



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015

No. 55

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House, who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace this opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

As they return to their home districts, may they bring discerning ears to hear not only what they are inclined to hear, but those words that might be unwelcome but important to hear. May all citizens help to make their Representatives better as legislators and as people as well.

May all that they do 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 Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REMEMBERING JIM MCNEAL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness, I rise to mourn the passing of Jim McNeal, a California business and civic leader, who for decades guided one of the largest and oldest independent ambulance companies in California, Schaefer Ambulance.

His work ethic was legendary. At the age of 83, he was still running the family business. For all those years, he struggled with the challenges of competing against his own tax dollars in a highly regulated environment, facing and fighting government double standards at every turn. I know all about that. I would get an earful from him every month or so.

Jim McNeal was a patriot who served in the Korean war and believed in freedom as a gospel that he would preach to everyone that he met.

During his marriage of 53 years, he and his wife, Louella, raised three children and had six grandchildren. Their family's grief today is shared by all who knew him. Our country has lost an exemplary citizen and, his family, a devoted patriarch.

WARRIOR BEACH RETREAT

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Warrior Beach Re-

retreat, a north Florida charity dedicated to supporting our combat wounded warriors, their families, and caregivers.

The organization was established by Linda Cope after her son, Sergeant Joshua Cope, was severely injured by an IED blast in Baghdad, Iraq, on November 12, 2006.

The Cope family turned tragedy into triumph, and twice a year, Warrior Beach Retreat welcomes 50 wounded warriors and their caregivers to Panama City with a parade and a weeklong retreat dedicated to honoring their service and sacrifice.

I wish I could be with them today in Panama City to welcome these brave wounded warriors, but unable to do that, I would like to officially recognize Warrior Beach Retreat in the RECORD and thank them on behalf of our north Florida community for all the hard work they do for our veterans.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I am introducing the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act. This bill is a bipartisan effort to make communities safer by improving access to mental health services for people in the criminal justice system.

U.S. jails have effectively replaced in-patient mental health facilities as the largest institutional treatment providers for adults with mental illnesses. Each year, more than 2 million people with serious mental illnesses are booked into jails, as well as millions more coping with less serious mental illnesses that jails are nonetheless required to address.

□ 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.

H2273

This is not right. Our jails are not mental health facilities. We can do better with the way we treat the mentally ill in the justice system, and we can do it while reducing costs and increasing public safety.

At a recent TED Talks, comedian and mental health activist Ruby White asked: How come every other organ in your body can get sick and you get sympathy, except the brain?

My bill will by no means solve the problem, but it is a step we can take to show some compassion, improve lives, and reduce recidivism by more appropriately responding to the mental health needs of those in the criminal justice system.

I encourage each of my colleagues to cosponsor and join me in this effort.

ONCOLOGY NURSING SOCIETY 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment today to highlight the contributions of the Oncology Nursing Society to cancer care in our Nation. Oncology nurses care for cancer patients during some of the most critical and challenging times of their lives.

As cancer treatments have become more complex, oncology nurses have been called upon to acquire new knowledge and skills while continuing to provide compassionate care and emotional support to their patients.

This is where the Oncology Nursing Society comes in. Since 1975, the Oncology Nursing Society has worked tirelessly to lead the transformation of cancer care and ensure that our Nation's oncology nurses are well equipped to tackle the healthcare challenges of the future. Next week, the Oncology Nursing Society will hold its 40th Annual Congress.

I want to commend the Oncology Nursing Society for its commitment to the highest quality care possible for cancer patients, and I want to offer my congratulations on its 40th anniversary.

DEATH TAX AND FARMERS

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before my time in Congress, I owned and operated a small independent insurance agency for about 20 years. I was also fortunate to spend a number of years working with my grandfather on a small cattle farm that we owned and operated.

Through both of these experiences, I have experienced firsthand how the Tax Code can make or break a small business or family farm and how the death tax, in particular, is very harm-

ful to farms and businesses and the families who own them.

Often, the death tax would force families to pay their tax bill by selling vital equipment, laying off loyal employees, or selling the farm or business entirely.

These are hard-working Americans who work from generation to generation to build these farms and businesses that are the backbone of our communities and our country.

Instead of incentivizing pursuit of the American Dream, this tax shuts down our local tractor dealers, peanut farms, and grocery stores, which is why I applaud my colleagues for joining me in repealing the death tax for family businesses, farmers, and American citizens not just in Georgia, but across this great country.

SUPPORTING THE DREAMERS AND L.B. 623

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unwavering support for the plight and uncertainty that DREAMers face in Nebraska and across the Nation.

Let me start by stating that I unequivocally support the DREAM Act. In Nebraska, the notion of immigration is as bipartisan as the legislative body itself.

As evidence, Republicans and Democrats in the State capitol are backing L.B. 623, introduced by State Senator Jeremy Nordquist. It allows driver's licenses for thousands of Nebraska DREAMers. I wholeheartedly support and endorse this bill. My good friend from across the aisle, State Senator John S. McCollister, is making these licenses his top priority.

By the way, if the name McCollister sounds familiar, it should be. In the early 1970s, John's father, Congressman John Y. McCollister, served the people of Nebraska's Second Congressional District with distinction. His son continues that tradition as he reaches across the aisle in Lincoln, Nebraska, to give our DREAMers a better life than their parents have had.

Again, I pledge today, as I have in the Nebraska legislature, to support the DREAMers. I ask my colleagues in this body and in the Senate to work towards a comprehensive reform package which includes a permanent and certain path for our DREAMer youth.

TRIBUTE TO ED WAY

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend—in fact, a friend to all of northeast Arkansas—Ed Way.

In February, Ed passed away after a short battle with brain cancer. He is

survived by his wife of 42 years, Dianna; his son-in-law, Phillip; daughters, Lindsey and Mary Catherine; and two granddaughters, Bailey and Weslea. Ed is also survived by his legacy, an incredible footprint of good works that won't soon wear away.

Ed was a banker by education and practice, but he was also an ambassador for northeast Arkansas. Whether it was the annual D.C. fly-in by the Chamber of Commerce in Jonesboro or road games supporting the Arkansas State Red Wolves, Ed was a willing and eager promoter of all that northeast Arkansas has to offer.

Ed's influence extends far beyond my own experiences. Countless others working with Ed recognized his leadership and good humor, but even beyond his job, his service with various Jonesboro civic clubs reflected Ed's desire to give back. He also served as a deacon at his church and was active with the Arkansas State Red Wolves athletic foundation.

We often search for the best way to remember and celebrate the lives of our most inspiring leaders and our truest friends. Because Ed's life was a long road of community service, the best way for us to honor his memory is through the continuation of that work.

His joyful devotion to our region set the gold standard for others to follow. By consistently striving towards that standard, we not only preserve Ed's legacy, but we honor the community he loved so much.

EARTH DAY 2015 RAPIDLY APPROACHING

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day 2015 is rapidly approaching.

I would like to draw the attention of the House and the American citizens to the reality of climate change. Global warming is real.

Take a look at California. We are in the midst of the fourth year of a very severe drought. You can debate whether the drought is or is not the result of climate change; but you cannot debate the fact that CO₂ in our atmosphere is approaching 400 parts per million, the highest it has ever been in over 800,000 years.

You cannot debate the fact that it is a heck of a lot warmer in California in the last decade than it has ever been in recorded time, and you cannot debate the fact that the snow level in California is rapidly rising up the Sierra Nevada and the Siskiyou Mountains, leaving us with an ever smaller snow reservoir.

This is a real problem. We need to address it with very strong, powerful legislation here in Congress, most of which has not been done. We have a challenge out ahead of us. I hope and pray that we meet that challenge.

HONORING FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, Florida Southern College is a liberal arts college nestled in my hometown of Lakeland, Florida. It is known not only as a great academic institution, but also contains the largest collection of Frank Lloyd Wright architecture in the world and was recently selected by the Princeton Review as the most beautiful campus in the country.

However, today, I rise to recognize another important distinction for Florida Southern College. The Moccasins Men's Basketball Team recently captured the 2015 NCAA Division II National Championship.

On Saturday, March 28, 2015, the Mocs defeated Indiana University of Pennsylvania, capping off a remarkable season with a 36-1 record. Led by senior guard and two-time Sunshine State Conference Player of the Year Kevin Capers of Winter Haven, Florida, the Mocs closed out the year by winning a school record 25 consecutive games.

Growing up in Lakeland, I have watched Florida Southern College flourish before my eyes. President Anne Kerr has done a wonderful job with this college. It is a tremendous educational institution, and this win is a terrific achievement not only for the school, but also the community.

Go Mocs.

□ 0915

PUT INLAND EMPIRE RESIDENTS BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we marked 100 days in the 114th Congress. Since taking office in January, I have traveled across my home district in southern California, in San Bernardino County, on a jobs tour to meet with small businesses, community leaders, labor representatives, and job seekers about what we can do in Congress to put the Inland Empire back to work.

After having many conversations with residents and businessowners, today, I am releasing a jobs plan—a strategy—for how we can get the Inland Empire economy back on the road to recovery.

My plan calls for giving small businesses the tools they need to grow and thrive to create 21st century jobs in emerging sectors like renewable energy and biotechnology, connecting employers with job seekers and supporting job training programs and investing in our infrastructure to spur economic development.

We have a lot of work to do, but if we focus on these areas, we can strengthen

the Inland Empire and the California economy and put our residents back to work.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE ADOPTION OF MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 1105, DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 1105 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 200, I call up the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-74, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1105

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 "Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAXES.

(a) ESTATE TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2210. TERMINATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter shall not apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

"(b) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED DOMESTIC TRUSTS.—In applying section 2056A with respect to the surviving spouse of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015—

"(1) section 2056A(b)(1)(A) shall not apply to distributions made after the 10-year period beginning on such date, and

"(2) section 2056A(b)(1)(B) shall not apply on or after such date."

(b) GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter G of chapter 13 of subtitle B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2664. TERMINATION.

"This chapter shall not apply to generation-skipping transfers on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 2210. Termination."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 13 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 2664. Termination."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and generation-skipping transfers, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATIONS OF GIFT TAX.

(a) COMPUTATION OF GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

"(A) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

"(B) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for each of the preceding calendar periods.

"(2) RATE SCHEDULE.—

"If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:

If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:	The tentative tax is:
Not over \$10,000	18% of such amount.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$20,000	\$1,800, plus 20% of the excess over \$10,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$40,000	\$3,800, plus 22% of the excess over \$20,000.
Over \$40,000 but not over \$60,000	\$8,200, plus 24% of the excess over \$40,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$80,000	\$13,000, plus 26% of the excess over \$60,000.
Over \$80,000 but not over \$100,000	\$18,200, plus 28% of the excess over \$80,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000	\$23,800, plus 30% of the excess over \$100,000.
Over \$150,000 but not over \$250,000	\$38,800, plus 32% of the excess of \$150,000.
Over \$250,000 but not over \$500,000	\$70,800, plus 34% of the excess over \$250,000.
Over \$500,000	\$155,800, plus 35% of the excess of \$500,000."

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Section 2511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and except as provided in regulations, a transfer in trust shall be treated as a taxable gift under section 2503, unless the trust is treated as wholly owned by the donor or the donor's spouse under subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1."

(c) LIFETIME GIFT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2502(a)(2) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were \$5,000,000, reduced by"

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 2505 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year after 2011, the dollar amount in subsection (a)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting ‘calendar year 2010’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10,000.”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for section 2505 of such Code is amended by striking “UNIFIED”.

(2) The item in the table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 of such Code relating to section 2505 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 2505. Credit against gift tax.”

(3) Section 2801(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “section 2001(c) as in effect on the date of such receipt” and inserting “section 2502(a)(2)”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to gifts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying sections 1015(d), 2502, and 2505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as 2 separate calendar years one of which ends on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and the other of which begins on such date of enactment.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 2504(b).—For purposes of applying section 2504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as one preceding calendar period.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of repealing the estate tax. Repealing this death tax is a top priority for Nebraska’s farmers, ranchers, and small businessowners—in fact, not just for Nebraska’s farmers, ranchers, and small businessowners but for these folks all around the country.

Agriculture, particularly raising cattle and crops such as corn, is a land-

and capital-intensive process. These Nebraskans aren’t sitting on piles of cash. In fact, their assets are the land and the equipment they use to help feed our Nation and to help feed the world. They pay income taxes on what they earn, and they pay high property taxes on the land on an annual basis. They take great pride in this work and want their children and grandchildren to continue in their livelihoods. They shouldn’t have to jump through hoops to ensure their descendants can continue their work when they have passed on.

The death tax doesn’t penalize the wealthiest Americans. In fact, they probably don’t even feel that penalty. They can plan their estates and give away their wealth as they see fit. It penalizes those who have worked all of their lives and who have reinvested in their family businesses to ensure their families and neighbors have every opportunity to be hard-working taxpayers.

I certainly urge a “yea” vote to grow opportunity in the U.S. and to support that growing opportunity.

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

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

It appears that the bipartisan, good feelings of the last few weeks are gone. After reaching across the aisle to pass important legislation like the doc fix, my Republican colleagues are back to their old tricks of handing out tax breaks to the few at the expense of the many.

Today’s vote to repeal the estate tax is just the Republicans’ last attempt to tilt the U.S. Tax Code in favor of their ultrawealthy campaign donors. This week’s target is the estate tax—a tax, I would mention, that was dreamed up by and championed by Teddy Roosevelt, who is the same guy the Republicans like to hold up as one of the greatest the party ever produced.

Their crusade to help the rich has gone too far. This proposed repeal of the estate tax is nothing more than a massive, unfunded tax break for a small sliver of America’s wealthiest families, and, as is usually the case with Republican tax policies, this repeal would do nothing to help hard-working, middle class families.

In Nebraska, 52 households would benefit while there are 202,000 people living in poverty. The fact of the matter is that the estate tax is only paid by about 5,400 families, or the top 0.2 percent of estates in the country. Estates worth less than \$5.4 million pay nothing. What is the cost of providing a tax break to the top 5,000 families? It is a quarter of a trillion dollars—\$269 billion.

Now, these are the deficit hawks who were talking last week about “we have got to worry about the deficit, the deficit, the deficit.” Yet they are standing here with a straight face, putting \$269 billion more on the deficit. Instead, we

should be using the money to extend the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit, which are tax credits that would actually help Main Street America—the real drivers of the American economy. Or we could fund universal pre-K or build new bridges and roads or provide free community college to 9 million people.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try and tell you that the estate tax hurts family farmers. My colleague who began this debate was talking about that, Mr. Speaker. They will tell you the estate tax forces farmers to liquidate in order to pay the estate tax. When pressed to provide examples, as we did, of family farms being forced to liquidate, my Republican colleagues pointed to a 15,000-acre farm they say had to be broken up for the estate tax.

Let me put that into context, as most people who live in the cities don’t know how big that is: 15,000 acres is the equivalent of 23.5 square miles. That is a 5-by-5 square mile farm. That is more than the island of Manhattan. Manhattan isn’t that big, and it is home to a million people. I think most people who work hard would be hard pressed to believe that 23 square miles is a family farm.

As families at the very top of the income scale experience unprecedented wealth and prosperity—some may call it the second Gilded Age—Republicans are helping the rich get richer. They want to talk about “We are going to help the middle class,” but what are they doing? They are shoveling a quarter of a trillion dollars out the door to the richest. Repealing the estate tax will surely sow the seeds of a permanent aristocracy in this country. We learned from Britain what a permanent aristocracy gets you.

As we prepare to take this vote, I would ask my colleagues: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of working families and communities across this country who are struggling to pay the bills, or are you on the side of the ultrawealthy heirs who don’t feel they need to pay taxes on the millions and billions that they were handed by their ancestors?

Wealth has never been taxed. That land and the accumulation of the wealth in it has never been taxed. I vote for the working middle class, and I hope that you will all vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) to manage the time for the Ways and Means Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership on ending this terrible tax.

Can you imagine working your whole life to build up a family-owned business or a farm, and then, upon your death, Uncle Sam swoops in and takes nearly half of what you have spent a lifetime building up for your children and grandchildren?

Can you imagine this case, as my friend from Washington talked about? This was a farm that had been in his family since the 1880s—five generations. It didn't start that size—it started small—and they built up over years and years and generations and generations. When the young woman went back to Texas—she actually worked up here and went back to Texas to settle her aunt's estate—she and her brother were forced to sell off two-thirds of the farm that they had had for five generations. They had to sell off two-thirds of it just to pay Uncle Sam, just to try to keep some small portion of what their family had worked so hard to build.

These are real life examples of how the death tax is the wrong tax at the wrong time, and it hurts the wrong people. It is the number one reason family-owned businesses and farms aren't passed down to the next generations. It is at its heart an immoral tax, and it is an attack on the American Dream, especially more so for our newest startups in America—women- and minority-owned businesses that are building wealth for the first time, hoping that they can create a nest egg, that they can create a business for their children and grandchildren so that they have greater opportunities in this great country.

I really want to thank my Democrat lead sponsor, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP of Georgia, for his leadership to repeal the death tax and for his belief that you shouldn't punish success.

I want to thank my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative KRISTI NOEM; longtime champion, Congressman MAC THORBERRY; and a former colleague of mine on the Ways and Means Committee, former Representative Kenny Hulshof, who carried this legislation for so long.

The superrich don't pay this tax. They have a legion of lawyers and tax planners, and they have charitable trusts and foundations. They never pay this tax. These are family-owned, hard-working, risk-taking, determined Americans who are building their businesses, their farms, their ranches. These are not, as we will hear today, the Paris Hiltons and robber barons of the Teddy Roosevelt days. These are Americans who are often forced back to the bank for a loan or who are cruelly forced to sell their land and businesses just to satisfy the IRS.

Death tax supporters will tell you this is all about income inequality, but it turns out, according to a former Federal Reserve Vice Chairman, with regard to income inequality only 2 percent is related to what people inherit. In America, it turns out we do build our prosperity. We pull ourselves up to prosperity. Some people say, Look, this thing generates \$200-plus billion.

Let me put this in perspective. For all of the damage it does to our family-owned businesses and farms, the damage it will do to our women-owned businesses and minority-owned businesses that are building wealth, it will generate less than 2 days of Federal spending a year, and it is declining.

At the end of the day, there is a basic question: Is this your money and your hard work, or is this the government's money? Who has the claim over all of the years you have spent working? Why, at the end of the day, are we punishing success?

Let's give children and let's give our families their shot at the American Dream and a better nation than the one, frankly, we inherited. That is why, today, we rise to bury the death tax once and for all.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Texas that 292 households in Texas will do nothing for the 4.4 million people who are living in poverty in Texas.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of estate tax reform and in strong opposition to this wrongfully and inaccurately titled Death Tax Repeal Act.

Whenever you hear people say "death tax," know right away that they are not talking about public policy and that they are not talking about tax reform—they are talking about politics. There is no such thing as a death tax. You won't find those words anywhere at all in the Tax Code. It is partisan jargon. After you die, you don't have to pay taxes. You don't have to take out the garbage. You don't get called for jury duty anymore. When you are dead, you are dead. So there is no such thing as a death tax.

Today, my Republican colleagues are pursuing a full repeal of the estate tax under the guise of helping family farms and small businesses. I wish this were the case, but the rhetoric is simply disingenuous when you look at the policy.

I agree that the estate tax is a real issue for family farmers and for ranchers. The first bill I introduced when I came to Congress was a bill to reform the estate tax. Folks in my district, where farmland values have reached as high as \$300,000 an acre, are often land rich and cash poor.

□ 0930

There are middle class people who work their land every day and pay taxes on the income they earn from that work. They are not people who the majority's bill is designed to help. Their full repeal is not the answer. It costs too much money. It is not paid for—\$269 billion not paid for—and it helps people who don't need the government's help.

A more commonsense and targeted approach would be to pass the bill that

I referenced earlier. My bill exempts farmlands and related assets from estate tax as long as the family that inherits the farm continues to farm the land. If they stop farming the land, then the tax kicks back in. This is a fair and equitable response to the issues many farmers are facing today: a shortage of young farmers because the barriers to entry are too high and the high volume of farmland we are losing. More than an acre of farmland is lost every minute of every day.

It is important that we help farmers preserve farmland for future generations, which will benefit our food supply and our environment, but it needs to be done the right way. So once this political exercise is over, I hope we can get down to business and work together on a proposal that is actually aimed at protecting our family farms and our family-owned small businesses.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I know the gentleman from California is sincere, but his approach was tried before. It failed so miserably to protect farms, it was repealed, I think, 3 years later. No more gimmicks. Let's actually help these family-owned farm businesses.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), a gentleman who understands the importance of family-owned farms and businesses and rewarding success.

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come from America's dairy land, the central and northwestern part of Wisconsin, and we have a lot of small dairy farms—300, 500, maybe a thousand acres of small family farms. This death tax, when Dad dies, isn't paid by Dad because he is gone, but the kids who inherit the farm are the ones who pay that tax, and they end up not being able to pay it. So what do they do? They sell to the corporate farm. Repealing the death tax is the ability to keep the American family farm and not transfer these farms to the big corporate conglomerates. If you want to stand with the little guy, let's repeal this thing.

But it is not just farms. I have a family in my community in Wisconsin that employs hundreds of families. They are a manufacturer. A family-owned business. They asked me not to use their name, but they understand that this tax, if two or more of them die at the same time, they can't pay it, and so what they would be forced to do is sell the business, which would more than likely mean that they are going to lose these jobs to some other part of the country or some other part of the world. So now this family, because they love their community, they love the people that work in their company, many for 20 and 30 years, what they won't do is they won't travel together, they won't fly together, they won't drive together, because God forbid, if there were an accident and two of them die, they have to sell a major employer

in our community. They don't travel together, family members, because of this tax.

I hear my friends across the aisle talk about this helping the big, wealthy guy. I agree with the gentleman from Texas who has done such great work on this bill. They don't pay this tax. They don't pay. They have great lawyers, great estate planners. It is the guys in the middle that are employing folks in their community that pay this tax; and when they have to pay it, that means jobs for middle class Americans.

I think we should all stand up in this House, and we should stand with the middle class Americans, the middle-income Americans, and let's work to repeal this bill to make sure that we have a vibrant, prosperous, middle class in America.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that 63 households will benefit in his State. There are 618,000 people living under the poverty level. That is \$18,000 for a family of four.

Now, one of the things about these kinds of debates is the political rhetoric gets a little overheated. If you die and you have this great big business, you have 5 years to pay that tax. You don't have to pay it the day that they bury the body of your grandfather or your mother, your father, whoever. You have 5 years to pay it or to decide on it, and 10 years deferred. So you have got 15 years before that tax has to be paid. It isn't like somebody shows up at the house when you are having the reception after the funeral and says, "Here, give us the money, or we are taking your property." That is not what happens in this country. We have laid it out to give people time to figure out how to do it financially. Anybody who has that much money probably has enough money to actually hire a financial consultant, it would seem to be, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I have heard better stories in the Bada Bing Club in New Jersey. I am listening to the accounts of all of these poor people. Let me tell you what we are talking about here.

Do you see this big chart? That is 99.85 percent that get nothing out of this legislation in the United States of America. Here is 0.15 percent that get a \$270 billion tax cut. Here, let me use the magnifying glass and get a better picture of how much we are talking about. You can all see that orange slash right there.

You are telling me that this helps the common good? My friends on the other side of the aisle—and when I use the word "friends," I mean it—recently have taken to talking about the lack of wage growth in this country, yet here we are today considering legislation that will add, Mr. Speaker, \$294.8 billion to the deficit for people who don't work at all.

This whole idea that the estate tax hurts middle class Americans in income that has already been taxed is simply not true. Much of this income has never been taxed. Repealing the estate tax in full would result in a massive tax cut for the wealthiest of the wealthy. It hits 5,500 households in this whole country—never mind Texas, the whole country—with estates worth more than \$5 million. I mean, that is the law. I am not making this stuff up as I go along.

This bill only further exacerbates our already upside-down Tax Code. Our Tax Code is already stacked against hard-working labor income, and this bill would make it even worse.

I sit on the House Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCARELL. After sitting through 13 hours of our budget markup, I could tell you that this \$294.8 billion goes a long way in making up for the devastating cuts that the other side of the aisle has inflicted on the middle class.

It is also important to note that the budget does not assume, Mr. Ranking Member, the repeal of the estate tax. Where the heck are they going to get the \$294.8 billion? It assumes a revenue-neutral—I like it when they say it—a revenue-neutral reform. It assumes that revenues will be exactly what CBO projects under current law for the next 10 years.

We really have only two conclusions: either this bill is directly contrary to the budget, or it is not paid for today. Congress will, at some point, have to sit down and go down the road, pass a tax hike to pay for this massive deficit-financed tax cut. You have no choice. You can't have it both ways.

I would like to hear from my good friend, the chairman, what his path will be to make up for this \$294.8 billion. That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. Where the heck is it coming from?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would point out studies show we would generate more money by repealing this tax than keeping it because people wouldn't put their money into tax shelters and other things and instead would put it back in their business into job creation.

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a leading member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a gentleman whose father started their business by the sweat of his brow.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to sit and listen to the rhetoric. I think sometimes if you drink the purple Kool-Aid long enough, you start to believe it.

That chart is a great chart that was just up there because what we are doing again is we are starting to separate America. We are saying that because it only applies to this very little sliver that we have to go after these people.

I want you to think about something. The entire produce of a woman's or man's life after they have paid their local taxes, their State taxes, their Federal taxes, all the sales taxes over their life and the way they have contributed to build their communities, at the time of their death—now, I know we don't want to call it a death tax, but it is triggered at the time of their death. God forbid these hard-working American taxpayers are allowed to pass on to the next generation that which they were able to accumulate.

Now, the chairman made a reference to my parents, and it is not just about my parents. My dad was a parts picker in a Chevrolet warehouse. He married the girl who ran the switchboard at that warehouse. That was my mother. He went off to World War II. He came back home, started with a little car dealership in Verona, Pennsylvania, one-car showroom, four service bays. He built it into something he was very proud of and was able to pass on to my brothers and me.

Now we want to go after these folks not because they were successful, but because they died and because the government cannot live within its means. So when we go to the viewing, we go to the funeral home and we go to pay our respects, we are also telling them: Thanks for all your hard work. You did a great job. You contributed so much, and now the government wants to take some of that produce of your entire life because they can't live within their means. You lived within your means. You tightened your belt when you had to. You made more with less.

But no, that is not good enough because we can't rein in spending, so we can't stop taxing. That is egregious in the United States of America to sit back and look at all those who have done so much and paid so many taxes in their lifetime, and yet to say upon their death they are not allowed to pass this on to the next generation.

I love the chart because you really specify exactly what has been going on here for too long. You are separating the country. You are dividing the country, rich versus poor. This is America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope you would remind the gentleman that the country is already divided into rich and poor. There is no question about that. In Pennsylvania, 144 households will get the benefit, and 1.57 million people in Pennsylvania live in poverty. So there is already a bit of a division here.

It might be more acceptable if this bill recouped all the money that we spent in farm subsidies over time.

Maybe when people die, they ought to give their farm subsidy back to the government. When my grandfather died, the State of Illinois came back to get the public assistance money that had been given to him during his life, his last years.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and perhaps for no better reason than it is a \$270 billion cost that the Congressional Budget Office showed with no pay-fors, no offsets in the Federal budget. If my Republican colleagues want to move forward on this policy proposal, at least they should show courage to the American people and tell them how they are going to pay for this \$270 billion bill or to admit that it is just going to be added to the annual structural budget deficits, a completely fiscally irresponsible approach to trying to reform our Tax Code. Lord knows we need to get to work on that.

But there is a larger point—and to speak to the last speaker's point that he just made on the floor—what is somewhat problematic and troublesome for me, it seems many of our Republican colleagues seem very comfortable with the idea of income inequality in this Nation, which is only growing worse. But here is the main point: this income inequality in our society, absent opportunity, absent hope, absent mobility, is just a caste system. It is just a caste system where birth determines outcome.

That is why one of the richest people in the world, Warren Buffett, who opposes repealing the estate tax, says that our fate in life should not depend on whether we win the birth lottery or not. It is no longer good enough for the other side to continue to deliver tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent; now it has got to be the wealthiest two-tenths of 1 percent, because that is what this legislation affects is two-tenths of 1 percent of the wealthiest households in America.

But they keep saying: Don't worry. We will address the deficit later. They say we have a spending problem in Washington. But what we have seen from their budgets, where they go for offsets in spending: it is in Pell grants; it is in workstudy; it is in GEAR UP and TRIO programs; it is the broadband expansion that we need in this Nation; it is the basic research funding that has to take place; it is the infrastructure modernization that we need.

□ 0945

It is those things that we need to be investing in to keep America competitive, and those are the type of programs that help with mobility, that help with opportunity for many Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend.

That is what is so onerous behind this legislation. They have become very clever at piling up debt, convincing the American people we have a spending problem; yet the very programs they decide to target in their budget resolutions are those programs that provide upward income mobility for all Americans.

I am a product of that. I am a kid who went on to school with Pell grants, with student loans, with the workstudy program. There is no way I want to be a Member of Congress that is going to pull up the ladder behind me and say "tough luck" to the lower income classes of this country.

That is what this bill leads to, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would say let's have the courage to stop hiding behind Warren Buffett, George Soros, the superrich. They don't pay this tax. They have lawyers and tax accountants and tax finders. They have charitable trusts. This is family-owned farms and businesses.

I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a second-generation small-businessowner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in 1939, a man started a car dealership to realize the American Dream. When he died, the ownership of the business was passed along to his son and so was a death tax liability equal to a significant value of the business' worth.

The IRS was there 3 days later after the father's death, wanting the money, 50 percent of the value of the business. His son nearly declared bankruptcy. Fortunately, he was able to pull resources together to keep his family's profitable dealership afloat and save jobs. He still runs the dealership to this day and has more than 100 employees. That son is me.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will vote to repeal the death tax, the most unfair double taxation on job creators we have ever seen. The death tax is a tax on savings that have already been taxed on before, but the tax provides less than 1 percent of Federal revenue.

According to the Tax Foundation, repeal of the death tax would boost GDP, create 139,000 jobs, and eventually increase Federal revenue. That is right. Ironically, by killing the death tax, the U.S. Government would earn more money and more opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, many second-generation businessowners do not have the means to hire teams of accountants and lawyers to navigate the costly obstacles to save the family farm and save the family business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a small-businessowner of 44 years, I have seen

friends and colleagues lose gains earned from a lifetime of hard work because of Washington's greed and failed policies, like the death tax.

We must repeal this unfair policy that does no good to the Federal Government and does life-changing harm to American job creators and families. We must make sure this law goes away.

In God we trust.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Brady "Borrow to Benefit Billionaires Act."

I don't believe that it is in the interest of our country to borrow another \$269 billion from the Chinese, the Saudis, or whomever we can get it from in order to benefit about 5,000 or so of the wealthiest families in this country, and that is precisely what this legislation does.

"If ever our people become so sordid as to feel that all that counts is moneyed prosperity, ignoble well-being, effortless ease and comfort, then this Nation shall perish."

"No advantage comes either to the country as a whole or to the individuals inheriting the money by permitting the transmission in their entirety of the enormous fortunes which would be affected by such a tax."

Those are bold words of a different kind of Republican than we have today. They are the bold words in 1907 of President Teddy Roosevelt when he originally proposed the tax that has been mislabeled today as the "death tax."

President Roosevelt thought that it would be the death of our country if we had a permanent leisure class elite of the type that dominated so many European countries. He thought that a reasonable tax on inheritance of the wealthiest, most prosperous members of our country would be in the national interest—indeed essential to the future of the country.

I think his approach was right at the beginning of the 19th century, and it remains true in this century because this is really a billionaire protection act.

When he introduced this legislation, Mr. BRADY said: What kind of government swoops in upon your death and takes nearly half of the nest egg that you've spent your life building?

Well, the answer is not the American Government. Our government does not do that and does not touch the estates of any but the smallest, smallest fraction of the wealthiest—about 5,000-plus households in the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. I am concerned about the anticompetitive effects of this bill because, while this money could be used to address the size of our national debt—and that might be an appropriate place for it. Think about the size of \$269 billion and what it could do. We know that our infrastructure is crumbling. That would be more than enough

to cover, over the next 10 years, the shortfall that has been estimated in dealing with our transportation infrastructure.

Think what dollars of that size would do for strengthening of the competitiveness of our workforce from pre-K to postgrad.

It is a bad investment to help those who have already got what they have got.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), a fifth-generation proud resident of his State.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring awareness to a pervasive tax that threatens the very livelihood of the future of generations of Montanans, the death tax.

April 15 was tax day; and, while some Americans look forward to a refund, many families in my home State and across the Nation are reminded of the looming debt their children and grandchildren will face.

The death tax jeopardizes the future of 28,000 Montana farms and thousands more small, family-run businesses. This is not a leisure class. These are hard-working Americans that spent their whole life—generations—building their future, only to see it threatened.

This tax punishes Americans that have worked hard, played by the rules, and want to pass that legacy on to their children. The death tax is a tax on the American Dream.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure in order to preserve the American Dream for farmers and small ranchers.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will remind the gentleman from Montana that he is talking about 19 families in Montana, when you have got 145,000 people who are living below the poverty line.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it could be very confusing trying to understand what is going on. I see in today's gallery a lot of young Americans—our future leaders—and they are probably wondering: Is this something that might affect me in the future?

Because I think everyone in America has this dream, this hope that our country makes available of making it in America, we all aspire to do well.

I know my parents—my father didn't get more than a sixth grade education—aspired to see their kids do more. I know they are very proud of what their children have been able to accomplish.

Make no doubt, we all want to make sure that we make it in America. We all want to make sure that we have what we need to buy that first home, to send our kids to college, to save up enough for retirement.

Most Americans would say: I have made it. That is the American Dream. If I can guarantee those things and know my kids are going to have an opportunity to be better than me, that is great. Can I do more? I would love to do more.

I don't think that most Americans say that we have to give a tax break not to the wealthy, not to the megawealthy, not to the ultra-megawealthy, but to the uber-mega-ultra-superwealthy, a tax break that would cost all us taxpayers \$270 billion because this bill is not paid for when, at the same time, that \$270 billion would pay for the same amount of coverage for the entire National Institutes of Health to do all the research that we expect it to do to help us cure Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, lung cancer, and heart disease.

All that research that the National Institutes of Health is doing with all those great scientists and all those universities today in America costs for 10 years the same amount that this bill would cost to give not 1 percent of the wealthiest—one-tenth of 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans—a tax break that costs \$270 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BECERRA. Every time a proponent of this measure gets up and says, We want to protect the family farmer, they have to say, Well, we mean the one-tenth of 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans who may be a family farmer.

I guarantee you that guy is not going to have callouses on his hands if he is a family farmer, and he is one-tenth of 1 percent of the richest Americans.

Let's be real. We have priorities. We want to make it in America. We want to buy that house; we want to send our kids to college, and we want to be able to retire securely.

You don't have to be the one-tenth of 1 percent richest Americans, at the cost of \$270 billion to all the other Americans, especially every one of those folks sitting in this gallery today, to say we have got to give a tax break to the uberwealthy.

Let's not vote for this bill.

I see in the gallery of this Chamber tomorrow's leaders. They have dreams and they have priorities for their future.

The American people are pretty straightforward about what their priorities are.

Having the opportunity to buy our own homes, send our kids to college, and having a secure retirement are parts of the American dream that we all aspire to.

Thanks to the decisive actions taken by Congressional Democrats and President Obama during the Great Recession, our economy is on the rebound: Over the last 61 straight months our economy has created over 12 million jobs, the longest consecutive period of job growth on record. Wages have grown by over 5% over the last year. The high school graduation rate is at an all time high.

Despite these gains, for too many families the American dream is still out of reach.

Congress's number one priority should be to build on this foundation to boost wages and economic growth. It should be to strengthen investments in the middle class. It should be to ensure our tax code and economic policy rewards hard work, not just wealth.

The legislation we are considering today does none of these things.

It won't benefit any middle class Americans. It won't make investments in our education or our infrastructure, it won't create ladders of opportunity into the middle class, and it won't put the American dream within reach for working class families.

Instead, this legislation is a special giveaway to the wealthiest estates.

At a time when the wealthiest 1% of Americans hold more than 40% of the nation's wealth, it would widen the wealth gap even further.

And we're not even talking about "the 1%" today—the group that benefits from this legislation is even more exclusive.

This bill would only benefit uber-mega-ultra-super wealthy estates.

This bill would give a mere fraction of the richest 1% estates a special tax break of over \$3 million each, and leave working class families to pick up the tab.

This bill only benefits fewer than 2 of every 1000 estates and costs \$270 billion. What other investments could be made with this money?

100% of school nutrition programs, which provide nutritious meals to 31 million children every day; 100% of Social Security survivor benefits, 3/4 the cost of providing Pell grants to more than 9 million students a year over the next 10 years; 31 times the funding for Head Start for FY 2015; 39 times the funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for FY 2015; 104 times the funding for the Food and Drug Administration for FY 2015.

Health Care: You could fund NIH's budget for 2015 9 times over. FY 2015 estimates: 461 times NIH Alzheimer's funding, 394 times NIH breast cancer funding, 50 times NIH general cancer funding, 894 times NIH stroke funding, 265 times NIH diabetes funding, 1929 times NIH Parkinson's funding, 221 times NIH heart disease funding.

The bottom line is that this bill fails to help the middle class get back on their feet.

It doesn't make it easier for the hardworking small business owner and it doesn't make it more affordable for a hardworking family to send their kids to college.

It's time for Congress to get to work and ensure that we put the American Dream within reach for every American, not just the wealthiest few.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

For those listening today, young people included, ask yourself a question: Do you want a government that guarantees you food stamps and welfare checks or an opportunity to build your American Dream?

At the end of your life, all the years of hard work, all the sweat, all the sacrifice, do you want to pass that down to your kids and grandchildren? Or should Uncle Sam swoop in and take

nearly half of everything you have worked a lifetime to earn?

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we all love hearing about American success stories. It might be that startup that begins with an idea, a couple of dollars, and a lot of hard work that grows into a business that can support a family, that serves a community, and provides for the future.

Many family-businessowners, ranchers, and farmers do hope to keep that success going by passing it on to the next generation.

However, for too many, the dream of taking over the family business can quickly turn into a nightmare. While having to cope with the loss of a loved one, relatives are often forced to make tough decisions in order just to meet the estate tax obligations under law.

It can mean taking on large amounts of debt. It can mean selling off critical assets. It can mean even closing down the business and being forced to sell the entire family farm or business just to pay the taxes alone.

The truth is that average Americans can be negatively affected by this tax. Not only are businesses not being passed down to the next generation, but they are also being forced to lay off other employees that are currently employed. When a small business shuts its doors and then lets those employees go, it can have a very profound affect on the community.

Farmers can be impacted by the Federal estate tax simply based on the value of the farmland alone. That doesn't even take into account, Mr. Speaker, the buildings, the equipment, the livestock, and other nonliquid assets that are present.

I spoke to a Minnesota family business who was forced to be spending 20 percent of their net income on an expensive life insurance just to fund their future death tax obligations. That is money that is not being used to expand and grow the current business.

We have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, for a country that prides itself on the American Dream that we all agree on and the idea that our children will be better off than we were: Does it make sense to penalize success?

I ask for support for this legislation, and I commend the gentleman, Mr. BRADY, for his leadership.

□ 1000

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I know the time that is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill

that would add hundreds of billions of dollars to our deficit to deliver a windfall to the heirs of the wealthiest estates in the country.

Although the Republican budget holds that we must make draconian cuts to domestic programs in the name of fiscal prudence, cuts that harm the elderly, the working poor, the infirm, the middle class, the Republican leadership lauds a bill that would provide inequality in our Nation and give an average tax break of \$3 million to the most secure.

In my congressional district, the median income is \$48,841. The unemployment rate for African Americans is 24.5 percent. The poverty level for children is 38.3 percent, the poverty rate for the elderly is 21.4 percent, and over 63,000 households receive food stamps.

In the State of Illinois, over 13,000 children are homeless. At the end of last year, Chicago had the fifth-highest foreclosure rate in the Nation.

This bill is fiscally irresponsible and reflects misplaced priorities for our Nation. We can make improvements to the bill to address the concerns of small businesses and family farms if current law is inadequate, but wholesale repeal reflects poor leadership.

The fiscal recklessness of the Republican approach that balloons our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars via dozens of tax cuts reminds me of the adage that says "death by a thousand cuts," only this time it is debt by a thousand tax cuts. Debt by a thousand tax cuts is bad for our economy, it is bad for our citizens, and it is bad for our Nation. I will vote "no."

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. NOEM. On March 10 of 1994, my dad was killed in an accident on our family farm. I was taking college classes at the time. I was 21 years old, and I ended up coming home with my family and trying to figure out how we were going to get by without him after this tragedy hit our family.

All I could hear during that point in time were the words that my dad had said to me for many years. It wasn't very long after he was killed that we got a bill in the mail from the IRS that said we owed them money because we had a tragedy happen to our family.

One of the things my dad had always said to me is, "Kristi, don't ever sell land, because God isn't making any more land."

But that was really our only option. We could either sell land that had been in our family for generations, or we could take out a loan. So I chose to take out a loan, but it took us 10 years to pay off that loan to pay the Federal Government those death taxes.

That is one of the main reasons why I got involved in government and politics, because I didn't understand how bureaucrats and politicians in Washington, D.C., could make a law that

says that when a tragedy hits a family they somehow are owed something from that family business. And it doesn't work for normal, everyday people.

That is why this death tax is so unfair because, at one of the most vulnerable times of people's lives, the Federal Government says, We need to take what you have and what your family has worked for.

A lot of the conversation today has been about that the rich need to pay more. Well, the rich will avoid this tax. They have the resources to do that. But it hits families like mine harder than ever. The rich certainly are not going to pay the burden of this tax.

I will also say that some of the discussion has been about the deficit. The government does not earn money. The government takes other people's money, is what it does. It certainly is not going to earn more money by this policy.

This previous administration and the members of the other party here on the House floor today talk about the people who have struggled. We have more people living in poverty today under your policies than we had before you were in charge of this country.

One in 15 children are on food stamps because of the policies of this administration. Fifty percent of our college students can't find work or are underemployed because of the policies of this administration. We talk about income inequality, and we are seeing it because of those previous policies.

This tax is a very unfair tax. It is double taxation. Please don't put any more families in the situation where they lose their family operation or are threatened by it because of a tragedy that happens to their family.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), another new member of the Ways and Means Committee who understands just how fragile these family-owned farms and businesses are.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, growing up and working on my great-grandfather's farm, I learned many values. One that I was taught is a comparison and, basically, when you are out there working with the hogs, you learn that there is little value in hogwash.

I would compare a lot of the facts that we have been hearing today, that are opposing this legislation, as equivalent to hogwash. And I say that under the stipulation that I have heard numerous facts stated of farms the size of 15,000 acres.

Well, the average family farm in this country is less than 500 acres. If you look at the Bootheel of Missouri, which I represent, every farm in that area, if you would just consider a 500-acre farm and the price of a 500-acre farm, times that by how many acres they have—say, 500 acres times \$10,000. That's \$5 million—\$5 million.

Then you have to put the price of a combine and a tractor to harvest the rice and the cotton. Guess what? They are part of that top 2 percent that the other side says is the wealthiest of the wealthy. Well, guess what?

Less than 2 percent of Americans are farmers. Less than 2 percent of Americans are farmers. This legislation, this tax is directly after farmers.

Our Tax Code, what is wrong with it, it is disadvantaging rural America, and the death tax is part of that disadvantage. You are seeing people leave rural America because of the Tax Code, and this is a way to fix the Tax Code.

When you look at family farmers, 85 percent of their investment is in the land and in the equipment. It is not in liquid assets. And when they get a tax bill, like the Congresswoman from South Dakota who spoke mentioned, they have to either sell their land or they have to take out a loan so they can keep their family business. This is a tax on the American Dream, and this is awful.

The folks on the other side of the aisle have never found a tax that they disliked. Folks, we have to stop this.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield one 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the leader of the Select Revenue Subcommittee on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for bringing this bill to the floor and for his hard work on this bill. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today in support of this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The story is the same across this country in all of our districts, whether you have heard that today from every Member or not.

Businessowners and farmers work hard for their entire lives with the goal of passing on the first fruits of their labor but face the sometimes insurmountable hurdle of the death tax. And, in addition to the actual tax liability the death tax imposes, merely planning for it, regardless of whether these businesspeople and farmers end up owing it, it is yet another challenge.

Last month, when I chaired the hearing in the Select Revenue Subcommittee on this bill, we heard from three witnesses: a rancher, a farmer, and a product distributor. Their stories were the same. This is an onerous tax, creating hours and hours and months of work by attorneys and by their own employees trying to figure out how they are going to keep their business in their family.

One businessowner said, for the first 26 years working in his family business—26 years he spent trying to figure out how to meet the death tax. When one relative was about to pass away, they had another death tax issue they had to address. Another relative was about to pass away and did pass away,

and again they had to address the death tax.

This is an issue that the other side wants to make between the rich and the poor. This is about average American men and women, businessowners across this country trying to keep their family-owned business and protect their hard work.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the lead sponsor of the Repeal the Death Tax Act, an Eagle Scout, Army veteran, key member.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join Representative BRADY on this important bipartisan legislation to repeal the death tax once and for all. I have always believed that the death tax is politically misguided, morally unjustified, and downright un-American. It is really a tax on success.

The assets that people want to pass on to their progeny have already been taxed. If it is a business or if it is a farm, the individuals who earned it, who started the business, they paid income taxes. If it was a corporation, the corporation paid taxes also.

Why should it be taxed a third time just to be passed on and just to keep the business together?

It undermines the life work and life savings of farmers, small- to medium-sized businesses in Georgia and all across the Nation.

We have all heard the statistics. The United States has the fourth-highest estate tax in the industrialized world at 40 percent. Only Japan, South Korea, and France have higher death taxes. Thirteen countries have repealed their taxes since 2000.

It has a disproportionate impact on African Americans. A study by the Boston College professors John Havens and Paul Schervish several years ago estimated that between 2001 and 2055, the death tax will erase between 11 percent and 13 percent of all African American wealth. This one tax alone will cost African American households between \$192 billion and \$257 billion.

Some people have argued that the estate tax is no longer a serious problem since we have permanently raised the exemption to \$5 million for individuals and \$10 million for couples to index it to inflation. Nothing can be further from the truth.

According to the Georgia Farm Bureau, the exemption is barely keeping pace with increasing farmland values. In fact, the number of farms in Georgia with building and land values of over \$5 million rose from 664 to 677 between 2007 and 2012.

I just can't stand by and allow this estate tax to continue to punish family-owned businesses in Georgia and throughout the country. It is not just farmers.

We have heard a lot about farms, but look at funeral homes, funeral direc-

tors who have multiple locations with rolling stock, caskets, limousines, hearses. That amounts to a pretty good amount of money.

I have got constituents who own radio stations; finally, worked hard enough to have a family-owned business that would be able to be in communications. They started out with one radio station. Now they have got five stations in three different States.

It is a family business. The husband, the wife, and now the three kids went to college, law school, and they are running the business. It is a shame that they would have to sell that business and, ultimately, have to lay off employees to pay the 40 percent estate tax.

It is clear that the estate tax really hurts the economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. A study by the Tax Foundation found that repealing the death tax would increase U.S. capital stock by 2.2 percent, it would boost GDP, and it would create 139,000 jobs, which eventually increases Federal revenue.

This is a tax on success. It is not a big contributor to the revenue of this country. It is a very, very—a drop in the ocean really, and so, it is time to repeal it.

I urge my colleagues to really think realistically, not ideologically, and just do the right thing. I urge you to join my colleagues and repeal the death tax once and for all.

□ 1015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

Madam Speaker, having served on the Ways and Means Committee for decades, it is a little bit embarrassing to see us debating a bill that goes nowhere. This is a political action that is taken by the majority to select provisions that are in the Tax Code and to have those of us that advocate tax reform to just select those parts that appear to be very popular with some parts of our constituencies.

There is nobody in this House that truly believes that this legislation, if passed, ever would become law, but it is something to be used in political campaigns as to what you voted for and why you voted against it.

The truth of the matter is that, to listen to the other side talk, we have some very, very rich farmers; and just because they are in a family doesn't mean that they are not wealthy.

First of all, let's go to the video, let's go to the facts, and let's find out how many people are going to be affected. And the statistics show that 99.8 percent of the population, those people who die, don't pay any taxes. So what

the heck are we talking about? We are talking about a few rich people that will be eligible for a tax, and that is only after we estimate that the value of their estate is \$5 million for one person and \$10 million for two.

So I am not saying that for these people it is not going to be inconvenient. But when you think about the number of people that pay taxes, that are working hard every day, that are trying to save money for their kids' education, then this really means that hundreds of billions of dollars are being set aside for those people that already have.

If we really want equity, if we really want fair play, why don't we take a look at the entire Tax Code? Why are we just looking at the estate tax or the local and State tax? Because equity is how much money are you raising and how much money do you need.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, to clarify, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a fourth-generation farmer.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act.

I want to thank Chairman BRADY and Chairman RYAN for their leadership in addressing this issue that is so important for my district in Indiana and for many folks all across the Hoosier State.

In Indiana, under the leadership of Governor Mike Pence, we officially repealed our State's death tax in 2013, and with this bill we can do the same thing on the Federal level.

As a fourth-generation farmer, I can see how family-owned businesses already struggle each year with a destructive mess that is our Federal Tax Code. The death tax, which is a double tax on Americans' hard work, only adds to the problem. It stifles prosperity, and it prevents individuals and families from making the personal decisions they want to make with their savings and their property for generations to follow them.

Madam Speaker, it is time to repeal the death tax. Only accounting for a fraction of a percent worth of annual revenue for the Federal Government, let's call it what it really is: it is a distorted attempt to redistribute the earnings of Americans' hard work.

With that, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, would you tell us the time left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

Madam Speaker, it is ironic. This week, we have had hundreds and hundreds of businesspeople, folks from organized labor, contractors coming to town, pleading with Congress to get its act together and enact a 6-year comprehensive transportation bill. We have been frozen in place for years, with 23 short-term extensions because this Congress can't figure out how to provide the resources necessary to deal with a critical situation.

America is falling apart and falling behind, yet we are caught here in an inability to provide resources to help rebuild and revitalize America. That is part of the issue.

Today my Republican friends have discovered that there is \$270 billion of revenue that somehow the Federal Government no longer needs. They have decided to give an additional tax cut to people who need the help the least. And, ironically, for all the talk about this being a death tax and double taxation, the vast majority of the wealth that will be untaxed has never been taxed in the first place. You don't get to be a billionaire on W-2 income. It is appreciated capital. But we are going to, in their judgment, give a windfall.

We have had this tax for over a century from Republican administrations, but we are going to turn our back on it because we no longer need \$270 billion while we continue to shortchange America. We are having construction projects stopped this summer because the short-term fix for the transportation bill is going to expire.

This is lunacy. It is not fair.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from east Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, several years ago, there was an author who wrote a book about millionaires in America; and it was amazing, most of the millionaires built a business, built a farm, and the number one most commonly driven vehicle by millionaires in America was a Ford F-150 truck. They were workers.

There was a time in America when we looked around and we saw somebody work 16 hours a day, like my aunt and uncle did, and build together a farm and we were proud of them. Well, my Aunt Lilly died, and the FDIC dumped land out by her place before the land could be sold. So the IRS came in and eventually sold every acre of her land.

The family was called in. Let's try to at least buy some of her assets from her home, her little modest home. I

bought this music box from Aunt Lilly. It plays "Amazing Grace." But she didn't get amazing grace. Her heirs didn't get amazing grace. They ran into the amazing greed of the United States Congress.

Let's take the green-eyed monster and put it where it belongs and begin to feel good for people that have worked for what they own.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Texas is ready to close.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have one further request for time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to share a story of Bobby McKnight, a seventh-generation cattleman from my district in Fort Davis, Texas.

Bobby says many farm and ranch farmers like his may be asset rich but they are cash poor. Most of the value of their estate is attributed to the value of the land they use to raise cattle and grow food for consumers around the world. In fact, a lot of that food, my colleagues are going to enjoy today.

Bobby shares that when times have been lean, he has had to make sacrifices to keep his family business above water. But as any small-businessowner can tell you, sometimes you run out of places to cut. That is what happened to his family during hard times brought on by the death tax. He had to let go of seasoned employees that had families of their own, losing the skilled labor he needed to run their operation. And now, as land values continue to increase, many farm and ranch families are concerned that this may trigger the estate tax.

As Bobby and others can attest to, the death tax is devastating to the family farms, ranches, and small businesses in my district and throughout the Nation.

Come on, y'all. Let's stop punishing families for achieving the American Dream. I support this bill to repeal the death tax and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

For the past hour, my Republican colleagues have stood up and tried to scare you. They have tried to turn the estate tax into a boogeyman that kills family farms and hurts family business. They have called the estate tax all kinds of bad names, like "immoral," and they have tried to claim it is a calculated attack on the American Dream. They have also claimed that the estate tax disproportionately affects poor small businesses and startups. These wild and inaccurate claims could not be farther from the truth.

Here are the facts that Republicans have forgotten to mention:

The estate tax would only affect 5,400 estates out of an estimated 2.6 million this year. That means repealing the estate tax would amount to a tax break for the top 0.2 percent—the Hiltons, the Adelsons, the Kochs, those folks.

According to the Tax Policy Center, only 20—I emphasize 20—small businesses and small farm estates nationwide owed an estate tax in 2013—20. Furthermore, those estates owed just 4 percent of their value in tax.

Now, the real question here is this: America is a wonderful country. We all have a chance to make it. Some make it better than others. That is because luck and whatever hard work—and it isn't that everybody who doesn't have money isn't working hard. We are all working hard, but some have a little more luck than others. The fact is that, if you have had a little luck, don't you owe a little something back to the country?

Here you have got people who have gotten \$10 million that we have given them as an estate exemption, and then they owe 4 percent of the value on money that has never been taxed before. It is all on capital appreciation.

Now, my Republican friends conveniently forget to mention how much this handout to the rich would cost—\$280 billion. That is as though every American today was giving a \$1 billion tax cut to the wealthy in this country. There are about 300-and-some-odd million of us. And if we all gave, there we would be. And we are doing this to a group that has no problems whatsoever. Their problem is how to keep their money. That is their only problem.

So I want people to understand: this is a quarter of \$1 trillion. And as the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, we have a tremendous problem in infrastructure in this country, but there is no money for that.

We have a tremendous problem in investment in the National Institutes of Health. It used to be the National Institutes of Health funded 20 percent of the grant applications that were given to them. Today they are only funding 6 percent of the grant applications that are given to them.

We are not investing either in the physical infrastructure or the human infrastructure of this country. What has made us strong, all of us immigrants who came here—about 99.99 percent of them, as immigrants, came here with nothing, and this country gave us an opportunity to be rich or to be successful. The only way it will work is if we pay something back into the process, not sitting there using money that you never have been taxed on.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this and to think about the 99.8 percent of Americans who will get no benefit whatsoever.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, feel free to dismiss the woman in my district, a widow, who now has been forced back to the bank for the third time to take out a loan just to be able to keep the family farm they worked generations—worked generations—to keep and hand down. Dismiss her as the Paris Hiltons of the world, as the superrich.

Dismiss the 114 organizations who back the repeal. Most of them are Main Street businesses who support this Death Tax Repeal Act. They are storeowners; they are loggers—loggers in the field—and they are plumbers. There is a glamorous life. That is the superrich.

That is who, after these people worked years and years and weekends and nights to build up their business, these are the ones who, when they pass away, Uncle Sam swoops in and confiscates—takes—nearly half of what they have built a lifetime earning. Dismiss them if you will, but this is the American Dream.

The American Dream is not a government that promises you welfare checks and food stamps. The American Dream is the thought that you can build yourself up and pull yourself up through hard work, skills, and dedication and that you can build a better life for your family and then give it to your children and grandchildren so maybe, just maybe, they have a better chance at the American Dream, that they have opportunities maybe you didn't have that they can pass on to their children.

You will hear today, Oh, this only affects a few. Those are the people who pay the tax. One out of three businesses, more than that, are farmers. They are already paying money into tax planning. They are putting money aside; they are spending hours that they would rather put into their farm and their business. They would rather hire young people and new people looking for jobs, but instead, they are trying to avoid this horrible tax.

All for what? For a measly 2 days of Federal spending—actually less than that—this government wastes so much money. It just pours it out of here. Instead of tightening our belt, we attack the American Dream of hard-working families and businesses.

Many of them, by the way, are women and minority-owned businesses building wealth for the first time, believing the American Dream is right for them. They are not Paris Hilton. They are not robber barons. They are not the people who are dismissed on the floor today.

At the end of the day, this is the simple question: Whose money is it? Whose hard work and years is it? Is it government's? Is it the Washington politicians' who will take your money in time, force you to sell your business or family-owned farm and waste it on who knows what? Or is it your money, your hard work, and your American Dream? Are you allowed to keep that dream and help your family going forward? Or is it the government's dream, whatever that could be?

At the end of the day, what I love the most about America is we don't resent success. We strive for it. Whatever success is for each of us, we strive for it. We are absolutely convinced that we can achieve it for us and that we can maybe give our kids a chance going forward.

This is a simple question. If you stand with those who believe it is the government's money and hard work, vote “no,” but if you stand with our family-owned farms, businesses, young people, and those chasing the American dream, vote “yes” to end the death tax once and for all.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, as a CPA, I understand that the only certainties in life are death and taxes. Unfortunately, Washington has decided that a third certainty can be created when we combine those two separate terms.

The death tax is an issue that, as long as it exists, will be seen as a provision by which politicians can pocket more of families' hard-earned legacies.

I recently heard from one Kansan whose father-in-law, a farmer, passed away in 2005. Because these folks wanted to keep the farm in the family, they had to set up an installment plan with the IRS to pay the death tax. Even then, they have been forced to dip into retirement funds and sell other assets in order to make the payments and keep the land.

Stories like this are the reason why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1105, which would permanently repeal the death tax. We need to stop treating death as a taxable event. The only solution to this problem, which faces family farmers and business owners in Kansas, is to eliminate the death tax, once and for all.

Mr. BLUM. Madam Speaker, to paraphrase Benjamin Franklin, there are only two sure things in life: death and taxes. Unfortunately for Americans, the federal government has managed to combine the two into greater tragedy with the federal estate tax, more commonly known as the “death” tax.

The death tax is a tax levied against property transferred at death to a person's heirs. This property is neither new income or newly acquired real estate or assets, but rather a simple transfer of ownership. Confusingly to most commonsense folks, this the federal government has already taxed this income. While there is an exemption of up to \$5.43M, the death tax remains a growing issue with farmers and small businesses in the First District of Iowa as the values of farmland real estate and industrial equipment continue to rise.

While supporters of the death tax say only a small percentage of businesses and farms actually end up paying the tax, I believe this is a question of fairness. I oppose any means that grants the federal government the ability to tax you twice on your income.

This, along with the compliance costs for estate planning, is why I advocate for abolishing the death tax altogether.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015, I commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives in joining me in passing this legislation by a bipartisan vote of 240 to 179.

Americans, already taxed to death, should not also be taxed in death. Let the heirs, no

matter the value of the estate, determine what is best for the family fortunes, large or small. It would be far better for our children and grandchildren to invest, spend, or utilize our estates rather than the federal government any more.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to continue to advance this important legislation that will finally permit farms and small businesses to pass from generation to generation without the specter of the death tax looming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 200, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NOLAN. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1105 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASES OF GIFT AND ESTATE TAX EVASION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any disqualified individual—

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the amendments made by this Act had never been enacted,

(2) no credit shall be allowed under section 2505 of such Code (relating to unified credit against gift tax) with respect to any gifts made after such conviction, and

(3) the applicable exclusion amount with respect to such individual under section 2010 of such Code (relating to unified credit against estate tax) shall be zero.

(b) DISQUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this section, the term “disqualified individual” means any individual who—

(1) is convicted of attempting to evade or defeat the tax imposed under chapter 12 of such Code (relating to gift tax), or

(2) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, engaged in a transaction (or series of transactions) with the intent to evade or defeat the tax imposed under chapter 11 of such Code (relating to estate tax).

Mr. BRADY of Texas (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which would not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, years ago, when I first went into public life, my father,—as fathers could be expected—gave me a little fatherly advice.

He said: Son, I will always be proud of you if you just do a couple of things.

I said: What is it, Dad?

He said: Number one, be honest. I don't want my kids getting in trouble. Tell the truth.

Secondly, he said: If you're going to go in public life, commit yourself to working for the common good. Don't worry too much about the rich. They have got a way of taking care of themselves.

Well, my father never had any money to speak of, but, boy, he sure understood that. If you look at this chart here, this is what this bill is really all about. This bill is about giving \$270 billion in tax benefits to the richest of the rich. That's right.

This is America, and here is that less than 1 percent of the 1 percent, \$270 billion tax break, 5,500 individuals over the next 10 years. That means the rest of the country is going to have to pay for it.

Have these people benefited from the greatness of America where people can work hard, prosper, and become successful? Yes, of course, they have. They are the richest of the rich.

Here, we want to give them another tax break? Talk about greed. Talk about carrying the water for the richest of the rich. What are we talking about here? Do you know what, it gets even more egregious, and that is what my amendment is about here today.

Under my amendment, this little percent, this little 1 percent of the 1 percent, if they have engaged and been found guilty of tax fraud as it relates to inheritance and gift taxes, they are going to benefit from this. They amass fortunes through illegal activities as it relates just to this very specific tax; and we want to give them a tax break on the fortunes that they amassed illegally?

The least we can do—and that is what my amendment does—my amendment says that, if you have been found guilty of tax fraud trying to get more than you already have illegally and criminally, then you are not going to get the benefit of this tax exemption.

I am confident that if my good friends and good colleagues here on the floor of the House on both the Republican and Democratic sides look at this thing honestly, they will say: I have got to support that amendment. I can't go back home and tell my folks how people who are found criminally guilty of trying to cheat the taxpayers of this country out of taxes that were due should be entitled to benefit from that. We can't do that.

I want to remind everybody that here we are looking at this country at a time when the disparity and inequality of income in this country is the worst of any developed nation in the world.

People like Pope Francis are concerned about it. Leading economists

like Al Greenspan are talking about it. By God, when Hillary Clinton and TED CRUZ announce their candidacies for the Presidency because they are concerned about the growing disparity and inequality in income, we have a problem in this country.

Mind you, this gift tax, we are here talking about farmers and businessmen. Well, I am a businessman. I spent 32 years of my life in business. Let's tell the truth. Let's tell the truth. Ninety-nine percent of the people in this country are not required to pay any estate or gift tax because the value of their farm, their business, their accumulation in life does not exceed the limits that are allowable under the law—which, by the way, are \$5.5 million per individual, \$10 million, \$11 million for a family.

That is a pretty nice gift at the end of the day for something that, quite frankly, you were not the hard-working, creative, innovative person who made all that money. You are just the beneficiary by wealth the old-fashioned way: you inherited it.

Do we all aspire to wealth and success? Yeah. That is something we want to applaud. It is something we want to celebrate. This is about celebrating the gift of inheritance, and there is plenty of it here in this legislation.

At the end of the day, this bill is really about the other 99 percent because they are the ones who are going to have to make up the \$270 billion in gifts that we gave already to the richest of the rich. That is not how you fix this problem of growing disparity that is threatening our economy and threatening our well-being.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, all this is a red herring. The desperation you hear is for a government in Washington that desperately wants to keep spending your money on \$800 toilets and on research projects that make no sense and who feel free to waste your money at will because they are not the ones who worked a lifetime to earn it.

Madam Speaker, today, we heard Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM talk about the tragedy of her dad and how, 3 days after his death, they were notified by Uncle Sam that they owed or they would have to sell their ranch.

We heard from a gentleman from Texas whose dad built up from one car and four stalls a family-owned car dealership with 400 workers. It was a profitable company that nearly went

bankrupt because they had to pay Uncle Sam or sell the business. They worked 20 years to pay off that loan.

My constituent, a woman who is widowed, was forced back to the bank for the third time, paying death tax for her grandfather, her father, and now her and her husband, just to keep the family farm they have worked generations on. These are the people who are punished by this tax.

It is not the government's money and work. It is yours. This is all about that issue. At the end of the day, unless we want to keep attacking the American Dream and insisting that Uncle Sam swoop in and take your nest egg, it is time to restore the American Dream and to end the death tax once and for all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

STATE AND LOCAL SALES TAX DEDUCTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 200, I call up the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-74 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 622

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 "State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION OF STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL SALES TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (I).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scoreboard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1045

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 622, the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues, JIM MCDERMOTT and MARSHA BLACKBURN, for joining me in leading the fight to make this middle class tax provision permanent.

This provision is about tax fairness and equal treatment. If taxpayers in income tax States can deduct their State and local income taxes, so should residents of sales tax States. That, in America, is just fair.

This provision helps hard-working taxpayers keep a little more of what they earn, which is even more important to families, given their stagnant paychecks over the past number of years. More than 10 million American taxpayers in nine States depend on this commonsense deduction, and the dollars that stay in the local community help grow their community rather than grow Washington's economy.

A permanent State and local sales tax deduction provides certainty to American families, makes Federal budget scorekeeping more honest, and removes the asterisk from this temporary provision so the progrowth tax reform can advance.

It is certainly important to Texas. Since it has been restored, my neighbors have saved more than \$10 billion, which buys a lot of school clothes, gas for your car, and helps with rising college costs.

To be sure, this provision isn't reserved just for sales tax States. It allows all American taxpayers to choose whether they deduct their State and local income taxes or their State and local sales taxes, whichever is greater. That is fair. That is equal treatment.

Let's be honest. Extending this provision temporarily year after year, which is exactly what has been done since 2004, that won't cost any more than making it permanent today and cre-

ating that certainty and fairness for taxpayers.

I want to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting middle class families by making this provision permanent.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The State and local sales tax deduction is an important tax provision for Americans living in States without a State income tax who cannot take advantage of the State and local income tax deduction.

Although I support this deduction as an important alternative for taxpayers in States without income taxes, H.R. 622 is fiscally irresponsible, given that it permanently extends this deduction without any offsets.

Frankly, I am quite surprised that the Republican leadership is advancing this bill that would add \$42 billion to the deficit. Just last year, then-Chairman Dave Camp proposed eliminating the State and local sales tax deduction in the Republican tax reform draft. At that time, current Chairman RYAN said he approved of eliminating the sales tax provision before us.

Further, just last month, the Republican leadership presented a budget that requires offsetting the cost of any tax extenders that are made permanent with other revenue measures. Indeed, the GOP budget principle is in line with the Republican tax reform draft last year, which adopted a fiscally responsible approach.

I am at a loss to understand why the Republican leadership is adding \$42 billion to our deficit to permanently extend a provision it thinks should be repealed. This bill coupled with the next bill under consideration would add over \$300 billion to our deficit, almost half of the amount the Republican budget said we must cut from domestic discretionary spending.

The Republican budget said that we had to cut \$759 billion over the next 10 years in domestic discretionary spending in the name of fiscal prudence but can throw \$300 billion to the wind for a provision that they have proposed eliminating in tax reform.

We need to provide certainty to taxpayers in affected States that the sales tax deduction will be available to them this year, and then we need to focus on comprehensive reform. This bill moves us farther away from tax reform, not closer.

In addition to being fiscally irresponsible, this bill coupled with the next one under consideration reflect misplaced priorities for this House; rather than pushing a piecemeal, deficit-inflating agenda, we should be helping hard-working American families by raising the minimum wage, ensuring equal pay for equal work, making college more affordable by increasing the Pell grants and improving student loans, helping low-income families afford quality child care, encouraging

work via effective tax programs, improving investment in low-income communities, and strengthening the research innovation and competitiveness of our Nation, just to name a few critical efforts on which we should focus.

I am ready to work with the majority on tax reform. However, I cannot support this piecemeal, fiscally irresponsible approach, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the leader of our tax reform subcommittee and a champion in restoring the State and local sales tax deduction.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for allowing me time to speak, recognizing that Texas is also affected—one of the States affected by this bill, as well as Washington State, which is the State where I come from, and several other States.

I rise to support H.R. 622, the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, this bill is really about two things. It is about fairness, and it is about certainty. Fairness because Washington is one of, as I said, several States without an income tax—and by allowing this deduction of State and local taxes, this legislation will put Washingtonians on the same level as those people who live in States that have an income tax. That is all. It is plain and simple. It is fairness. That is all we are asking for in this bill.

Certainty because people work hard, they pay their sales taxes, and at the end of the year, they want to know for sure that they can deduct their sales taxes.

That is all it is, fairness and certainty. Fairness puts us on parity with the rest of the States across the country and certainty in allowing those people in the State of Washington, Texas, and others to know that, when they spend and pay their sales taxes, they can deduct those from their Federal income taxes at the end of the year. That is it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), one of the key leaders of the Ways and Means Committee who has been in this fight to successfully restore and extend the sales tax deduction for many years.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and Texan, Mr. BRADY, for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, today, we are voting on a bill that is long overdue, a bill that would permanently allow taxpayers, including most especially my

constituents, to permanently deduct the State and local sales taxes that they pay.

Back in 2004, I was part of the effort that brought back this important tax deduction. Unfortunately, as many of my constituents know too well, this deduction is not permanent. Because it is not permanent, Congress has had to renew it almost every year. This creates uncertainty for taxpayers.

That is why this bill is so important. By making this deduction permanent, we can provide taxpayers with the certainty that they deserve, but this bill isn't just about providing certainty; it is about providing fairness.

Right now, taxpayers in States with income taxes can permanently deduct their State and local income taxes; but, in States without an income tax, like Texas, taxpayers can't permanently deduct their State and local sales taxes. That is wrong, and that is unfair.

It shouldn't matter what type of State and local taxes we are talking about. If the IRS allows folks to permanently deduct their income taxes, it ought to also allow so for sales taxes. The IRS shouldn't discriminate against hard-working taxpayers in other States like Texas.

With many hard-working Americans, taxpayers are trying to make ends meet. Every dollar in the pocketbook makes a difference.

In closing, I would like to thank my good friend, Mr. BRADY, for his work on this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I emphasize my surprise at Republican priorities before us. This week, the Joint Economic Committee issued a report on the economic challenges facing the African American community. The findings are stark and detail the significant racial inequities in employment, earnings, wealth, and poverty.

The report shows that the median income of African American households is \$34,600, nearly \$24,000 less than the median income of White households. Black Americans are nearly three times more likely to live in poverty than White Americans.

At 10.1 percent, the current unemployment rate for Black Americans is more than double that for White Americans. In my congressional district, the rate of Black unemployment is 24.5 percent compared to only 5.1 percent for White unemployment.

These facts exemplify the extraordinary growth of inequality in recent years. Massive inequality and the injustices which flow from the great imbalance grips so many of our neighborhoods, so many of our towns and villages, so many of our people who need and deserve the opportunity to share in all of our Nation's potential and all that it has to offer.

These are the topics on which policymakers should focus, not hundreds of

billions of dollars in piecemeal tax cuts for the wealthiest corporations and heirs to estates over \$10 million. The Republican budget proposes to raise taxes on 26 million working families and students by discontinuing important improvements to the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and education tax credits.

The Republican budget proposes making college more costly by freezing the maximum Pell grant award, eliminating mandatory Pell funding, reducing eligibility for Pell grants, eliminating the in-school interest subsidy, and cutting the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

The Republican budget would end Medicare as we know it and proposes undermining the retirement and employee benefits of Federal workers and postal workers. It cuts funding for the Internal Revenue Service, which results in less revenue for our government, undermines taxpayer assistance, and encourages fraud.

We should focus on repairing our Tax Code and enacting policies to help hard-working Americans share in the economic opportunity enjoyed by the wealthiest Americans and most profitable companies.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), a distinguished Member of the House who has been fighting for the State and local sales tax deduction and, as a new mom, understands just how expensive it is to raise families these days.

□ 1100

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, Mr. Speaker, which is so important to the residents in my State, the people whom I serve. I encourage folks to support permanently extending the State and local sales tax deduction.

I was listening to the previous speaker, and I don't think he was really focused on this bill. This bill is about ensuring that residents of Washington and of seven other States are treated equally, that their income taxes are treated equally by the Federal Tax Code. It is a fairness issue. It is also about eliminating the uncertainty that comes at the eleventh hour every year when Congress reauthorizes this as a 1-year deal.

Residents from 40 other States get to deduct their State income taxes from their Federal taxes, but residents of Washington State don't have that option. We pay one of the highest sales taxes in the country, and without the option to deduct our State sales tax, we are forced to carry a higher amount of the Federal burden. Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

Since it is my job to fight for the residents of Washington State, let me also mention that folks in the Evergreen State have been the highest

beneficiaries of the State and local sales tax deduction. More Washingtonians use it than any other State. My predecessor, who was a Democrat, was a big proponent of this bill as well.

At a time when several counties in southwest Washington are still in economic recovery, we need to make sure that families who have already dutifully paid their fair share of taxes get to keep a little bit more of their money. \$602 is the average claim from a State sales tax deduction. A mom in Chehalis, Washington, can make \$602 go a long way. When she spends it on groceries, on gas, or on new soccer cleats for the kids, that money is going back into the local economy, and it is generating more economic activity.

We often hear about “fairness” when it comes to the Tax Code, and I believe in fairness for hard-working taxpayers and for job-creating businesses. What better way to provide fairness than to seize this opportunity before us today to permanently etch this provision into our Tax Code. This bill helps families, and it helps local economies. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), one of our key members of the Ways and Means Committee who has been fighting for this as a Representative from Tennessee, and as a small business owner, she knows how expensive it is for families who work and live along Main Street.

Mrs. BLACK. I want to thank my good friend and colleague for leading this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act.

My home State of Tennessee is proud to be one of the eight States without a State income tax. In fact, such a tax is, actually, explicitly banned in our constitution. We do, however, have a State and local sales tax, which could be as high as 9.75 percent in parts of my district.

Taxpayers in other States are able to deduct their State income taxes on their Federal returns, and it only makes sense that Tennesseans should be able to do the same when it comes to their State and local sales tax. In 2012, more than 18 percent of Tennesseans did exactly that, getting an average deduction of \$404; but too often, my constituents haven't been able to count on this tax credit being available to them from one year to the next. So, today, let's do something different.

Let's ensure that this tax provision for families, which they rely upon, is not subject to a political tug of war here in Washington. Let's help our small businesses plan for tomorrow by giving them peace of mind that this credit will be there for them now and in the future, and let's make the State

and local sales tax deduction permanent by passing this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is, after all, a matter of fairness. I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 622.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. PAUL RYAN, for bringing this measure to the floor and for offering hope to taxpayers in States across the country that they will be treated fairly.

Mr. RYAN is making tax reform—fixing this broken Tax Code and reining in the IRS—a top priority. This measure actually helps take us a step toward that by creating certainty for taxpayers in sales tax States by creating more honest scorekeeping in budgeting. Because we are going to extend this temporarily, it makes no difference in our doing it permanently, but it helps create that honest scorekeeping, and it removes the asterisk from this provision so we can do tax reform, which creates a much healthier economy.

If you support fairness for taxpayers in sales tax States as well as those that have income taxes, if you believe we ought not to discriminate depending on where you live, and that we ought not force States into income taxes that believe a sales tax is the right way to go, this measure is for you.

I acknowledge the President has threatened a veto on this bill. I guess my question is: Why turn your back on hard-working taxpayers? Middle class economics means helping families keep more of what they earn, especially those who are living paycheck to paycheck.

Today, we will stand for families and fairness in making sure they can keep a little bit more of what they earn. I urge support for a permanent extension of the important State and local sales tax deduction.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 200, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 622 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. NO INCREASE IN DEFICIT OR DELAY OF COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

Nothing in this Act shall result in—

- (1) an increase in the deficit, or
- (2) a delay or weakening of efforts to adopt a permanent extension of the election to deduct State and local sales taxes, so long as such extension is accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner.

SEC. 3. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL SALES TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b)(5)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2016”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. BRADY spoke eloquently, as always, about the notion of fundamental tax reform. I mean, a reasonable mind in this Chamber might ask: When? The chairman is not even here this morning. He sends out as the starting pitcher his ace reliever, Mr. BRADY, to defend what we all know in the end is going to be a 1-year extension of this tax provision.

Friends, this is a messaging amendment. By the way, after they get done today with repealing the estate tax, perhaps we could move in this Chamber to call this now the “House of Lords,” where it might be peerage and peer review that brings us here.

Mr. Speaker, it is April. The birds are chirping; the flowers are blooming; the days are getting longer; and the nights are getting warmer. Spring has sprung. The onset of spring brings with it a new baseball season—that time of year when hope springs eternal and every fan thinks his team has a fair shot of claiming baseball glory and immortality.

However, for the fans of bipartisan tax reform, the Republicans are saying here in April: wait until next year.

Yesterday was the 100th day of the 114th Congress. It is 100 days up, 100 days down, and we are no closer to making tax reform a reality. Our Republican friends have wasted 4 months of valuable time and have nothing to show for it. They have whiffed on the 10 permanent tax extender bills that they have passed this year. Not one of these bills has become law nor will any

become law. The President has made that clear, and he has issued a veto threat on every one of these bills.

Contrast this with the Senate Finance Committee. Rather than pursuing a minor league strategy of passing one partisan, unpaid-for, permanent tax extender bill after another on party-line votes, adding to the deficits, they are working together to move forward on bipartisan tax reform.

Democrats have no quarrel with the bill that is before us today but for one exception: State and local sales tax deduction promotes tax fairness for the States that do not impose a State income tax. It only makes sense that, if taxpayers in income tax States can deduct their State and local taxes, so should the residents of sales tax States. We support making State and local sales tax deductions eventually permanent but not at the cost of \$42 billion a year being added to the deficit. This is how they have done all of these tax extenders—the party, by the way, that frequently will have us believe that they are champions of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to step up to the plate as Democrats and pass a bipartisan tax reform bill that really hits it out of the park for middle class people, that creates jobs, that gives special interests a little chin music—or, as we call it, the “brushback”—and that ushers in lasting economic growth, much the same as we experienced during the Clinton years here in America: surpluses for years, growth unprecedented. There were 23 million new jobs created during those years. That is the experience that we should be talking about today.

The chairman of our committee, my friend, Mr. RYAN, is always saying that this committee can walk and chew gum at the same time. Guess what? I believe him.

So, Mr. Chairman, do we prefer Wrigley’s, Hubba Bubba, or, maybe, the classic Big League Chew?

Let’s get on to the third inning and get tax reform done, and let’s stop procrastinating in front of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman’s motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this motion is what people sort of hate about Washington.

We say we stand for fairness for taxpayers in sales tax States but only for a few more months. We say we don’t want to discriminate between you and people who are in income tax States but only for a few more months. Up here, Washington says, Look, we think

you ought to keep more of what you have earned because it is expensive to raise a family but only for a few more months because we in Washington, they say, have the power to yank this any time we want.

The truth of the matter is it is so expensive to raise families these days, and our Tax Code picks winners and losers all the time. What this provision does is make permanent the fairness to ensure taxpayers across America are treated equally, that this Tax Code doesn’t discriminate, that you can keep a little more of the money it takes to raise your family, to buy that gas, to buy the school clothes, to pay the utilities. That is all that this law does.

□ 1115

It is a step toward tax reform and reining in the IRS because it removes the asterisks from this temporary provision we extend year after year at the same cost. It is really about honest budgeting, because those who claim there is a huge cost of this, they are going to vote and have voted to extend this. So there is no difference there. It is just a talking point. At the end of the day, this creates a certainty for our taxpayers, removes that asterisk from a temporary provision, and moves us forward to progrowth tax reform that creates a much healthier economy and creates a Tax Code that is fair, flatter, and simpler.

I urge support for permanently helping families with their costs and lowering the cost of their taxes. I urge support for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 622, if ordered; the motion to recommit on H.R. 1105; and passage of H.R. 1105, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 243, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—179

Adams	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Carney
Ashford	F.	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Beyer	Butterfield	Cicilline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke (NY)

Clay	Huffman	Pascarell
Cleaver	Israel	Payne
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Connolly	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Costa	Jones	Pingree
Courtney	Kaptur	Pocan
Crowley	Keating	Polis
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kennedy	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Rangel
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kind	Richmond
DeGette	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Kuster	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Langevin	Rush
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Deutch	Lawrence	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lee	Sarbanes
Doggett	Levin	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael F.	Lewis	Schiff
Duckworth	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lipinski	Scott, David
Ellison	Loeb sack	Serrano
Engel	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Sherman
Esty	Lowe y	Sires
Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Slaughter
Fattah	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Speier
Foster	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Takai
Fudge	Caroly n	Takano
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Gallego	Matsui	Tonko
Garamendi	McCollum	Torres
Graham	McDermott	Tsongas
Grayson	McGovern	Van Hollen
Green, Al	McNerney	Vargas
Green, Gene	Meeks	Veasey
Grijalva	Meng	Vela
Gutiérrez	Moore	Velázquez
Hahn	Moulton	Visclosky
Hastings	Nadler	Walz
Heck (WA)	Napolitano	Wasserman
Higgins	Neal	Schultz
Himes	Nolan	Waters, Maxine
Hinojosa	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Honda	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Hoyer		Yarmuth

NAYS—243

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Hice, Jody B.
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Allen	Denham	Holding
Amash	Dent	Hudson
Amodel	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Babin	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Barr	Dold	Hunter
Barton	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Hurt (VA)
Bilirakis	Ellmers (NC)	Issa
Bishop (MI)	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Black	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Blum	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jolly
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Jordan
Brat	Flores	Joyce
Bridenstine	Forbes	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	King (IA)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buck	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Bucshon	Garrett	Kline
Burgess	Gibbs	Knight
Byrne	Gibson	Labrador
Calvert	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Lance
Chabot	Granger	Latta
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Clawson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Long
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Loudermillk
Cohen	Griffith	Love
Cole	Grothman	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Lummis
Comstock	Hanna	MacArthur
Conaway	Hardy	Marchant
Cook	Harper	Marino
Costello (PA)	Harris	Masse
Cramer	Hartzler	McCarthy
Crawford	Heck (NV)	McCauley
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McClintock
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	McHenry

McKinley Renacci Stutzman Davis, Rodney
 McMorris Ribble Thompson (CA) DelBene
 Rodgers Rice (SC) Thompson (PA) Denham
 McSally Rigell Thornberry Dent
 Meadows Roby Tiberi DeSantis
 Meehan Roe (TN) Tipton DesJarlais
 Messer Rogers (AL) Titus Deutch
 Mica Rogers (KY) Trotter Diaz-Balart
 Miller (FL) Rohrabacher Turner Dold
 Miller (MI) Rokita Duffy
 Moonenaar Rooney (FL) Upton Duncan (TN)
 Mooney (WV) Ros-Lehtinen Valadao Ellmers (NC)
 Mullin Roskam Wagner Emmer (MN)
 Mulvaney Ross Walberg Farenthold
 Murphy (FL) Rothfus Walden
 Murphy (PA) Rouzer Walker
 Neugebauer Royce Walorski
 Newhouse Russell Walters, Mimi
 Noem Ryan (WI) Weber (TX)
 Nugent Salmon Webster (FL)
 Nunes Sanford Wenstrup
 O'Rourke Scalise Westerman
 Olson Schweikert Westmoreland
 Palazzo Scott, Austin Whitfield
 Palmer Sensenbrenner Williams
 Paulsen Sessions Wilson (SC)
 Pearce Shimkus Wittman
 Pittenger Shuster Womack
 Pitts Simpson Woodall
 Poe (TX) Sinema Yoder
 Poliquin Smith (MO) Yoho
 Pompeo Smith (NE) Young (AK)
 Posey Smith (NJ) Young (IA)
 Price, Tom Smith (TX) Young (IN)
 Ratcliffe Stefanik Zeldin
 Reed Stewart
 Reichert Stivers Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (UT) Gosar Schrader
 Blackburn Perry Smith (WA)
 Duncan (SC) Ruiz Welch

□ 1145

Messrs. PALMER, WALKER, Mrs. LOVE, Messrs. STUTZMAN, BRIDENSTINE and THOMPSON of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ASHFORD, DESAULNIER, FATTAH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 152, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—272

Abraham Boustany Chabot
 Aderholt Brady (TX) Chaffetz
 Allen Brat Clawson (FL)
 Amash Bridenstine Coffman
 Amodei Brooks (AL) Cohen
 Ashford Brooks (IN) Cole
 Babin Brown (FL) Collins (GA)
 Barletta Buchanan Collins (NY)
 Barr Buck Comstock
 Barton Bucshon Conaway
 Benishek Burgess Cook
 Bilirakis Bustos Costello (PA)
 Bishop (GA) Byrne Cramer
 Bishop (MI) Calvert Crawford
 Bishop (UT) Carter (GA) Crenshaw
 Black Carter (TX) Cuellar
 Blum Castor (FL) Culberson
 Best Castro (TX) Curbelo (FL)

Kilmer King (IA) King (NY) Kinzinger (IL) Kline Rokita Rooney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce Ruppertsberger Russell Ryan (WI) Salmon Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin Sensenbrenner Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Swalwell (CA) Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Titus Trotter Turner Upton Valadao Valero Vela Wagner Walberg Walden Walker Walorski Walz Walters, Mimi Wasserman Waters, Maxine Watt Clapper Webb Weener Welch Westerman Whitfield Williams Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Young (AK) Young (IA) Young (IN) Zinke

NAYS—152

Adams Clarke (NY) Edwards
 Aguilar Clay Ellison
 Bass Cleaver Engel
 Beatty Clyburn Eshoo
 Becerra Connolly Esty
 Bera Conyers Farr
 Beyer Cooper Fattah
 Blumenauer Costa Foster
 Bonamici Courtney Frankel (FL)
 Boyle, Brendan Crowley Fudge
 F. Cummings Gabbard
 Brady (PA) Davis (CA) Gallego
 Brownley (CA) Davis, Danny Garamendi
 Butterfield DeFazio Grijalva
 Capps DeGette Gutierrez
 Capuano Delaney Hahn
 Cárdenas DeLauro Higgins
 Carney DeSaunier Himes
 Carson (IN) Dingell Honds
 Cartwright Doggett Hoyer
 Chu, Judy Doyle, Michael Huffman
 Cicilline F. Israel
 Clark (MA) Duckworth Jeffries

Roe (TN) Johnson (GA) McDermott
 Johnson, E. B. McGovern
 Jones McNeery Schakowsky
 Kaptur Meeks Schiff
 Keating Meng Schrader
 Kelly (IL) Moore Scott (VA)
 Kennedy Moulton Scott, David
 Kildee Nadler Serrano
 Kind Neapolitano Sewell (AL)
 Kirkpatrick Neal Sherman
 Langevin Nolan Sires
 Larson (CT) Norcross
 Lawrence Pallone Slaughter
 Lee Pascrell Speier
 Levin Payne Takai
 Lewis Pelosi Takano
 Lieu, Ted Peters Thompson (CA)
 Lipinski Peterson Thompson (MS)
 Lofgren Pingree Tonko
 Lowenthal Pocan Torres
 Lowey Polls Tsongas
 Lujan Grisham Price (NC) Van Hollen
 (NM) Quigley Vargas
 Lujan, Ben Ray Rangel Velázquez
 (NM) Richmond Visclosky
 Lynch Roybal-Allard Walz
 Maloney, Rush
 Carolyn Ryan (OH) Watson Coleman
 Matsui Sánchez, Linda Wilson (FL)
 McCollum T. Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Blackburn Perry Welch
 Duncan (SC) Ruiz
 Gosar Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1154

Mr. CUMMINGS and Mrs. LAWRENCE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 159 on H.R. 622, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 232, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—186

Adams Brown (FL)
 Aguilar Bishop (GA) Brownley (CA)
 Ashford Blumenauer Bustos
 Bass Bonamici Butterfield
 Beatty Boyle, Brendan Capps
 Becerra F. Capuano
 Bera Brady (PA) Cárdenas

Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins

NAYS—232

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishke
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway

Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone

Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Ryan (OH)
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Neuhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce

Blackburn
 Dold
 Duncan (SC)
 Fincher
 Gosar

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1201

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160 I was unavoidably detained with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—240

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta

Barr
 Barton
 Benishke
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black

Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho

Smith (WA)
 Welch
 Whitfield

Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Hunter
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Duffy
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foss
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding

NOES—179

Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell

Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Meehan
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)

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

NOT VOTING—12

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

□ 1210

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield to my friend.

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield to my friend.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Go Canes.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN LEAHR

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

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

□ 1245

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Day of Silence.

Tomorrow is the 18th year we have recognized the National Day of Silence, a day when young people come together to raise awareness for the discrimination that LGBT students face.

I am proud of students who stand up against bullying, students like Karen Jimenez of Aptos, California, who said: "Identity extends further than our physical selves, so when expression of identity becomes restricted, it's similar to having chains placed on your home."

I am a proud sponsor of the Student Non-Discrimination Act and will continue to fight for acceptance and tolerance for LGBT youth. California is a leader in promoting and protecting the rights of our LGBT community.

This year, we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the passage of the Safety and Violence Prevention Act and recent passage of a bill to ensure that trans students are afforded necessary gender neutral facilities in their schools.

We, in Congress, have a responsibility not to be silent. It is our job to speak for those who cannot. We must work harder towards becoming a wholly gender-inclusive society that welcomes and protects all our Members.

HONORING MANO A MANO

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mano a Mano on its 15-year anniversary in Round Lake Park and to recognize the staff and volunteers who support this incredible organization.

In 2000, community leaders saw a rise in the Latino immigrant population, as well as the struggles they face due to language barriers and a lack of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, these leaders took it upon themselves to help the growing community through support and education. They opened the doors of Mano a Mano and began providing services such as community school for parents, kindergarten readiness, citizenship preparation, employment connection, and health education.

It is because of organizations like Mano a Mano that families can break down the barriers they face and succeed. Through these services, Mr. Speaker, Mano a Mano has empowered immigrants and underserved families to become proud contributing members of our community.

I congratulate them on their 15-year anniversary.

PAYDAY LENDING REGULATIONS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to talk about the critical need for the stronger oversight of payday lenders.

In March, I welcomed President Obama to the city of Birmingham, in my district, where he highlighted our Nation's economic recovery and put a spotlight on the areas that needed the most improvement. The President highlighted the urgent need for better regulations of the payday lending industry—the very same day that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau unveiled proposals to rein in this loosely regulated industry.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the CFPB's efforts to ensure that these products help—not harm—consumers. The payday lending and title loan industry must take steps to ensure that borrowers understand the loan terms and have the resources to pay them back.

In my district, the proliferation of payday lending is, really, unacceptable. On every corner, you will find a payday lender. In fact, the President quoted that there were more payday lending institutions in my district than there were McDonald's. These borrowers are disproportionately African American and Latino—two communities that were severely impacted by the predatory lending practices, and far too many of these borrowers find themselves trapped in a cycle of debt.

In the coming weeks, I plan to introduce a bill and to spearhead efforts, led by consumer industry groups, to protect consumers from predatory lending. I ask my colleagues to join me. These good people are my constituents and are not this industry's prey.

IN MEMORY OF MARY LARAE RICHTER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in memory of Mary LaRae Richter.

Everybody knew her as "Rae" in the Chico, California, and northern California area. She was a truly inspiring woman who left a deep, lasting impact on her family, on the community of Chico, and on all who knew her. I knew her very well for quite a few years. She was a very, very sweet lady, indeed.

Born in 1932, at the height of the Great Depression, Rae was an exceptional student and a joyful daughter who was no stranger to hard work. Her first job was behind a soda fountain in a drug store in order to help support her family.

She married her husband, Bernie, in 1953 after they met in high school. Their marriage lasted for 46 years until

Bernie passed away. Of course, with Bernie's having been a political figure, including in the State legislature, she played a very supportive role in that endeavor, which was sometimes an arduous one, but she always had the right thing to say, including, "Oh, Bernard," when, maybe, things were getting a little out of control.

Bernie and Rae moved with their three children up to Chico in the 1960s. Rae poured her heart into her town and into her community and into her family-owned businesses while always making time to volunteer for the students just across the street at the Rosedale Elementary School. Rae fought valiantly with Parkinson's disease since 1998, and she displayed courage and joy even in that battle.

Being that supportive wife, a loving mom and grandmother, a joyful business manager, and a good friend to many, she will be greatly missed by all who knew her in northern California.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, my father used to point out to me that there were certain moments, certain events, that not only defined, perhaps, a community or a generation but that left an indelible mark on a person. He referenced me to go speak to my grandparents about where they were when the news came that Pearl Harbor had been bombed. I can remember my Grandfather Lucas describing the exact field, the exact row that he was picking cotton in in December of 1941 when one of the neighbors stopped and asked, "Have you heard?"

My father could tell you exactly the moment, while walking down the street in Elk City, Oklahoma, when he walked up on a crowd that was staring in the window of a store that was selling televisions. Everyone's mouth was down. Everyone was aghast at the news from Dallas.

In many ways, the experience of 2 minutes after 9 a.m. on April 19, 1995, has had the same mark and the same effect on not only me and on my colleagues in this delegation but on our communities in the country. Like my grandfather in his remembering the moment that he found out about Pearl Harbor and like my father in the moment he understood that President Kennedy had been assassinated, I will never forget sitting with the Oklahoma delegation, waiting to give testimony in a BRAC hearing in Dallas, when a reporter tapped me on the shoulder, a reporter I had known for some time.

He said: "We have a report that there has been an explosion at the Federal building in Oklahoma City. They say the building is gone. Your district office is in one of those Federal buildings

in downtown Oklahoma City. Which building are your people in?"

It is a moment that I will never forget.

The delegation got up, and, en masse, we rushed out into the lobby. There on the television monitors was the building that we recognized as the shell of the Murrah building. It, literally, was gone.

My folks were spared, but, on that day, 168 of our good fellow citizens in Oklahoma City were not. This Sunday morning, we will gather to remember that event of 20 years ago, an event that has changed us all forever.

I am proud of my fellow Oklahoma delegation here today because we still work just now as we did 20 years ago to address those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to one of my colleagues from Oklahoma, who was at that time the secretary of state for the State of Oklahoma, one of the folks in the inner circle in Governor Keating's administration as State government responded to something that no one could have expected.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank my friend for leading us in this genuinely somber and extraordinarily important moment not only for our State and, certainly, for what was then his district but, I think, for Americans everywhere.

Twenty years ago on April 19 of 1995, we saw a domestic tragedy of historic proportions. It is still the largest single act of domestic terrorism in American history. It was totally unexpected, totally unanticipated, and extraordinarily devastating to the people involved and, I think, to the country as a whole. But sometimes out of a tragedy of that proportion a triumph emerges, and that is certainly what occurred in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, and on the days that followed.

Our first thoughts on the 20th anniversary is always of the victims—of the 168 lives who were lost, 19 of them children, unknowing that disaster was about to overtake them—and of the many dozens who were wounded severely and who still, to this day, carry those injuries with them.

Next, we think always of the first responders, particularly of the Oklahoma City fire and police officers who immediately rushed to the scene; of the surrounding fire and police departments that were rapidly mobilized to assist them; of the Oklahoma National Guard, which was there within a matter of hours; and, frankly, of the rescue teams from all across the United States of America that immediately moved in our direction to help our people.

I think of the people of Oklahoma next, who, stunned, rallied with enormous speed and with great courage to try and support, in each and every way that they could, the folks whose lives had been lost and the people who were still in danger.

I still remember that day at the Governor's office—at the end of the day, at

2 o'clock in the morning—and driving from the capitol toward my home in Moore, Oklahoma, and seeing a line of people outside the blood center. At 2 in the morning, they were still there, wanting to help and be supportive in whatever way that they could. We were really blessed at that particular moment in the history of our State and in the history of our country with extraordinary leadership. I think, first, always—because I worked for Governor Keating as his secretary of state—of the manner in which he responded.

Like my friend Mr. LUCAS, I heard about this totally unexpectedly. I was, literally, walking into the capitol at 9:02, in the tunnel, and I felt a little shudder. When I walked into my office, my secretary immediately walked in and said, "Your wife is on the phone." She was working two blocks away from the site of the bombing, and she was on the 18th floor of a building.

She said, "I don't know what has happened, but I am looking down, and I can see enormous smoke—an explosion occurred—rolling out, and there are hundreds of people on the street, fleeing from this disaster."

My office was below the Governor's office on the first floor of the capitol, and I went up. This was maybe 8 minutes into the event. I walked in because I knew the Governor would be focused on this, obviously. He was standing in the press room immediately to the right as you walked in, and at that time, there were already helicopters in the air, and, on the scene, we were seeing the horrific sights.

The speculation immediately was that it was some sort of natural gas explosion. Well, Frank Keating, who was our Governor, was also a former FBI agent who had been trained in investigating terrorism in the 1960s. He was a former Tulsa prosecutor, a former U.S. attorney, a former Associate Attorney General of the United States, and he knew what he was looking at. He immediately looked at that television set, and I will never forget what he said.

He said: "That is not a natural gas explosion. That is a car bomb of some sort." He knew instantly what he was dealing with.

On that day and on the subsequent days, he led with extraordinary distinction in mobilizing resources, leading from the front, being on the front line. It was an exceptional act of public leadership from an official who was less than 100 days into his first term as Governor of the State.

Equally impressive was the leadership of his wife, our first lady, Cathy Keating. Most of America knows of the memorial service that took place on the Sunday after the disaster. I remember the night after the disaster my being at the Governor's Mansion. We still didn't know how many people had been lost, and we didn't know if there were survivors still in the building. There were search teams. We were dealing with a disaster of national and, really, international proportions.

Cathy Keating came to the meeting and said: "We need to have some sort of service to memorialize the people who have been lost. People are grieving, and they want to participate."

I remember thinking at the time, my goodness, how in the world can we ever pull this off? We are dealing with more than we can deal with, let alone organizing something like that, and I made that point. She said, "Don't worry. I will take over," and she did.

America, not just Oklahoma City and Oklahoma, was given a moment to mourn, a moment that attracted the President of the United States, Billy Graham, a national audience, and thousands of Oklahomans who simply wanted to get together and pay tribute to those who had lost their lives. It was an exceptional act of public leadership on her part. The two of them set up a foundation to take care of the educational needs of anyone who had lost a parent, let alone two parents, in the course of that, and that institution still functions to this day. Again, exceptional leadership.

We have had other moments of tragedy in our country, like 9/11, and just as Rudy Giuliani was quoted as being "America's mayor" on that day, Ron Norick in Oklahoma City was "America's mayor" that day. It was an amazing performance as he got together his police and his fire firefighters and was immediately on the scene. He is one of the greatest public servants who I have ever seen.

I would be remiss not to mention my friend behind me, Mr. LUCAS. As he alluded to in his remarks, that was his district office one building over. That was a place where he was in and out of a lot in the Federal building. My task as secretary of state, assigned by the Governor, was to work in Washington to try and coordinate with the Federal Government long-term rebuilding efforts.

□ 1300

Nobody did more to rebuild Oklahoma City than FRANK LUCAS. Nobody did more to help secure the funds, get the national support, work with us to get out of the requirements. We had to match this with 25 percent because this was not a natural disaster. This was literally an attack on a Federal facility in Oklahoma City with a unique Federal responsibility. Those were all things that FRANK LUCAS got done for not just the people of his district, but the people of our State; and, frankly, in that, he set some precedents that served the people of New York on 9/11 awfully well in addition.

The last person I want to mention is the President of the United States at the time. I am a pretty good Republican, and I can't say I ever voted for Bill Clinton, but I was very glad he was President of the United States at that moment. Nobody helped us more.

I will never forget 1 p.m. the day of the disaster. We had moved the Governor to a civil defense facility below

ground at the Capitol—he was directing affairs there—and we got a call from the President of the United States. I did not know it at the time, but they—Frank Keating and Bill Clinton—had actually gone to school together. They were both at Georgetown together. Frank Keating was president of the student body when Bill Clinton was president of the sophomore class, so they knew one another.

The first thing that the President asked was: Governor, do you have any idea who is responsible for this?

There were, of course, all sorts of wild reports on television, wild speculation.

The Governor, being a law enforcement professional, immediately responded: Mr. President, we have no idea. We do not know who would do this. I know you are hearing foreign terrorists or all sorts of things. We just don't know yet. It is too chaotic for us to know.

President Clinton at that point said something that really struck me, and struck me more later. He said: Well, I hope it wasn't a foreign national.

And I remember being almost shocked that you would hope that, you know, an American had done something this awful, but then he added, prophetically, as it turned out several years later: Because if it was, we will be at war someplace in the world within 6 months.

He was absolutely right. He, too, understood the dimensions of the tragedy. And in the days ahead, everything we asked for and all the resources and compassion that a great people like the United States of America and its citizens can muster was immediately at our disposal.

I remember President Clinton, when we announced we were doing the ceremony, we were discreetly approached by a member in his administration, who said: You know, the President would like to be here, but we certainly don't want to be here if it is inappropriate.

I said: Look, I have to go clear that with the Governor, but I can tell you, I know what Frank Keating's response is going to be. Of course, we would welcome the President of the United States.

He did, indeed, come. He not only helped us through it, he helped us emotionally through it, as did the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, at the time also made that journey and was there to help and comfort people.

So we may have our political differences from time to time as Americans, but in times of tragedy, we stick together. We come together; we pull together; and we work to help one another, and certainly President Clinton did that.

Finally, let me just make this observation and this expression of gratitude. I want to use this occasion to thank the millions and millions of Americans who responded with their prayers, with their help, the rescue workers that

came, the donations that flowed in from all across the country to help the victims and the families of the victims, that came, frankly, from around the world, because we had international help as well.

I want to remind people that whenever they lose faith in the United States of America or just the sheer decency of people, think of the Oklahoma City bombing; think of the magnificent performance of this country, not just of the people on the scene, but of the support this country directed toward its fellow citizens in a time of difficulty, and of the many prayers and expressions of goodwill and condolence from around the world as people rallied in the face of what was an unspeakable act of terror.

So we had our moment of tragedy, but we have had 20 years of triumph since then; and that triumph is not just the triumph of the people of Oklahoma City or the people of Oklahoma, it is an American triumph, and it is a human triumph of enormous dimensions and of great consequence.

Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Congressman COLE.

I certainly want to acknowledge Congressman MULLIN and Congressman BRIDENSTINE. We work as a family delegation, so to speak, in the Oklahoma delegation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Congressman RUSSELL, who has the responsibility of representing that site in the Fifth District of Oklahoma, to conclude with a few comments.

Congressman RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank Congressman LUCAS and my friends and colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1995, I was defending my country as an officer in the United States Army. We were preparing warriors to defend our country, never imagining that an attack would occur in our hometown.

Among the 168 people that were killed and the 680 nonfatal injuries, the 324 buildings that were destroyed or damaged in a 16-block radius, and the \$652 million worth of damage that was caused in my hometown, there were a number of brother warriors and sister warriors that were defending their country at their duty stations at the recruiting depots that were contained in the Federal building—Victoria Sohn, a master sergeant in the United States Army; Benjamin Davis, a sergeant in the United States Marine Corps; Lakesha Levy, an airman first class in the United States Air Force; Randolph Guzman, a captain in the United States Marine Corps; Cartney McRaven, an airman first class in the United States Air Force; and Lola Bolden, a sergeant first class in the United States Army—never imagining that in their recruiting duties in Oklahoma City that they would give their lives in defense of their country.

To my colleagues and to Congressman LUCAS, I would ask that we could observe a moment of silence in mem-

ory to all the 168 Americans, Oklahomans, friends that were killed in this despicable act of terror on our domestic shores, and to all of those that carry the scars and injuries to this day, if we could observe a brief moment of silence.

I thank my colleague and friend, Congressman LUCAS, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the Oklahoma delegation can express our thanks to the country for the help over the last 20 years, but with this moment of silence just now, we ask that everyone, 2 minutes after 9, central time, this Sunday morning think about those 168 souls, those killed and those who survived, and those who were changed forever.

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

HONORING ALEX MILLS WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, after the Japanese attacks on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Americans from across the Nation were driven by a sudden sense of patriotism, and they sought ways that they could serve their country. One such patriotic American was young Alex Mills of Concord, North Carolina. Although Alex desperately wanted to serve his nation, at only 13 years old, he was too young to join the ranks of thousands of young men and women who were shipping off overseas.

Determined to not allow his youth to stand between him and doing something significant, young Alex searched for a way that he could help his country. Now, learning of a newly organized outfit created to patrol the coastline and borders of our homeland, Alex quickly enlisted in the Civil Air Patrol.

Throughout World War II, the Civil Air Patrol pilots flew hundreds of patrol missions searching for enemy submarines operating along our coastline. Throughout the war, the Civil Air Patrol spotted numerous German U-boats, and after the planes were fitted with bombs, the Civil Air Patrol crews were credited with sinking at least two enemy submarines. Recognizing the value of this volunteer force of civilians, Congress acted to make the Civil Air Patrol the official auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

Forty-one years after first joining the Civil Air Patrol, Alex Mills was appointed as the chaplain of Civil Air Patrol's Rome Composite Squadron at the Richard B. Russell Airfield in Rome, Georgia.

Since taking on the role of chaplain, Alex Mills has continued his exemplary service and has risen to the rank of

lieutenant colonel. He also has been recognized as the Georgia Wing Chaplain of the Year and the Southeast Region Chaplain of the Year.

Having had the honor to serve side by side with Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills during my tenure at the Rome Squadron, I can attest firsthand to his dedication to duty, God, and country. I have witnessed the positive impact he has had on many young Americans who, as he did 74 years ago, joined the Civil Air Patrol as a way to serve their nation.

On Sunday, April 26, I will have the honor of presenting the Congressional Gold Medal to Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills for his lifetime of service and as one of the few remaining charter members of the Civil Air Patrol.

Of all those that I have served with during my time in the military and serving in Civil Air Patrol, there are only a few that have had such a positive influence on my life and the life of my family. Without any reservation, I can attest that Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills is one of those individuals.

On behalf of the State of Georgia and Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I recognize and commend Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills for his 74 years of service to God, community, and country.

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

—————
 HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY
 AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
 APRIL 17, 2015, TO MONDAY,
 APRIL 20, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

—————
 THE WAR ON COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you making time to be down here with me today.

Mr. Speaker, I am down here to talk about the war on coal. And when I say "the war on coal," people think of that as if we can actually go and attack a natural resource. I am not worried about attacking natural resources. I am worried about the impact it has on American families. In particular, I am worried about the impact it has on families in my district in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, you can't see this chart, but it is a chart that represents section 111(d). It is the language that the President used to create his new carbon emission targets. I am not saying that Congress passed a law to do this, because Congress didn't pass a law. The President just decided he was going to do it. I am not saying that the House and the Senate got together and debated it, because we didn't get together and debate it. The President just decided this was the way it was going to be.

It is 292 words that were already in statute. The President has turned it into a 130-page regulation that he is implementing on the country—hundreds more pages of technical support documents going behind that. This is what President Obama's constitutional law professor had to say.

Again, this is a regulation that the President, Mr. Speaker, is implementing without any action of Congress whatsoever.

□ 1315

Laurence Tribe, the Harvard law professor who was President Obama's constitutional law professor, said this in December of last year: "To justify the Clean Power Plan"—the President's energy plan—"the EPA has brazenly rewritten the history of an obscure section of the 1970 Clean Air Act"—that is these 292 words I talked about—"passed by Congress in 1970."

Professor Tribe goes on to say: "Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal."

Mr. Speaker, a Clean Air Act passed in 1970—and I will get into some charts that show the successes we have had of previous Clean Air Acts in 1970, 1990. The President wants to do things differently than the law of the land allows, and he is frustrated, as described by Professor Tribe, that Congress refuses to do what the President wants us to do.

I am going to talk about why it is we don't want to do what the President wants us to do. We don't want to do it because it is destructive to the American economy and it is destructive to American families. We don't want to do what the President wants to do. The President hasn't come up here to lobby Congress to try to get Congress to do what the President wants us to do.

The President, to quote Professor Tribe, is "throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal."

We will come back to Professor Tribe. I want to talk about it in terms of my constituency, Mr. Speaker. I am right there in kind of the northeastern Atlanta suburbs there. It is only two counties, Mr. Speaker, but they are two of the fastest growing counties in the State of Georgia. They have also just been named two of the healthiest counties in the State of Georgia.

This is what we are talking about in Georgia. This is our Georgia Public

Service Commission, that group of elected officials in charge of keeping energy prices affordable for Georgia families, that group that is tasked with keeping energy supplies reliable in Georgia, that group that is tasked with regulating energy in the State of Georgia.

It is not the EPA; it is not President Obama. It is the Georgia Public Service Commission. They say this about the President's rule:

This rule will be unduly burdensome on Georgians, placing upward pressure on electricity rates, an outcome that is not acceptable to our organization or the citizens that we serve.

These are not Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker. These are folks who are concerned, literally, about how families are able to keep the lights on. How do you keep the lights on? We talk about getting the mortgage paid. We talk about getting the car note paid. How do you keep the lights on? The Georgia Public Service Commission is concerned about the burden of this new rule.

The Clean Power Plan—that is what the President calls his plan—has nothing to do with clean power. It has to do with a war on America's energy security.

He says this:

The Clean Power Plan is illegal, unfair, and unwise.

That is Georgia's attorney general. That is the one elected official in Georgia that is tasked with enforcing the laws of the land as they exist in Georgia, a statewide elected office. He calls this plan illegal, unfair, and unwise.

It is not just President Obama's constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe, calling it unconstitutional. We hear it from our Georgia State attorney general as well.

This is from one of our power suppliers in Georgia. You may think of power suppliers. Well, of course, they want to pollute. That is what those big energy companies do—nonsense.

Oglethorpe Power is the group that supplies power to all of the electric co-ops in the State. Mr. Speaker, I know you have electric co-ops in your State, as I do in mine. These are citizen-owned utilities. These are citizen-owned companies that make sure the lights stay on.

Oglethorpe Power provides the power to those citizen-owned groups. This is not some big investor-owned utility. This isn't some dirty power producer. This is the group of citizens that represents every single one of us in the State of Georgia who receive our power in this way.

This is what Oglethorpe Power says:

Consequently, there is substantial probability bordering on certainty that Oglethorpe Power will suffer economic injury if the EPA finalizes the proposal in its current form or in any substantially similar form.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bad idea to do it because Congress wasn't involved in it. It is a bad idea, as Professor Tribe suggests, to do it because the Constitution

doesn't allow. It is a bad idea, as Georgia's attorney general says, because it is unfair and it is unwise and it is unlawful.

It is a bad idea to do it, as Oglethorpe Power says, because it is going to burden every single American family, particularly these Georgia families that Oglethorpe Power serves, if that goes into effect.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to get hit the hardest? I will just use my State of Georgia because I get so tired on this House floor of pitting one group of folks against another.

There is that part of me, Mr. Speaker, that remembers when President Obama was first running for office, and he promised to be the President that had the most transparent administration in American history, and he promised to be a uniter, bringing America together, as we have not heretofore been together in recent times.

That is not what I see, Mr. Speaker. What I see is division. What I see are politics of division each and every day, so often along economic lines.

I would argue what is the right metric is not how much money you make in a day. It is how much money you are able to make tomorrow. The opportunity is the metric on which we ought to measure. Do you have opportunity for tomorrow? Do you have choices that you can make to make your life better?

Quoting an energy economist who testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee just this week, Mr. Speaker, he said this:

Lower-income groups will bear the burden of higher energy costs imposed by the EPA's plan but will be among the least likely to invest in or benefit from the energy efficiency programs that the proposed rule envisions.

I want you to think about that. The President has big plans in this unlawful rule, this unconstitutional rule, this undebated rule; but he has big plans.

It is twofold. Number one, he is going to get American families to invest in energy-efficient products in their home which, in theory, Mr. Speaker, if I am using less electricity in my home, I am going to be spending less money on that electricity.

The President's plan is if I can get families to have more efficient products in their home, I can drive up the cost of electricity to the home, but families are still going to be out about the same amount of money. That is not the way the economists see it, Mr. Speaker.

Look at families with their aftertax income of less than \$10,000 a year. Now, that is not altogether uncommon in the great State of Georgia, and certainly, those are the folks who already have a tough time keeping the lights on.

Thirty percent or more of their income, on average, is dedicated to energy costs. Thirty percent or more of everything that family has is dedicated to paying their energy costs. This rule

proposes to run those costs up dramatically.

Now, you move up to folks who are making aftertax incomes higher than \$50,000, Mr. Speaker, and you are down below 5 percent of their income that they are spending on energy costs.

The folks who can handle an increased rise in energy prices are also going to be those folks who invest in the more energy-efficient system. It is those folks who are trapped at the bottom of the income ladder, who don't have those opportunities to invest in more energy-efficient products, who are going to be hit the hardest by rising energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in my District—700,000 strong—who doesn't want to see clean air, but the President's rule isn't about clean air. It is about picking winners and losers in energy production. The President doesn't like coal. He doesn't like coal miners. He doesn't like coal processors. He don't like coal power plant operators.

This isn't about clean air. It is about coal. Is going to have an economic impact on constituents in my District.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to the words that folks use. This is the Georgia Chamber of Commerce. They obviously have an obligation to grow the economy in Georgia.

Let me just tell you that you can't pay taxes if you don't have a job, right? It is an essential point of basic government economics. You need people to work. You need people to be successful because, if they are not successful, they cannot pay their taxes.

The Georgia Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to success in our part of the world. They say:

EPA's regulations will impose billions of dollars in costs on the United States—and Georgia's—economy but fail to meaningfully reduce CO₂ emissions on a global scale.

If EPA adopts policies that substantially increase the cost of energy, thereby decreasing the competitiveness of the United States, investments and emissions will be sent to other, less efficient countries with higher CO₂ emission intensities.

As a result, overly restrictive and costly United States policies to reduce emissions will not only be offset around the globe, but could actually result in a net increase.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker. I want you to think about that. We just had this conversation in respect to the Keystone pipeline. The President vetoed bipartisan language passed in this House, passed in the Senate, to build the Keystone pipeline.

This pipeline has been in the approval process for longer than it took to build the entire Hoover Dam. The entire Hoover Dam, start to finish, was built faster than we can even get an approval. This law wasn't to mandate the building of the pipeline. This law was to mandate that the approval process come to conclusion.

The process still hasn't come to a conclusion—the President won't do it—as if, if America decides not to build the Keystone pipeline, oil will not be

harvested in the independent nation of Canada—nonsense.

Canada didn't ask us whether or not they should bring the oil out of the ground. They asked us to help them get the oil to market. They are America's largest trading partner.

They said: America, will you help us with this pipeline?

The answer should have been: Absolutely, yes.

If not yes, perhaps the answer could be no; but, instead of a yes or no, we had 7 years of delay.

Well, that oil is going to come out of the ground. It is going to be shipped to a port in Canada. It is going to be shipped overseas to China. I promise you it is not going to reduce emissions. It is going to increase emissions because they are not going to process it in China as responsibly as we process it here.

What is the President asking of us? We are talking about how this is going to raise the cost of producing goods.

Again, just in Georgia, between 2005 and 2012—the last 7 years, Mr. Speaker—we have reduced carbon emissions in Georgia by 33 percent. The President's targets have Georgia needing another 44 percent in reductions by 2030—44 percent.

According to the Georgia Environmental Protection Division—again, these aren't the folks who are in charge of polluting the air; these are the folks who are in charge of protecting the air, our Georgia EPD, which is our equivalent of the EPA. They are tough on polluters; they are tough on folks who don't want to be good corporate citizens.

They say, "The CPP"—this is the President's proposal—"does not provide flexibility to Georgia. In fact, the CPP is inflexible and punitive to States that have taken early action."

I want you to think about that. If you were sitting around doing nothing; if you didn't come from two of the healthiest counties in the country, as I do, Mr. Speaker; if you weren't worried about protecting the planet, about our stewardship responsibilities to the Earth; if you weren't worried about any of those things, the President is going to set some targets for you.

Again, these are the unlawful, unwise, constitutional targets, but he is going to set some targets for you that you need to achieve. If you have been working, as we have in Georgia, to do the right thing ahead of time, he is still setting those targets for you, giving you no credit for the good things you have done in the past, asking you to do even more in the future.

It is not going to be economically feasible. Georgia, number six in the Nation, is being asked to do the most by the White House in this unwise, unlawful, unconstitutional rulemaking.

Let's talk about the dollars and cents that are required here. For the Nation, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about between \$360 billion and \$480 billion to implement the President's proposal—

again, the unlawful, unwise, unconstitutional proposal—but the President's proposal, \$360 billion to \$480 billion.

According to the economic projections, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be about a 12 or 13 percent increase in electricity prices across the country—a 12 or 13 percent increase in utility prices, electricity prices, across the country.

Now, in Georgia, that translates into about \$400 a year. We have a pretty mild climate in the great State of Georgia, but it is about \$400 a year per family. In my District, Mr. Speaker, it is about \$94 million a year.

You put all of my constituents together, all those folks who are the boss of the Seventh District of Georgia together, we are talking about almost \$100 million lost to implement the President's plan, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1330

Now, my question is, for what?

My folks are responsible folks, Mr. Speaker. They are dedicated to their stewardship responsibilities. They are dedicated to doing the right thing for the right reasons.

We are not a district where we try to figure out who is to blame. We are a district where we try to figure out how to fix it. How do you fix it?

But the current worldwide carbon emissions—again, this isn't about clean air. This is about carbon dioxide in the air. Carbon dioxide is in the air. It is a natural part of the air. It is a required part of the air.

Carbon dioxide emissions across the country, Mr. Speaker, across the world, rather, if we talk about developed nations, we generally talk about the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD.

Carbon emissions of those developed nations, Mr. Speaker, are projected to be relatively flat for the two-generational future. Two generations from now, still flat. You are not seeing those increase.

You look at non-OECD nations, Mr. Speaker, those emissions are projected to double, and then triple.

From 1990, when we passed the Clean Air Act, you see level emissions coming from both OECD and non-OECD nations. About 2000, Mr. Speaker, you begin to see those lines diverge, and there is no expectation that non-OECD nations are going to change their carbon dioxide emissions.

There is a funny thing about the Earth, Mr. Speaker: we are all in this together. I don't know if you have reflected on that. There is no escaping this big ball of rock that we are all floating through space on. We are in this together. We will succeed or we will fail together.

For the price tag of \$400 per American family, for the price tag of \$100 million a year, just in my one congressional district, Mr. Speaker, for the price tag of more than \$400 billion a year—that is about 10 percent of everything we spend in this country, about

10 percent of the Federal budget—is the cost of implementing the President's unwise and unlawful regulation.

And what we get for that, Mr. Speaker, what we get for that investment of American treasure, what we get for disadvantaging American businesses relative to foreign businesses, what we get for raising the costs of American products so that other products around the globe can be cheaper, what we get for that—golly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you can even see it—is this little bitty red line in terms of carbon reductions.

What I have charted here, Mr. Speaker, are metric tons of carbon being produced, carbon dioxide being produced around the globe. This is the entire globe here.

I have 1990, I have 2010, I have 2020, I have 2030.

The benefit of disadvantaging American workers, the benefit of disadvantaging American manufacturers, the benefit of raising prices for every single American family is that the amount of carbon produced on the entire planet will drop the distance of this little bitty red line.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can see it. Now that is 2020. 2030, perhaps the line gets visible enough to see. It is virtually nothing. Virtually nothing.

The President talks about this unwise, unlawful, unconstitutional proposal as if it is designed to save the world. It is not. It is not designed to save the world. It is not designed to reduce carbon emissions around the globe. It is designed to put coal out of business in America.

We are the Saudi Arabia of coal, Mr. Speaker. We have coal. We have clean coal. We have coal.

Now, if we pulled up the charts of the Energy Information Administration, they are not going to tell you that coal production in America is going to go to zero. It is not. It is falling off dramatically. We are putting coal mining families out of business in record numbers.

If you go into coal mining country, Mr. Speaker, it used to be all Democrats, all the time. You know, there is not one Member of this Chamber from the Democratic Party that represents coal country today because coal miners threw every one of them out, not because they, as individuals, were bad Members, Mr. Speaker, but because the President was driving those individual families out of business.

Those families said, We are doing honorable work. We are doing lawful work. We work hard for a living, and we are providing a national service.

They are absolutely right.

\$500 billion annually in American treasure for virtually no reduction in carbon around the globe.

Now, if we were actually going to talk about clean air, Mr. Speaker, and I wish we would. I wish we would get out of the business of picking winners and losers and talk about clean air. I wish we would get out of the business of having an ax to grind about energy

producers and get to talking about clean air.

If we were going to talk about clean air we would talk about things like NO_x and SO_x. That is nitrogen oxide, sulfur oxide, Mr. Speaker, NO_x and SO_x.

We passed the Clean Air Act of 1990—and I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, that was a Republican President and a Democratic Congress—that bipartisan legislation where the President just didn't decide what he wanted to do; he came to Congress and worked with Congress to craft the law. It went after what at that time was so frequently referred to as acid rain, Mr. Speaker.

You would get this nitrogen oxide, this sulfur oxide in the air. It would come out of the air when it rained. It had an impact around the country. NO_x and SO_x we went after in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

The dark green line represents the sulfur, the yellow line represents the nitrogen. 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2011, and 2012.

We came together as a nation, Mr. Speaker. We targeted these pollutants in the air, and we changed the way we produced power in this country. We didn't abolish coal; we made it cleaner coal. We didn't abolish electric power coming from these big power plants; we changed the way the scrubbers and the smokestacks worked, and we positively impacted air quality in this country.

We didn't pass the Clean Air Act of 1990 because we had an ax to grind; we passed the Clean Air Act of 1990 because we had a problem to solve. And as you can see by this chart, we solved it. We didn't just spend money to feel better about it; we solved it. We weren't just trying to pick winners and losers; we were trying to solve a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the Associated Press. They are talking about coal in this country, talking about the President's rule, talking about carbon production. They say this—they say it is leaving this Nation's shores, but not the planet. The fossil fuel trade which has soared under President Obama soared because we have had record exploration going on on private land.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President has completely eliminated exploration on public lands. Those permits are not going out the door. Private exploration has soared under President Obama's administration.

They said this fossil fuel trade threatens to undermine his strategy, the President's strategy to reduce the gases blamed for global warming.

It also reveals a little-discussed side effect of countries acting alone on a global issues. As the U.S. tries to set a global example by reducing demand for fossil fuels at home, American energy companies are sending more dirty fuel than ever to other parts of the world, exports worth billions of dollars each year.

Let me go back, Mr. Speaker. When we were working together, when we

were working together in Congress, working together with the administration, we changed the way we produced energy. We changed the way we burned this coal to drastically reduce the pollutants coming from that coal.

In a classic example of Federal overreach, Mr. Speaker, again, acting alone, unlawful, unwise, and unconstitutional, the President has said, I want to do more. And in doing more, according to the AP, which is no conservative defender, in doing more, what the President is doing is telling these energy companies, Don't try to do better; don't try to be cleaner. We are going to put you out of business in America, so bring these products out of the ground and ship them overseas.

Mr. Speaker, where do you think our overseas competitors rank in terms of reducing these pollutants? Where do you think? Where do you think India ranks? Where do you think China ranks? Where do you think these nations competing with American workers rank?

Do you think they are producing it as cleanly as we were in 2012? Maybe you think they are a little worse like they were in 2000. Maybe you think they are as bad as when we started way back in 1990.

Nonsense. They are way back here off the chart altogether.

If you believe in a stewardship responsibility to the planet, if you believe we have a multigenerational obligation to care for our environment, then you know that only nations with a robust economy have a robust environmental protection program.

You think about that, Mr. Speaker. You will not find a single nation living in poverty that has advanced environmental protections. You can't afford to care about the environment if you can't keep the lights on. You can't afford to care about the environment if you can't feed your families.

We do both in this country, Mr. Speaker. In the name of protecting the environment, the President is forcing these natural resources overseas, which has the combined negative effect of polluting the planet to a greater degree and making American workers competitive to a lesser degree.

You are shipping cheap energy overseas, which makes that manufacturing more productive. You are raising energy prices in America, which makes our manufacturing less productive.

Mr. Speaker, I am all about making a difference. I am all about solving a problem.

The President wants to spend half a trillion dollars, more than 10 percent of what we spend in this country every year, focused solely, solely, solely, on reducing carbon emissions by the size of this line that you can't even see.

And the people who are going to pay the price for that, literally, the price, are going to be American citizens with higher energy bills and American workers with fewer job opportunities.

We have two models that we can choose from, Mr. Speaker. We can

choose from the model that we used in the Clean Air Act of 1990, where we came together in a bipartisan way, and we solved a problem together. We identified the problem, we solved the problem, and we have measurable results.

Or we can go it alone—and by alone, I don't mean America going it alone. I mean the administration and the EPA going it alone—unlawful, unwise, unconstitutional, spend a half a trillion dollars more than the size of our budget deficit this year, making us less competitive, trapping more American families in poverty, to achieve absolutely no result at all.

Mr. Speaker, I will end where I began, an obscure section, section 11(d), 292 words that were never intended to allow the President to do what the President is doing; where the President's own constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe, says the President's desires cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this 130-page proposal; this 130-page proposal which promises to do virtually nothing to change global emissions but promises to disadvantage the American economy in a global economy.

Mr. Speaker, we can solve our energy challenges. We can find energy independence in this country, energy security in this country. We can solve our environmental stewardship responsibilities. We are doing things cleaner and better today than we ever have, and we will continue to do so.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, the value of divided government, as it is today; the value of folks who hold different ideas, as we do today. Two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, Mr. Speaker: the President and the Democratic Party on one end, and Republicans and Congress on the other. The value of that divided government is that it allows us to do the big things, the big and necessary things. If it is all Republicans or all Democrats, folks just tend to try to jam their own ideas through, whether America likes it or not. That is not the way to build a stronger nation. Divided government requires—not just allows, but requires—that we come together to solve problems. Every time the President goes it alone, every time Congress goes it alone, we miss an opportunity to come together and solve a problem.

To justify the clean power plan, the President's power plan, the EPA has brazenly rewritten the history of an obscure section of the 1970 Clean Air Act. Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal.

We have an opportunity to do better, Mr. Speaker; and more importantly, we have the ability, with the men and women in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker—the men and women who serve this entire institution, this entire Nation, good men and women on both sides of the aisle who care about American

workers and who care about the American economy and who care about not just America's environment, but the global environment—we can come together, and we can do better. But this proposal by the President is not it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will help me to encourage all of our colleagues to reject this proposal, to rein in this overreach, and then to work together to do those things that matter to our constituents—our bosses back home.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HUIZENGA, Michigan, Chairman

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE TONY CÁRDENAS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Gabriela Marquez, District Director, the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS, Member of Congress:

TONY CÁRDENAS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a grand jury subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

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

Sincerely,

GABRIELA MARQUEZ,
District Director for the
Hon. Tony Cardenas.

GOVERNMENT IS NOT GOD

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Georgia, ROB WOODALL, so much. What clarity.

We lost a good man when John Linder didn't run again, and we gained a good man when ROB WOODALL ran for that seat. So it is a good day.

Well, there is a matter of concern. Let me just say this:

We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that

all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

Now, there are some people these days that say it is not appropriate to mention God, that that has no place in government. Yet the very God that I speak of and those very words that I spoke are not from me; they are from 152 years ago.

Abraham Lincoln didn't just say those words. He made that his Presidential proclamation. On March 30, 1863, he called for the Nation to have a national day—and these are his words—of “humiliation, fasting, and prayer.” So he made that official proclamation.

Sometimes my office starts getting calls if I mention the three-letter word that some find to be such a heinous word to use on the House floor, even though it was one of the most used and most called-upon names, certainly, in our Congress for the first 150, 175 years or so. The Bible was the most quoted book for most of our history.

So the problem is those people that will call and email irate about a Member of the United States Congress saying we have forgotten God.

We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own.

That was Abraham Lincoln who said those words. And he didn't just say them; it was an official proclamation of the United States of America. So at this day and time it is more popular to issue executive orders, as if one person in our government were God, but Abraham Lincoln knew better.

Two years later, he was assassinated. He could have done so much to bring this country together after the worst war the country had ever faced, yet his life was cut short 150 years ago.

He was an extraordinary man. It was an extraordinary time. But he tells us with his written word that we have forgotten God.

He said: We are too proud to pray to the God that made us. Some find that offensive. Some think the government should be god; that the government should tell people: You can see this doctor, but you can't see this doctor. This doctor may be able to heal you, but you can't see this doctor. Why? Because we are the government, and we are the new god. Seniors, look, we know you had plans for health care to last longer, but, sorry, you don't get as good health care as you did 5 years ago.

In my own family, my dad is not going to get the same health care that my mother did, which kept her alive 15 more years after her tumor was discov-

ered. As Dad told me last week: I am not going to be able to have the health care your mother got because of Medicare and all these cuts. I can't even have the option to do what we did for your mother.

Well, that is what happens when the government becomes god. Unfortunately, if we were going to have the government become the god of the United States, it would be nice if the government were a little more truthful, a little more honest, a little more just.

One of the major problems that has been revealed recently is the fact that the Department of Homeland Security has lied to a United States district judge in Texas. He was told that because he was going to issue an injunction, and was issuing an injunction, that there would be no 3-year amnesty provided that the President spoke into being, and after he spoke into being the new law overriding with his very oral words, the laws that were passed by the House and Senate, signed into law by other Presidents, disregard those.

Then the Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson wrote memos—memos—overriding laws that were worked on in subcommittee, committee, brought to the floor of the House, debated, fussed over, eventually voted on, and approved in the House; debated, fussed over, eventually passed in the Senate, signed into law by another President. We disregard that, because the government is god now. We don't need to pray to anybody except Washington these days.

Well, some of us believe the government is not god. Nobody wants a dishonest god. And we have had too much of that from Washington.

So with recent revelations about the Department of Homeland Security and its failures, many Americans have become gravely concerned that their actions and performance are causing additional misrepresentations, and that is why it was critically important that we have a thorough investigation of the Department of Homeland Security.

I know there were misrepresentations by the prior Director of Homeland Security before our committee. I talked about those previously.

But the American people deserve to be protected by their government—not spied on, not lied to, not pay to have the Department of Homeland Security ignore the law. So there were 22 of us that just signed a letter going to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Some pronounce it “comptroller” because that is how it is spelled. As my late English teacher mother told me many years ago, that may be the way it is spelled. If you look in the dictionary, which I was forced to do, then you will see that the number one pronunciation is “controller,” but because of usage—I don't know. I haven't looked recently. Maybe number one now is “comptroller,” but it didn't used to be.

To the Comptroller General Dodaro, here is the letter that 22 of us sent yesterday: “As you know, on November 20, 2014, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, issued a series of memoranda affecting federal immigration law. Included in the new DHS policy directives was an order to extend and expand the existing Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, as well as an order to establish a new program that provides work authorization permits to an estimated five million undocumented immigrants residing in the United States. This new program was termed, ‘Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents,’ or DAPA.

“U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services is the federal agency that adjudicates applications for immigration benefits. This agency's website claims a workforce of 19,000 people operating throughout 223 offices worldwide with an annual operating budget of \$4 billion. This agency is very unique from many other agencies. According to its own FY16 USCIS Budget Request, 96.8% of the agency's annual operating budget comes from fees collected from applicants for most types of immigration benefits, from petitions to sponsor relatives or employees, to replacement green cards, to naturalization applications. These fee-based revenues appear to be considered ‘permanently appropriated’ mandatory funds compared to annual discretionary appropriations which apply to federal agencies. As a result, this permanently appropriated mandatory spending allotment for USCIS falls outside the annual appropriations process.

□ 1400

“While Congress determines the categories of aliens that are to be admitted into the United States, it does not always set the fees USCIS charges or constructively control how USCIS allocates its resources. This fee-generated portion of its annual budget, translating to \$3.874 billion in FY16, appears to be completely fungible. That is, this money, raised for one purpose can perhaps be used for other purposes. This arrangement creates the potential for USCIS to, in effect, create slush funds and skim off congressionally authorized fees imposed on legal immigrants and their sponsors in order to fund programs that may not be specifically authorized by Congress. Mr. Joseph Moore, the Chief Financial Officer of USCIS, testified in a Senate hearing on March 3, 2015, that the agency determines the fees it charges based on a practice known as activity-based costing. Thus, transaction fees are proportional to the amount of time and resources to fulfill that transaction. However, records indicate that USCIS has a carry-over balance from excess revenues at the end of FY14 of approximately \$1.27 billion. Mr. Moore claimed that he seeks to maintain a rolling reserve balance of about \$600 million to cover unexpected costs and surge activity. He further stated that funds from

this account helped USCIS handle early spending in response to the executive actions. Eventually, new fees paid by illegal immigrant applicants are intended to replenish that account, plus cover all the new costs. What is not clear is why or how this agency has built up reserves of more than twice the amount it says it aims to keep for contingency requirements. This draws scrutiny as to how long this practice has occurred, for what reasons, what can or cannot be done with that money and, ultimately, how Congress can effectively conduct oversight.

“Experts refer to this arrangement where an agency can skim off, or ‘tax,’ certain types of applications in order to fund others as ‘cross-subsidization.’ Currently, fees from legal immigrants and their sponsors subsidize refugee and asylum applications, military naturalizations, the anti-fraud division, and other activities—with ‘other activities’ being very broadly defined.”

So we go on and ask for the Comptroller General to audit the Department of Homeland Security because we haven’t gotten truthful answers, and we haven’t gotten complete answers.

It appears we have a shadow government in existence that can go across the river and lease or purchase, spend tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars—we don’t know—without any accountability to anybody.

It moves toward being like a Kafka novel of just a completely unaccountable mammoth government that no individual can ever take on. That was never the intention of the Founders, nor those who have given their lives throughout the history of this, the greatest country in the history of the world.

We are calling for an audit. We are asking the GAO to audit USCIS and find out critically needed answers. Homeland security agencies continue to be hindered by leadership that breaks the law and ignores the Constitution while using highly suspect spending practices. It has got to stop, and we have to know exactly what they are doing so that we can get them back with acting within the constitutional requisites.

The Department of Homeland Security has been so obsessed, as directed by the President, with having open borders and bringing in illegal immigrants. As one border patrolman told me: We, in homeland security, are called logistics by the drug cartels, the gangs, all those people that bring in illegal aliens into the United States.

Like the commercial that is widely seen on television, the logistics they are referring to are the fact that they can bring people into the United States illegally, the drug cartels and the gangs, for a huge, whopping fee.

Once they get them in to the United States, they can count on Homeland Security to spend this money that many trying to do things the right way, the legal way, are paying to have

their immigration, their visa application, expedited.

We don’t know where those expedited fees are going, but their visas, their applications are not really being expedited, so it would appear probably the Homeland Security Department is taking fees that are being paid for one thing by people wanting to do things the right way, the legal way, the constitutional way, and Homeland Security is subverting the law and the Constitution and spending it on people who keep coming in, pouring in naturally, illegally, because they are taken care of.

Homeland Security will ship them around the country. All you have to do is come in, we will give you a hearing date some years in the future, ship you off, and don’t worry about showing up for your hearings.

How long can a country last doing these kinds of absurd governmental actions? It is insane. The book that will be written about the rise and fall of the United States will be very easy to write. These things are not new.

They are very predictable that, when a country starts ignoring the law, then it becomes lawless, and it is not long before the people take up that position and the country becomes a terrible place to live.

This country became the greatest country in the history of the world—more freedoms, more personal assets. Now, we see that being frittered away by a government that is being allowed to do so, and at the same time, the head of the government still may have around 50 percent approval rating.

It is, once again, making very clear the old adage is true: democracy ensures a people are governed no better than they deserve.

America, as at least 50 percent sits on their hands, they are okay with total disregard of the Constitution. One survey found there were more, I believe, college students that could name the Three Stooges but could not name the three branches of government, and they are eligible to vote.

Well, if that is the way you educate the generations coming up to vote, then you will, once again, get the government you deserve.

Well, because the Department of Homeland Security has been taking funds paid by people trying to do things legally, do them the right way, and subverting them for uses for those who are wanting to act illegally or have acted illegally. They haven’t been able to pay enough attention to securing our homeland, which was originally their charter.

I didn’t think we needed a Department of Homeland Security. I thought it was another huge bureaucracy that was created before I got to Congress in the name of, Gee, let’s help all these agencies work together. Well, it hasn’t done that. It has just added another level of bureaucracy.

We get this report. This is from The Washington Times, dated Tuesday, April 14, that:

“The Islamic State terror group is operating a camp in the northern Mexican state of Chihuahua, just eight miles from the U.S. border, Judicial Watch reported Tuesday.

“Citing sources that include a ‘Mexican Army field grade officer and a Mexican Federal Police Inspector,’ the conservative watchdog group reported that the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, is organizing only a few miles from El Paso, Texas, in the Anapra neighborhood of Juarez and in Puerto Palomas.

“Judicial Watch sources said ‘coyotes’ working for the notorious Juarez Cartel are smuggling Islamic State terrorists across the U.S. border between the New Mexico cities of Santa Teresa and Sunland Park, as well as ‘through the porous border between Acala and Fort Hancock, Texas.’

“These specific areas were targeted for exploitation by ISIS because of their understaffed municipal and county police forces, and the relative safe-havens the areas provide for the unchecked large-scale drug smuggling that was already ongoing,’ Judicial Watch reported.

“Mexican intelligence sources say the Islamic State intends to exploit the railways and airport facilities in the vicinity of Santa Teresa, New Mexico.

“The sources also say that ISIS has ‘spotters’ located in the East Potrillo Mountains of New Mexico (largely managed by the Bureau of Land Management)’—I would submit mismanaged—“to assist with terrorist border crossing operations,’ Judicial Watch reported. ‘ISIS is conducting reconnaissance of regional universities; the White Sands Missile Range; government facilities in Alamogordo, NM; Ft. Bliss; and the electrical power facilities near Anapra and Chaparral, NM.’”

There were some reports then that: Oh, Judicial Watch had it wrong. There is really nobody from ISIS in Mexico. There is no threat. Then this report came out today from our friends at Judicial Watch, April 16, 2015:

“Responding to Judicial Watch’s report earlier this week of ISIS activity along the Mexican border, Federal Bureau of Investigation supervisors called a ‘special’ meeting at the U.S. Consulate in Ciudad Juarez.

“A high-level intelligence source, who must remain anonymous for safety reasons”—let me insert parenthetically, what that means is, if you don’t get that—and I sure do because I have people tell me about problems in the executive branch and Homeland Security, Justice, and Intelligence.

What we find is this administration has prosecuted more people they called whistleblowers than every administration put together in the history of the country. What I know is if you have information that exposes corruption or illegal or improper action by leaders in this administration, they are coming after you and calling you a whistleblower, and they will convene a grand jury, as they have done, and one is

right now in Atlanta going on. They are coming after you if you can expose impropriety in this government, so that is why this says what it does in the article.

“The meeting was convened specifically to address a press strategy to deny Judicial Watch’s accurate reporting and identify who is providing information to JW. FBI supervisory personnel met with Mexican Army officers and Mexican Federal Police officials, according to JW’s intelligence source. The FBI liaison officers regularly assigned to Mexico were not present at the meeting and conspicuously absent were representatives from the Department of Homeland Security. It is not clear why DHS did not participate.”

Again, parenthetically to the article, since I have known of the sector of Homeland Security not being truthful in testifying before our Judiciary Committee, then if I were the FBI and I were trying to get to the bottom of something, the last people I would tell are people at Homeland Security at the top, I trust the ones I know at the bottom, but not the ones at the top.

So perhaps the head of the FBI is realizing we have such big problems in Homeland Security.

□ 1415

For example, when I complained to Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano, You have given a secret security clearance to a person who was a featured speaker about the Ayatollah Khomeini being the man of vision for the 20th century, a man that thinks the Holy Land Foundation, convicted of over 100 counts of supporting terrorism, was improperly prosecuted, who ended up tweeting last August that the caliphate was going to happen, so you might as well get used to it.

Well, I wouldn’t trust them either. The FBI apparently doesn’t. Publicly, U.S. and Mexico have denied that Islamic terrorists are operating in the southern border region, but the rapid deployment of FBI brass in the aftermath of Judicial Watch’s report seems to indicate otherwise.

A Mexican Army field grade officer and a Mexican Federal police inspector were among the sources that confirmed to Judicial Watch that ISIS is operating a camp just a few miles from El Paso, Texas. The base is around 8 miles from the United States border in an area known as Anapra, situated just west of Ciudad Juarez, in the Mexican State of Chihuahua.

Another ISIS cell to the west of Ciudad Juarez, in Puerto Palomas, targets the New Mexico towns of Columbus and Deming for easy access to the United States, the same knowledgeable sources confirm.

During the course of a joint operation last week, Mexican Army and Federal law enforcement officials discovered documents in Arabic and Urdu, as well as plans of Fort Bliss, the sprawling military installation that houses the U.S. Army’s 1st Armored Division. Muslim prayer rugs were recovered with the documents during the operation.

The administration can deny and they can say, Oh, this is these crazy

people in Congress or Judicial Watch, when the truth is that the more time that goes on, the more we are proved right on everything Judicial Watch has been claiming, the things that we have been asserting, the things that we have been saying we have to wake up about because this is a time of danger.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the original point, this is the danger that arises when government begins to think of itself as God and infallible, and it is time for those who think that to fall, it is time for the people to wake up and demand better because, the minute a majority of American people demand better government, they will get it.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 17, 2015, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2012 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities — Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs, pursuant to Sec. 680(c) of the Community Services Block Grant Act of 1981, Pub. L. 97-35, as amended by the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the first report to Congress on the National Agriculture and Food Defense Strategy, as mandated in the Food and Drug Administration’s Food Safety Modernization Act of 2011, Pub. L. 111-353; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1158. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Pakistan, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-05; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1159. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of proposed lease of communications equipment to the Government of Honduras, pursuant to Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 01-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1160. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of proposed lease of communications equipment to the Government of Colombia, pursuant to Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 02-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1161. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1162. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency’s FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1163. A letter from the Associate Commissioner/Equal Employment Opportunity Director, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission’s FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1164. A letter from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission’s FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1165. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Tripoli (HLLL) Flight Information Region (FIR); Extension of Expiration Date [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0246; Amdt. No.: 91-321B] (RIN: 2120-AK70) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1166. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Coaldale, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0871; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AWP-8] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1167. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31004; Amdt. No.: 3631] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1168. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31005; Amdt. No.: 3632] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1169. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31006; Amdt. No.: 3633] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1170. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31007; Amdt. No.: 3634] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1171. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0229; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-186-AD; Amendment 39-18123; AD 2015-06-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1172. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0619; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-18124; AD 2015-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1173. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1032; Directorate Identifier 2012- NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-18122; AD 2015-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1174. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reimbursement for Caskets and Urns for Burial of Unclaimed Remains in a National Cemetery (RIN: 2900-AO99) received April 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1175. A letter from the Chairman, National Health Care Workforce Commission, transmitting a letter describing the status of the National Health Care Workforce Commission; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

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. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1830. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law; 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. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1831. A bill to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 1832. A bill to provide for the permanent funding of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include guidance on how dependent students with parents without SSNs may obtain Federal student assistance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 1834. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain E-2 nonimmigrant investors to adjust status to lawful permanent resident status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1835. A bill to establish an employee stock ownership plan for air traffic control personnel; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ISSA (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1836. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with State and local governments to provide for the continued operation of public land, open air monuments and memorials, units of the National

Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System during a lapse in appropriations, 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. ISSA (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to enhance the security and efficiency of nationwide mail and parcel delivery; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1838. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, to designate additional components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1839. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1840. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 as soon as practicable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, known as the Volcker Rule, to exclude certain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations from the prohibition against acquiring or retaining an ownership interest in a hedge fund or private equity fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FARR, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income payments under the Indian Health Service Loan Repayment Program and certain amounts received under the Indian Health Professions Scholarships Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1843. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to improve access to supportive services and community coordination for families of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on

the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VELA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1845. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 1846. A bill to provide for sustainable highway funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Rules, 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. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1848. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes; 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. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1850. A bill to protect Federal employees and visitors, improve the security of Federal facilities, authorize and modernize the Federal Protective Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to apply certain annuity benefits to Federal Protective Service law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for increasing research activities, to increase such credit for amounts paid or incurred for qualified research occurring in the United States, and to increase the domestic production activities deduction for the manufacture of property substantially all of the research and development of which occurred in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1853. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 1854. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HANNA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1856. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the National Labor Relations Act to protect the health benefits of retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1857. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Major Dominic S. Gentile of the United States Army Air Forces for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1858. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1860. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to publish information on the provision of health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1861. A bill to stop motorcycle check-point funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 1862. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct outreach to veterans regarding the effect of delayed payments of claims for emergency medical care furnished by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical providers by the Chief Business Office and to direct the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report regarding such delayed payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1863. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to expand the Veterans Choice Program to veterans who would otherwise receive medical care from a deficient medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 1864. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to designate a single senior official of the Department of Defense to procure wideband satellite communications necessary to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 1865. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1866. A bill to establish a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to fund the establishment of centers of excellence to support research, development and planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective programs in financial literacy education for young people and families ages 8 through 24 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 1867. A bill to encourage benchmarking and disclosure of energy information for commercial buildings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to follow certain procedures in placing a child who has been removed from the custody of his or her parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES,

Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 1869. A bill to provide for transparency and reporting related to direct and indirect costs incurred by the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration related to compliance with any Federal environmental laws impacting the conservation of fish and wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1870. A bill to authorize Energy Innovation Hubs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1871. A bill to authorize a nuclear physics program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1872. A bill to authorize Energy Frontier Research Centers; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 1873. A bill to eliminate the use of the frank for mail transmitted by Members of Congress and Congressional officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school library media specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1875. A bill to extend the Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund and to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept certain documents as proof of service in determining the eligibility of a person to receive amounts from such Fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1876. A bill to recognize a primary measure of national unemployment for purposes of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1878. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1879. A bill to allow homeowners facing foreclosure to avoid deficiency judg-

ments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 1880. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1881. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to secure the rights of visual artists to copyright, to provide for resale royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1883. A bill to improve the process by which the Librarian of Congress considers requests for exemptions to section 1201(a)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, and to ease restrictions on the use of certain statutory exemptions to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1884. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to cap rural post office closures at no more than 5 percent of total closures in any given year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal the funding mechanism for the transitional reinsurance program in the individual market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1888. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on

geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LAN-GEVIN):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FARR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network's (GLSEN) National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. TORRES:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BERA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DENT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES,

Mr. NOLAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. FATTAH):

H. Res. 207. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding establishing a National Strategic Agenda; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and the Budget, 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. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals should be protected from discrimination under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Res. 209. A resolution deploring the actions of the Palestinian Authority to join the International Criminal Court and under-

take legal action through the Court against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced A bill (H.R. 1889) for the relief of Roberto Luis Dunoyer Mejia, Consuelo Cardona Molina, Camilo Dunoyer Cardona, and Pablo Dunoyer Cardona; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. TIPTON:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4 Section 3 Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Section 8 U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 1839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution: “The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common

Defence, and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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. CRAWFORD:
H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .".

By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 1850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 1851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:
H.R. 1852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, "to promote the general welfare."

By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 1853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:
H.R. 1854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 1855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:
H.R. 1856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:
H.R. 1857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16.
By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. II, Sec. 3, Cl. 3 ("[The President] shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed[.]"); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 ("Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.") (This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authority per the Necessary and Proper Clause provided the Attorney General's duties, as an agent of the President, to enforce federal law and punish criminal wrongdoing).

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 1859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:
H.R. 1860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 1861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:
H.R. 1862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:
H.R. 1863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:
H.R. 1864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 enumerates to Congress the power 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".

By Mrs. CAPPS:
H.R. 1865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 1866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:
H.R. 1867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 1868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8
By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3. (Commerce Clause) The Commerce Clause give Congress the power to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States." If the matter in question is not purely a local matter or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, then it falls within Congress' powers. National Federal of Independent Business v. Sebilius. (2012).

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 1870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 1871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WOODALL:
H.R. 1873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 7, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:
H.R. 1875.

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, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 1876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18
"The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:
H.R. 1877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:
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.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H.R. 1878.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1879.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1880.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), cl. 8 (copyright clause), and cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause).

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1885.

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 establish Post Offices and post Roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 1886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 8 and 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which provides Congress the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 24: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 91: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 126: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 131: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 200: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 213: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 224: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 232: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 251: Mr. NORTON, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 282: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 292: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 306: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 343: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 348: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 353: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 366: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 372: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 379: Mr. DENT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 413: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 463: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 501: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 539: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 540: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 564: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 586: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 592: Mr. DENT, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 595: Mr. NUNES, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 605: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 612: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 665: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 703: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 704: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 707: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 767: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 789: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 793: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 815: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 831: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 832: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 836: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 837: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 865: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 868: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 879: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 927: Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 928: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 970: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 986: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. KLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 1042: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1073: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1142: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1145: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1151: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1171: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1178: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1187: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1193: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1202: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1211: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1212: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1218: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1220: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1256: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1286: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1287: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1288: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1300: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1306: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1308: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1378: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1389: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1434: Mr. WELCH, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1436: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1437: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1438: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1441: Mr. HIGGINS and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1454: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1462: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1464: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1476: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1516: Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HANNA, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1519: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1534: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1541: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1552: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1559: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1568: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1574: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1578: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1590: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1598: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1605: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1610: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1612: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1618: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1624: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LONG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

- H.R. 1635: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1642: Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 1653: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1660: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1661: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1664: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 1667: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1669: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1671: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. AMASH.
 H.R. 1674: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 1676: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1680: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1684: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
- H.R. 1690: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 1714: Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 1717: Mr. DOLD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 1737: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 1762: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 1782: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H.R. 1784: Mr. TURNER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1806: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
- H.R. 1807: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.J. Res. 42: Mr. YOHO.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 123: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 140: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H. Res. 182: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 194: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. MOOLENAAR.