that the Government of North Korea's continuing pursuit of its nuclear and missile programs, as evidenced most recently by its February 7, 2016, launch using ballistic missile technology and its January 6, 2016, nuclear test in violation of its obligations pursuant to numerous UNSCRs and in contravention of its commitments under the September 19, 2005, Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks, increasingly imperils the United States and its allies. The order addresses those actions and takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008. The order also facilitates implementation of certain provisions of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122), which I signed on February 18, 2016, and ensures the implementation of certain provisions of UNSCR 2270 of March 2, 2016.

The order is not targeted at the people of North Korea, but rather is aimed at the Government of North Korea and its activities that threaten the United States and others. It blocks the property and interests in property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers' Party of Korea and provides additional criteria for blocking the property and interests in property of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

- to operate in such industries in the North Korean economy as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, such as transportation, mining, energy, or financial services;

- to have sold, supplied, transferred, or purchased, directly or indirectly, to or from North Korea or any person acting for or on behalf of the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea, metal, graphite, coal, or software, where any revenue or goods received may benefit the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea, including North Korea's nuclear or ballistic missile programs;

- to have engaged in, facilitated, or been responsible for an abuse or violation of human rights by the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea or any person acting for or on behalf of either such entity;

- to have engaged in, facilitated, or been responsible for the exportation of workers from North Korea, including exportation to generate revenue for the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea;

- to have engaged in significant activities undermining cybersecurity through the use of computer networks or systems against targets outside of North Korea on behalf of the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea;

- to have engaged in, facilitated, or been responsible for censorship by the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea;

- to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;

- to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

- to have attempted to engage in any of the activities described above.

In addition, the order prohibits:

- the exportation of goods, services, and technology to North Korea;

- new investment in North Korea; and

- the approval, financing, facilitation, or guarantee of such exports and investments.

Finally, the order suspends entry into the United States of any alien determined to meet one or more of the above criteria.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All executive agencies are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 15, 2016.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attendance of memorial service for Ms. Tiffany Johnson, who served the House of Representatives.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 15, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1755. To amend title 36, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the congressional charter of the Disabled American Veterans.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 2015, 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:

4657. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Removal of Obsolete and Redundant Regulations [Docket No.: FDA-2003-N-0446 (formerly 2003N-0324)] received March 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4658. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pharmaceutical Science and Clinical Pharmacology Advisory Committee [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-0001] received March 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4659. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unique Device Identification System; Editorial Provisions; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0090] received March 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4660. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4661. A letter from the Supervisory Regulations Specialist, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Improving and Expanding Training Opportunities for F-1 Non-immigrant Students With STEM Degrees and Cap-Gap Relief for All Eligible F-1 Students [DHS Docket No.: ICEB-2015-0002] (RIN: 1653-AA72) received March 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4662. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's 2015 Data Mining Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4360. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that a Federal employee who leaves Government service while under personnel investigation shall have a notation of any adverse findings under such investigation placed in such employee's official personnel file, and for other

purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114-454). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3583. A bill to reform and improve the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Emergency Communications, and the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-455, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4404. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 639. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15-674 (Rept. 114-457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 649. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 639) authorizing the Speaker to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15-674 (Rept. 114-458). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3583 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. HUDSON:

H.R. 4749. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an oil and gas lease sale for areas off the coast of North Carolina determined by the Secretary to have the most geologically promising hydrocarbon resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4750. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the prohibition on providing adoptive leave to each member of a dual military couple; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4751. A bill to terminate the law enforcement functions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and to provide block grants to States for the enforcement of Federal law on Federal land under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 4752. A bill to require the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to investigate and promote the exploration and development of space leading to human settlements beyond Earth, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4753. A bill to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 certain veterans compensation and pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BASS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 4754. A bill to require the Attorney General to ensure that State-appointed emergency financial managers do not violate Constitutional protections and that they ensure public health and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4755. A bill to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4756. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of Honor and are buried in private cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the award of the Presidential Memorial Certificate to certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces and certain deceased members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4759. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay costs relating to the transportation of certain deceased veterans to veterans' cemeteries owned by a State or tribal organization; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 4760. A bill to make an attack on a police officer a hate crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AGULLAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 4761. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 61 South Baldwin Avenue in Sierra Madre, California, as the "Louis Van Iersel Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 4762. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to cellular therapies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 4763. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 to prevent wage theft and assist in the recovery of stolen wages, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to administer grants to prevent wage and hour violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. FLORES, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4764. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide service dogs to certain veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 4765. A bill to provide first responders with planning, training, and equipment capabilities for crude oil-by-rail and ethanol-by-rail derailment and incident response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 4766. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to American military personnel who fought in defense of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago between December 7, 1941, and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942, until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to their country; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. NADLER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4767. A bill to provide safe, fair, and responsible procedures and standards for resolving claims of state secret privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BUCK, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4768. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4769. A bill to repeal the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Incentive Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide appropriate rules for the application of the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to certain contract manufacturing or production arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H. Res. 646. A resolution expressing the position of the House of Representatives in the matter of United States, et al. v. Texas, et al., No. 15-674; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 647. A resolution recognizing the Girl Scouts of the USA on the 100th anniversary of the Girl Scout Gold Award, the highest award in Girl Scouts, which has stood for excellence and leadership for girls everywhere since 1916; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 648. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives respecting budget-related points of order; to the Committee on Rules.

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. HUDSON:

H.R. 4749.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 4750.
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 provide for the common Defence”, “to raise and support Armies”, “to provide and maintain a Navy” and “to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 4751.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 4752.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power 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 of Officer thereof

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 4753.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers (Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13 and 14), and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4754.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4755.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power 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 of Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4756.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4757.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4758.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4759.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 4760.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 1, section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution of the United States which states: “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 and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 4761.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4762.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4763.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 4764.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have the 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 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 4765.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4766.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution, “The Congress shall have power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures”

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 4768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clauses 1 and 4, of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress; Article I, Section 1, Clause 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; 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. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress has the authority "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes"

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 612: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 619: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 654: Mr. OLSON and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 664: Mr. KIND, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD,

Ms. ADAMS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 752: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 759: Mr. POLLS.

H.R. 815: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 816: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 842: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 953: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 969: Mr. ROUZER and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 986: Mr. DENT and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1336: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1427: Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CLAY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1431: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1432: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1479: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1586: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1594: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1859: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. GALLEGU, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2342: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2434: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2460: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2697: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2799: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2802: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 2817: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 2894: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2896: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2932: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2962: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2992: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MENG, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 3080: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3222: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 3235: Mr. POCAN and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 3365: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3381: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 3429: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 3514: Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MENG, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3673: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3684: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3690: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3691: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 3817: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3880: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3892: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 3986: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4116: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4177: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 4184: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 4219: Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 4248: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 4262: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 4336: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 4352: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4369: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 4400: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 4448: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 4534: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4554: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4562: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 4570: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 4584: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4592: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4622: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4633: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4637: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 4640: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4651: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4664: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4668: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 4678: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4682: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4715: Mr. HURT of Virginia and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 4730: Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4747: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 112: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 156: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H. Res. 290: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 615: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Res. 621: Mr. BARTON.