

is functionally a tiny percent of our population, I think it is like 5 percent of the population, equals almost 50 percent of all the spending.

So the reason this chart is up here, we were trying to find an elegant way to try to say those of us who, like myself, I have fairly severe asthma, but folks with chronic conditions, diabetes, particularly if it is not managed, other things, that is actually 84 percent of all healthcare costs.

When we did the risk-sharing amendment for the ACA replacement bill, we were trying to fixate on that continuity of care. How do you finance that continuity of care for our brothers and sisters, particularly those who have those chronic conditions, to make sure that is continuity of care between themselves, their doctors, their healthcare institution, the insurer? I thought we did a fairly elegant job of drafting that and then putting real resources behind it.

But this is important to understand, the outlier of our brothers and sisters out there, those of us who have pre-existing conditions or who have chronic conditions, end up being the cost drivers in our healthcare.

So our ability to be creative, our ability to say: If you have one of those in your pocket, can this actually be part of your healthcare management? Are we going to accept the reality that someone with a chronic condition should be allowed to pick up their phone and use FaceTime to talk to their doctor?

□ 1930

Should a poor person be allowed to use their phone to consult their doctor? Should they be allowed to wear sensors and other things? There are some incredibly creative things rolling onto the market there to help our brothers and sisters with chronic illness. This body needs to be prepared to adopt them, because here is the punch line: whether it had been the ACA, whether it had been a replacement, had almost nothing actually to do with healthcare. It had to do with who pays. This was about the money: who pays, who gets the money.

Because remember, it was in 1986—31 years ago—a piece of legislation was passed basically saying you cannot deny someone medical services. You show up to the emergency room, you show up in the hospital, you are getting your medical services, and you can actually see this in the data. For the last 30 years, the number of procedures, particularly the stuff it costs, has been laid much the same.

So when you have people saying, “Oh, you are not going to be able to get healthcare,” we have been a society for 30-plus years that has sort of a guarantee of delivery of health services. The great battle is who pays.

Do you remember a few years ago when we had the great consternation of dispro share, uncompensated care. I worked on those issues. And now all of

these years later, we are basically trying to make an argument of who pays, how do we pay, how do we get more healthy—that is 20-, 30-, 40-year-olds who are healthy, how do we get more of them, particularly in the individual markets, to participate?

Then the second half is Medicaid. This is a strange city because it is one of those cities, when you actually look at the dollars, even though the dollars are going to continue to grow and grow, so many people define that as a cut. But remember, we were looking at the exploding deficit debt numbers. We have to deal with the reality. We are in real trouble, and we are going to have to step up and start being honest with each other about what is happening in the underlying math here.

So I know this is a little diversion from what was in the CBO report, but once again, you saw on the charts that the healthcare and healthcare entitlement numbers were substantially driving the deficits. Now you actually sort of see what is in the underlying part of that population.

We will go back to the beginning again. Hopefully, I haven't spoken for a whole hour, for your sake and mine. But one more time: this year, according to CBO, 3 weeks ago—and you have heard lots of talk about it, right? That was me being sarcastic—\$193 billion of borrowing this year. We are going to borrow almost \$1.9 billion every day, \$79 million every hour. I have been here an hour. Has this been worth \$79 million to you?

But think about it—and I know I misspoke earlier, so that is one of the reasons I wanted to put this board up. It is \$21,900, \$21,900 every second of borrowing.

I have a 21-month-old. It is the greatest gift the good Lord has ever given my wife and me.

I pray for the birth mother every night, saying, “Thank you.”

But if you look at the charts, when she hits her peak earning years, her tax rates are going to be double, maybe even more, of what I would pay today.

The economic growth is probably crushed by the amount of debt; and a lot of the calculations, if we step out 30 years, the computers can't even model them anymore. Because, understand, there are some amazing numbers in here that functionally, in 9 budget years, we are at 91 percent debt to GDP on publicly held debt. That is not the money we borrowed from the trust funds.

So the question I ask—I love my little girl. How many of you love your kids? How many of you love your grandkids? How many of you love this country? How many of you want this country to have an amazing future, because it can. This is all fixable. Just every single day we wait, we make it so much more difficult.

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

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague, Congressman SCHWEIKERT from Arizona.

I hadn't intended to, but I will begin my remarks by addressing his remarks, and I will do something that I rarely do, and that is to quote a French historian, political scientist, and diplomat, Alexis de Tocqueville, who stated: “The American Republic will endure until the day that Congress discovers that it can bribe the public with the public's own money.”

The previous administration was led by an individual who, on the campaign trail, said that \$7 trillion in debt was unpatriotic. Now we sit at the precipice of \$20 trillion after two terms, and I would submit that perhaps that is unpatriotic multiplied by three, or nearly that, and echo the sentiments of Mr. SCHWEIKERT that it is absolutely, positively unsustainable.

Now, there are ways that we could certainly deal with runaway debt. One way would be to completely devalue the currency. If you really want to step away from the hyperbolic barbs that are thrown by my colleagues across the aisle as relate to the motives for the legislation that we carry and find out who would be really harming seniors and children, it would be those who would continue to spend until the only way to cover the tab was to deflate the value of the very moneys set aside to care for those least able to care for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCHWEIKERT not only for his wise remarks, but also for reminding me just how much I miss being a member of the statehouse in the Commonwealth of Virginia where there is actual back-and-forth debate on the merits of issues, wherein that small percentage of individuals who choose to inform themselves might shape their opinions based on a discourse rather than people standing at this microphone unchecked.

That leads me to my next point, which is also not on the subject that I originally intended to address, and that is the statement of my distinguished colleague from Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, who spoke on this floor about 45 minutes ago on a subject that is important not just to him and not just to me, but to America, and that is on the subject of asset forfeiture.

His comments were indicative of the tone that this body has devolved into. One of the many Democrats whom I admire, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, whom Vanity Fair described as a fervent Democrat who saw the value in working with Republicans—where is he today?—he once said: You are entitled to your own opinions, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

Mr. RASKIN said that the Trump administration was burdening Americans

by virtue of an asset forfeiture policy, and he cited the case of a Chinese restaurant, an entrepreneur who he said had amassed \$25,000 so that he could buy a building. But he was going over the speed limit so he was pulled over by police. So without cause, they took his money, and it took him 7 years, according to my colleague, to recoup his money and the opportunity was lost, and that is what is wrong with Mr. Trump's policy.

Wow. And he implored listeners to please look up this case, so I did.

In fact, there was a man who had saved money to purchase a Chinese restaurant who was going 10 miles an hour over the speed limit. He was pulled over by law enforcement, and he had not \$25,000, but \$75,000 forfeited. It took him not 7 years, but 10 months to get it back, and it happened in 2014. I am not terribly sure who was President then, but I don't think it was Donald Trump.

So I will join my colleague in suggesting that we need asset forfeiture review and reform in this country. But, please, you are entitled to your own opinions; you are not entitled to your own facts.

Now, why am I here tonight? Golly, Ned, why am I here at all? Who are we as a nation?

I tell my children, if you want to know what is the right thing to do in life when you are confronted with tough challenges, when you have a dilemma, ask yourself, "Who do I want to be?" Not "Who am I?" "Who do I want to be?"

Because I hope I never reach my aspirational goals, but I keep trying as long as I am here. I don't think if you reach all of your goals for who you want to be that you have aimed high enough. If you ask yourself, "Who do I want to be when I face that ethical or moral dilemma?" you will always then come up with the right answer when you answer what the person you want to be would do.

I grew up with a father who actually had a name for the belt that he wore around his waist. It was "The Enforcer." I had a mother who thought I could do anything I wanted to do and a father who would kick my tail if I didn't give it my best effort.

I spent nearly 10 years as a prosecutor, and I can't tell you how many times I looked down the dais at the criminal defendant and thought, "I wonder, but there for the grace of God go I"—but for the fact that I was blessed with amazing parents who encouraged me and loved me and disciplined me and told me the things I could do, unlike so many in political office today who garner votes and support by telling people what they can't do, what they need done for them.

By gosh, this country was built on a government dependent upon people, not a people dependent upon government. And that is who we are. Now, who are we going to be? Where are we going?

A wiser person than I once said, if you want to know where you are going, you should look where you have been. It is a relatively humbling thing to do representing the Fifth District of Virginia, because the Fifth District of Virginia was first represented in this institution by James Madison.

I tell people those are some very small, big shoes to fill—very small, big shoes to fill. James Madison won the congressional seat when he ran in an election against a pillar of American foreign policy named Monroe. They were so collegial during their campaign that they often traveled together.

When Madison was elected to Congress prior to the 17th Amendment, he went to the Virginia General Assembly—the longest serving democratically elected legislative body on the planet Earth—and suggested that James Monroe should be the Senator; and, indeed, he was made the Senator. So we have Madison. We have Monroe.

The drafter of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, lived in Virginia's Fifth District. The power of the Article III branch of government, the Supreme Court, John Marshall retired in Virginia's Fifth District. Patrick Henry retired in Virginia's Fifth District. Lee and Grant sat at a table at Appomattox Court House and ended the American Civil War in the Fifth District of Virginia, and a young woman named Barbara Johns stood up in the face of possible injury or death to start the Virginia civil rights movement in the Fifth District. So it is pretty humbling, but it gives me a good lesson in who we are.

So many on my side of the aisle criticized President Obama when he said: If you have a business, you didn't do that. Somebody else did that for you.

I will defend him. I will defend him. You did it with blood and sweat and tears and hard work and persistence and the willingness to stand up time and again after failing. You did it, but you did it because you stood on the shoulders of giants who gave you the opportunity to do it, those imperfect people: Thomas Jefferson, a slave owner, who gave us near-perfect documents; James Madison, documents that have been revised, oh, I don't know, 27 times in hundreds of years, that we constantly should strive to be a more perfect Union, that we will never achieve that status of a perfect Union so long as institutions on Earth are governed by mere mortal men, but that we have a duty in this Nation to try to continue to.

So that is why I am here. I am not here to perpetuate my own power. I understand that the most indispensable person is the person who recognizes that they are not indispensable.

Folks, drive past the graveyard and look at the headstones, because I can promise you, there are piles of folks buried there who thought the world just couldn't go on without them. And the band played on.

The Fifth District of Virginia was here before I got here. It will be here

after I leave. I am not here to perpetuate my own name or my own legacy or any sort of power. I am here to make sure that everything I do is pointed towards giving the posterity that will follow us—to my children, SCHWEIKERT's children, and your children—every bit as good, if not better, opportunities than those which we had.

I believe there are two fundamental entitlements to birth of Americanism.

□ 1945

First, you are entitled to an opportunity. We should always strive to make that opportunity more of an equal opportunity. But in a world where if your last name is Clinton, Trump, Obama, or Bush, you probably have a better chance of getting into Harvard. We are not there yet. But everyone is entitled to an opportunity. Everyone within the Jeffersonian construct of liberty that is "my freedom extends to the point where yours starts so long as you don't harm another," should be free to make decisions for yourself and has an entitlement to define success for themselves.

If you want to be the world's best beekeeper, go be the world's best beekeeper. If you want to be a great stay-at-home dad, by golly, be a great stay-at-home dad. If you would like to work to cure cancer, please do. If you want to be a Member of this body and try to perpetuate opportunity for our posterity, please do. If you want to be a Member of this body and try to perpetuate your own power or your own legacy, please don't.

So this brings me to the point where I stand here today. I have been here 6 months—not terribly long. Thank God I have been unable to shake my citizen world view in favor of a legislator world view. So as I walk into this Chamber and as I stand next to these women and men on both sides of the aisle, I am a little humbled. When I walk down the staircase on the edge of the original House Chamber that has been worn through time by the footfalls of the likes of Kennedy, Madison, Monroe, Eisenhower, and Lincoln, I am humbled.

But I would revert back to the words that Alexis de Tocqueville observed over 150 years ago, and that is we will thrive until we begin to attempt to bribe the taxpayers with their own money. At some point things become unsustainable. At some point we need to recognize that we are about freedom of individuals to venture and fail and venture and gain, that we are a nation whose government should depend upon people, not whose people should depend upon government.

An hour and a half ago I stood on this very floor, and I dropped at the Clerk's desk H. Res. 458. H. Res. 458 is a vehicle that would move to discharge past the normal process of procedures. H.R. 1436 is a bill that was voted for by every Republican Member of this body in 2015, which would provide for a repeal of the broken promises that are the Affordable Care Act.

Just yesterday, in conference, they showed us polling, and it showed that the American people trust the Republicans more on national defense, border security, jobs, and the economy, but we were kind of sketchy on healthcare. I can read a poll, but I came here to do what I think is right. I came here to do what I said I would do.

This plan that I think could reasonably be called the Managed Healthcare Bailout Program or the Health Insurance Industry Profit Enhancement Act has failed working Americans, and the paradigm under which we have debated it has failed to be an honest one. So if I am here not to enhance myself or my legacy, if I am here to do what I think is right or what I said I would do when I ran for office, then I need to stand up and do what I said I was going to do when I ran for office, and that was to ensure that the decisions of Americans were left to Americans, that we minimize the interference in individuals' lives by the government, and that we recognize—and I will paraphrase—that Mr. Jefferson was correct when he said that the fruits of the working class are safest when the legislature is not in session.

I believe it was Will Rogers who said: They say the only certain things in life are death and taxes, only death doesn't get worse every time Congress meets.

We hear about a CBO score that says X million people will lose coverage. The last time I looked, this thing was called the Affordable Care Act, not the Affordable Coverage Act. Even if it were called the Affordable Coverage Act, it would be a misnomer because it is not affordable.

A story published about 3 months ago indicated that two-thirds of Americans couldn't find \$1,000 in case of a financial crisis. But deductibles have gone from \$1,000 to 2,000, to 3,000, to 4,000, to \$5,000 for the average family of four.

I ask you: If your deductible is \$5,000 and you can't find \$1,000 in times of crisis, do you have healthcare?

You have coverage. You have coverage, but you don't have healthcare. You are still indigent, and it is a broken promise. But don't worry, there were lots more: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. It turns out that wasn't true. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It turns out that wasn't true. We should see an average decrease of about \$2,500 a year per policy. It turns out that wasn't true.

Don't worry, these insurers who supported the plan—remember the insurance industry endorsed the Affordable Care Act—they are doing this out of benevolence, folks.

I have an article from the New York Post that says there is a cost spiral associated with ObamaCare and with the insurance industry, but the cost spiral is upward. If you had bought \$100 worth of UnitedHealthcare the day the ACA passed and sold it, the last time I looked, you would have \$580. That is a heck of an investment. The only people

making out on this are the big insurers. Meanwhile, rank and file Americans are perpetually lied to by folks who say: Those guys don't care.

Actually, we do. We are just not trying to perpetuate our own power by taking from one group and giving to another while bankrupting our Nation and robbing our children blind.

So I have only been here for 6 months. I went to some people very early on and I said: How about discharging this bill? I am frustrated.

They said: Well, it is not time for that.

I said: Okay. I want to be a team player.

I am frustrated, and we get to this point. The President is frustrated. The Senate is frustrated. I don't give a hootin' heck about the President or the Senate or this body. I care about the American people whom I serve. They are frustrated. And nobody on the other side of the aisle will talk about a plan that the namesake of the plan, President Barack Obama, said has serious problems, that Minnesota Democratic Governor Mark Dayton said is bankrupting his State and is unsustainable, and that President Bill Clinton said is the craziest thing.

We have zero suggestions for help because, by gosh, we can score political points. Shame on both sides of the aisle if you are doing this to score political points.

We ought to be doing this to make sure that the fundamental birthright of Americanism, opportunity, is perpetuated for perpetuity and that it doesn't die in the hands of a group of the political class who say: Well, this will get me points at home. People told me not to do this. It might not help you. Your district is not that safe.

I don't rightly care. I am going to do the right thing. I have never had a job in my life that I wasn't willing to lose if it meant doing the right thing.

So what are the goals of this?

This is rather brash. They are humble. I want the leadership of this Chamber to understand that the rank and file Members support them, that we got their backs, that we thank them for their best efforts, and we don't want to quit this fight. We thank you for what you do. Let's keep going and keep that darn promise.

I got a feeling that if you keep your promise, if you are worried about elections, then your reward will come when people realize there is somebody in this town who has some integrity. So I want to support leadership. I want to send a message to the other Chamber that we are willing to act if they are willing to act, and maybe embolden them. I want to let the President know that we haven't quit on him. But, most importantly, I want to send a message to the American people that some people in D.C. mean what they say.

There have been dozens of votes for repeal by Members who knew that the repeal would never happen because it had to cross the desk of the person for

whom the bill was named. It was a theoretical abstract: Sure, I support it.

We are playing with live ammunition, folks. Let's see who meant what they said. Come to this desk—and if you are watching at home, contact your Member and tell him to come to this desk—and sign onto the discharge petition, H. Res. 458. Or maybe you didn't mean it or you did. Who knows? But let us know. Shoot straight with folks. Dozens of votes for repeal.

Let me be clear about this, too. I am not sitting here trying to pull the rug out from under people. The bill that would be discharged by this resolution would not immediately end ObamaCare. Instead, it would give us a 2-year window. And I will bet you that if we repealed and had a 2-year window to debate a replacement, that we might get some input from people on both sides of the aisle. I know to a metaphysical certainty that no side has the monopoly on good ideas. I would love to have some input. There will certainly be Members who say: I don't believe the Federal Government should have a large role. There will be other Members who say: We should have single payer.

Right now, we are stuck in a broken system because of political gamesmanship. It burned me when I was on the outside, and it burns me on the inside.

What are the facts? What are the real facts?

The average individual premium, according to eHealth, May 3, 2017, has gone up 39 percent in the last 2 years. The average family plan has gone up 49 percent. That means if you were an individual and your premium was \$1,000 a month, it is now \$1,330 roughly a month. I am doing math on the fly in my head. If you are a family and you were paying \$500 a month, then it is \$740-ish a month. That is in 2 years. The average individual plan is up 147 percent from 2008. The average family plan is up 177 percent.

Folks, Americans' income hasn't increased at that rate.

The average is up 25 percent in the last year, and that is according to the Department of Health and Human Services' report of October of 2016. That means if you were paying \$2,000 a year ago, you are paying \$2,500 now—25 percent in 1 year.

Candidly, all the disingenuous arguments on the other side about how many will die if we move to a system that allows individuals choices are not only hollow, disingenuous, and beneath the dignity of this body by virtue of their disingenuousness, but they are also false.

Folks, for the first time in nearly a generation, the mortality rate rose in 2015. U.S. life expectancy dropped from 2014 to 2015 for the first time since the 1990s. Ironically, it dropped more in States that expanded Medicaid. So I am not only disgusted with and sick of such harsh rhetoric, but I think it has now been proven demonstrably false.

We talk about who will be kicked off their plan. According to the CBO, 10

million people lost their employer plans. Those are the plans that, if they liked, they could keep. Roughly 15 million of the people who are now insured are insured by virtue of an individual mandate. That means that we have forcefully compelled American citizens to purchase a good or service at the risk of forfeiture of their money or their freedom.

We live in a country where you can choose in many places to buy marijuana. You can choose to bungee jump. You can choose to skydive. Heck, in some places, you can choose to visit a prostitute. But you can't choose a healthcare plan that doesn't carry coverage for mental health or for maternity. You can't do that. That is against the law.

This is about choice. I served in the United States Army as a fire support officer, and when I left the Army, I made the egregious error of attending law school—just kidding. When I did that, I chose not to have healthcare because as I looked at what I was able to do on the limited amount of money that my family had and did a cost-benefit analysis and the fact I was in relatively good shape and young, I determined that our family's best interests were served by not spending that money. It was a crazy, brazen risk that I think paid off, but it certainly should be within the purview of decisions that Americans are allowed to make, and right now it is not.

I am frustrated, but I am fighting. A lot of people are frustrated, but they are fighting. I want to see our leadership succeed. I want to see this Nation continue to be unequivocally the greatest experiment in freedom that the Earth has ever known. But if we continue to try to parlay largesse in failed programs into political power, we won't. We won't.

The time to measure things based not on intentions, but results is nigh. In Oregon, they spent hundreds of millions of dollars to create a website for the ObamaCare exchange that failed to enroll a single individual, and nobody was fired and nobody went to prison. I was a prosecutor for a long time, and I will tell you, if you waste or defraud people of 100, 200, \$300 million, you usually either lose your job or go to prison. But if you are in politics in Oregon, you are rewarded because, by gosh, you had great intentions.

Let's judge these things not by their intentions, but by their outcomes. Let's not argue about who has coverage, but about who has access to affordable care. Let's support revision that drives down premiums and deductibles, and let's trumpet our victories based on whom we actually help, not whom we intended to help.

□ 2000

I stand united with the bulk of my colleagues. I know there are some who might have said one thing and now do another. This is an avenue by which we might find out who they are.

I don't, for a moment, question the individual motives of Members. I think they have an opportunity to distinguish themselves by virtue of signing onto this resolution.

I ask you again, if you are watching at home, to contact your Member if you agree with what I said and ask them if they will come to this bar when we are in session and sign their name to H. Res. 458 and demonstrate that they are willing to do the exact same thing now, when it counts, that they did dozens and dozens of times under the previous administration when they knew that their actions would be met with a veto pen.

I don't do this to score political points, I don't do this to make my name bigger, and I don't do this because it feels good. I do this because we owe it to the giants whose shoulders we stand upon—Patrick Henry; Thomas Jefferson; Martin Luther King, Jr.; Abraham Lincoln; Barbara Johns; John F. Kennedy; and Ronald Reagan—the people who gave us the opportunity to be as successful and great as we are. Don't piddle it away. Be responsible. Be willing to say no when no is the appropriate answer, and do what is right.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 20, 2017, at 9 a.m.

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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the definitions relating to HUBZones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 3295. A bill to require the President, the Vice President, and certain high-level of-

ficials to file a report with the Office of Government Ethics, when selling real property, disclosing each natural person who is a beneficial owner of the real property upon completion of the sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for gain from the sale of real property for use as a manufactured home community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 3297. A bill to streamline the application process for H-2A employers and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Mr. MI-

CHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PALMER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YODER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIREN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3298. A bill to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 3299. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the rate of